

***The Roles of the Citizen Practitioner in Citizen Engagement for
Architecture, Urban Design, and Planning Policy: A Phronesis-Based
Approach***

Basil Henrik Schaban-Maurer, School of Architecture, McGill University, Montreal
February 2013

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

© Basil Henrik Schaban-Maurer, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	5
RÉSUMÉ	6
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	7
GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS	8
1. INTRODUCTION	17
1.1 CULTURAL FRAME OF REFERENCE	18
1.2. PROBLEM DEFINITION	21
1.3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	24
1.4. METHODOLOGIES	26
1.4.1. Three Research Methods	27
1.4.2. Two Examined Methodologies	34
1.5. STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION	37
1.6. QUESTIONS FOR EXPLORATION	41
2. PHRONESIS, EXPERTISE, AND THE NATURES OF KNOWLEDGE: TACIT KNOWLEDGE VERSUS EXPLICIT KNOWLEDGE AS MANIFESTATIONS OF EXPERTISE IN PUBLIC POLICY	43
2.1. DEFINING CITIZEN PARTICIPATION/ENGAGEMENT	52
2.2. PHRONESIS AND SOPHIA	56
2.3. EXPERTISE AS EXPLICIT KNOWLEDGE	60
2.4. TACIT KNOWLEDGE AND COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE	62
2.5. EXPRESSIONS OF EXPERTISE IN PLANNING, DESIGN, AND PUBLIC POLICY	67
2.6. SYNTHESIS	78
3. AUTHORITY; KNOWLEDGE; AND INSTITUTIONALISED PLANNING, ARCHITECTURE, AND URBAN DESIGN	84
3.1. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT	85
3.1.1. Illustrations of Different Approaches: A Comparative Analysis of CP Strategies in RCP and Transactive Planning Processes	152
3.1.1.1. Case Study: The City of Miramar, Florida, United States	154
3.1.1.2. Case Study: Dundee, Whitfield, United Kingdom	162
3.1.1.3. Comparative Analysis	166

3.2.	RATIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING	170
3.3.	ADVOCACY PLANNING, TRANSACTIVE PLANNING, AND PLURALISM	175
3.4.	COMMUNICATIVE ACTION AND THE DELIBERATIVE PRACTITIONER	180
3.5.	REFLECTIVE PRACTICE, SOCIAL LEARNING, AND PHRONESIS: INSIGHTS FROM WORK ON SOCIAL LEARNING AND REFLECTIVE PRACTICE	184
3.6.	SYNTHESIS	190
4.	PHRONESIS AS A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	197
4.1.	PHRONESIS AS A UNIFYING CONCEPT	200
4.1.1.	Philosophical Implications of the Phronesis-based Approach	203
4.1.2.	Theory of Practice: Bourdieu	213
4.1.3.	Structural-Functionalism/Social Conflict Theory/Critical Theory	216
4.1.3.1.	Social Conflict Theory	220
4.1.3.2.	Critical Theory	222
4.2.	EXAMPLES OF PHRONESIS-BASED APPROACHES IN OTHER DOMAINS	226
4.3.	APPLYING A PHRONESIS-BASED APPROACH FOR CASE STUDY RESEARCH	230
4.4.	A PHRONESIS-BASED APPROACH TO CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT	247
4.5.	SYNTHESIS: OPERATIONALIZATION FOR THE STUDY OF CITIZEN PRACTITIONERS	253
5.	RECOGNIZING CITIZEN PRACTITIONER EXPERTISE AS A FORM OF PRAXIS	256
5.1	WHAT IS IN A NAME? THE NOTION OF A CITIZEN PRACTITIONER	257
5.1.1.	An Identity Forged Through Praxis	259
5.1.2.	A Citizen Practitioner Versus an Expert-Citizen	262
5.1.3.	Local Knowledge Expertise	267
5.2.	EXPLORING THE NOTION OF A CITIZEN PRACTITIONER: SELF-NARRATIVE AS PRAXIS	271
5.3.	DEMONSTRATIONS OF PHRONESIS IN RESPONDENT NARRATIVES	274
5.3.1.	Second-Homeowners in Central Ontario	275
5.3.1.1.	Citizen Engagement, Citizen Practitioners, and Local Place Knowledge	293
5.3.1.2.	Analysis of Key Themes in Respondent Narratives	300
5.3.1.2.1.	Context	305
5.3.1.2.2.	Value-Rationality	311

5.3.1.2.3. Praxis	315
5.4. SYNTHESIS	323
6. DISCUSSION, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	326
6.1 RECAPITULATION	332
6.2. ANALYSIS: REDEFINING CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT RESEARCH METHODS IN URBAN DESIGN, ARCHITECTURE, AND PLANNING TO INCLUDE PHRONESIS-BASED APPROACHES	344
6.3. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	350
APPENDIX	360
Full text of Luka, N. transcribed long excerpts from interviews C01, S02, S07, S08 with owners-occupiers of dwellings on Crystal Lake and the Severn River	360
REFERENCES	373
1. Published scholarly sources	373
2. Poetry	417
3. Unpublished interview material	417

ABSTRACT

The challenges facing citizen participation/engagement in policy are a pressing area of concern for architects, urban designers, planners, policy-makers, and researchers. This dissertation explores the relationships between citizens and their representatives or professionals, with an emphasis on the nature of their participation in matters of policy in such communities (physical locales or neighbourhoods). The purpose of this work is to advance a Phronesis-based approach as a transformative participatory perspective, enabling direct communication between ordinary citizens and their representatives or professionals, through an interface of Phronesis and citizen participation/engagement for architecture, urban design and planning policy design, development and implementation. The scope of this study is: 1. an evaluation of the current state of research on citizen participation/engagement policy strategies through a variety of literature reviews, addressing all predisposed findings through a phronetic lens. 2. An exploration of the roles of the individual in a community as a “citizen practitioner”, whose life experiences and practical knowledge shape that individual’s self-narrative and community level of participation and enriches local place knowledge transmission in architecture, urban design, and planning policy strategies and outcomes. 3. An application of the Aristotelian concept of Phronesis to examine the intersection of authority/expertise vs. knowledge in a conceptual framework driven by several exploratory questions and the research question: *How can current architecture, urban design, and planning research methods and practices concerned with citizen participation/engagement in policy be redefined as learning systems in a Phronesis-dominant approach?*

A. The methodology of this work employs a fully integrated mixed model design in a triangulation of three research methods: a primary method, a secondary method, and a tertiary method. Meta-research analysis was conducted of the work of Altshuler and Luberoff (2003); Arnstein (1969); Bang (2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2005, 2009); Chong (1991); Collins (1990); Cornwall and Jewkes (1995); Dahl (1956, 1961, 1967); Davidoff (1965); Etzioni (1973); Faludi (1973a, 1973b); Fischer (2000); Flyvbjerg (2001); Forester (1980, 1989, 1990); Friedmann (1971, 1973, 1978, 1987, 1993); Habermas ([1962] 1989, 1984); Katz (1992); King, Feltey, and Susel (1998); Lave and Wenger (1991); Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993); Mouffe (2000); Petersen et al (2006); Putnam (2002); Roberts (2004a, 2004b); Rose (1997); Rosener (1978); Schön (1983, 1993); Schneider and Ingram (1997, 2005); Yang and Callahan (2005); Yin (2003); and other influential writers on citizen participation/engagement, in policy. This is followed by a comparative analysis of two competing paradigms, two case studies and a thematic analysis of secondary semi-structured interviews with second-homeowners in Central Ontario, Canada.

B. The findings indicate that current citizen participation/engagement strategies in policy are lacking in effectiveness, relevancy, validity, credibility. The lack of emphasis on value, trust and meaning in dialogues between citizens and their representatives or professionals are some among other challenges. Findings also indicate that in order to overcome such challenges, architecture, urban design, and planning participatory policy strategies can be redefined as learning systems in a Phronesis-based approach, characterized by three components: context, value-rationality, and praxis. Conclusions reached are that there exists a very real necessity for face-to-face interaction and relationship building between people to occur at an individual level, along the lines delineated by a Phronesis-based approach utilizing the life experience-based self-narrative of the citizen practitioner, as a relevant and effective means of transmitting and exchanging local place knowledge between citizens and their representatives. Limitations of this study include compromised effectiveness in a politically charged context and partial or misconceived interpretation and implementation, as well as and resistance by officials, professionals and academicians to the approach and its associated terms. This study contributes a conceptual framework that explicitly integrates knowledge and learning into an understanding of authority and expertise, and redefines classical case study research and practice. It also provides an original contribution to the research, education and practice of policy-oriented participatory processes in architecture, urban design and planning with an impact that extends to other fields.

RÉSUMÉ

Les défis que doit relever la participation des citoyens/engagement dans la politique sont une aire de pressurage de préoccupation pour les architectes, les urbanistes, les planificateurs, les décideurs et les chercheurs. Cette thèse explore les relations entre les citoyens et leurs représentants ou des professionnels, portant sur la nature de leur participation en matière de politique de ces communautés (lieux physiques ou quartiers). Le but de ce travail est de promouvoir une approche Phronesis à base d'une perspective de transformation participative, permettant une communication directe entre les citoyens ordinaires et de leurs représentants ou les professionnels, grâce à une interface de Phronesis et la participation citoyenne/engagement pour l'architecture, l'urbanisme et la conception des politiques de planification, le développement et la mise en œuvre. La portée de cette étude comprend les éléments suivants: 1. une évaluation de l'état actuel de la recherche sur les stratégies politiques des citoyens de participation/d'engagement à travers une variété de revues de la littérature, en abordant tous les résultats prédéposés à travers une lentille phronetic. 2. Une exploration des rôles de l'individu dans une communauté comme un «praticien citoyen», dont l'expérience de vie et la forme des connaissances pratiques de cet individu auto-récit et de la communauté de la participation et enrichit locale de transmission des connaissances dans l'architecture, de l'urbanisme et de la politique de planification les stratégies et les résultats. 3. Une application de la notion aristotélicienne de Phronesis d'examiner l'intersection de l'autorité/expertise vs connaissances dans un cadre conceptuel conduit par plusieurs questions exploratoires et la question de recherche: *Comment l'architecture actuelle, l'aménagement urbain et la planification des méthodes de recherche et des pratiques concernées par la participation des citoyens/engagement dans la politique être redéfini comme les systèmes d'apprentissage dans une approche Phronesis-dominant?*

A. La méthodologie de cette étude utilise un modèle de conception entièrement intégrée mixte dans une triangulation de trois méthodes de recherche: une méthode primaire, une méthode secondaire, tertiaire et une méthode. Avec la méta-analyse de la recherche du travail de Altshuler et Luberoff (2003); Arnstein (1969); Bang (2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2005, 2009); Chong (1991); Collins (1990), Cornwall et Jewkes (1995); Dahl (1956, 1961, 1967), Davidoff (1965); Etzioni (1973); Faludi (1973a, 1973b); Fischer (2000); Flyvbjerg (2001); Forester (1980, 1989, 1990); Friedmann (1971, 1973, 1978, 1987, 1993); Habermas ([1962] 1989, 1984); Katz (1992), le roi, Feltey et Susel (1998); Lave et Wenger (1991); Lindblom et Woodhouse (1993); Mouffe (2000); Petersen et al (2006), Putnam (2002), Roberts (2004a, 2004b), Rose (1997); Rosener (1978); Schön (1983, 1993); Schneider et Ingram (1997, 2005), Yang et Callahan (2005); Yin (2003); et d'autres auteurs influents sur la participation des citoyens/engagement dans la politique. Elle est suivie par une analyse comparative des deux paradigmes concurrents, deux études de cas et une analyse thématique de l'enseignement secondaire entrevue semi-structurée avec le deuxième-propriétaires dans le centre de l'Ontario, Canada.

B. Les résultats indiquent que la participation des citoyens actuels/l'engagement des stratégies en matière de politique font défaut dans l'efficacité, la pertinence, la validité, la crédibilité. L'absence d'accent sur la valeur, la confiance et le sens dans le dialogue entre les citoyens et leurs représentants ou les professionnels sont quelques-uns parmi les nombreux autres défis. Les résultats indiquent également que, pour surmonter ces difficultés, l'architecture, l'urbanisme et la planification des stratégies de politique participative peut être redéfini comme les systèmes d'apprentissage dans une approche basée sur Phronesis caractérisé par trois éléments, le contexte, la rationalité, la valeur et la praxis. Conclusions sont qu'il existe une nécessité très réelle pour les face-à-face et le renforcement des relations entre les gens de se produire à un niveau individuel, le long des lignes délimitées par une approche basée sur l'utilisation Phronesis la vie fondée sur l'expérience d'auto-récit de la praticien citoyen comme un moyen pertinent et efficace de la transmission et l'échange de connaissances endroit local entre les citoyens et leurs représentants. Les limites de cette étude comprennent l'efficacité compromise dans un contexte politiquement chargé et l'interprétation partielle ou erronée, la mise en œuvre et la résistance des fonctionnaires, des professionnels et des universitaires à l'approche et ses termes associés. Cette étude apporte un cadre conceptuel qui intègre explicitement les connaissances et l'apprentissage dans une compréhension de l'autorité et de l'expertise, et redéfinit classique étude de cas et la pratique. Il fournit également une contribution originale à la recherche, l'éducation et la pratique des politiques axées sur les processus participatifs dans l'architecture, de l'urbanisme et de planification avec un impact qui s'étend à d'autres domaines.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere thanks are due to many of my friends, family and colleagues who over the years that it took to complete this work extended their support and goodwill. The early ideas and theories for this work were presented in 2007 in my master's thesis for urban planning and public policy at the University of Texas (SUPA). I continued to develop them through my journey north to Montreal, Canada at the School of Architecture of McGill University. They evolved from the daily labours of design in my architecture practice and the countless and impassioned conversations with clients and ordinary citizens where experiential knowledge and design insights were shared from a trough of meaningful life experiences.

I'm indebted to Professor Nik Luka at the schools of Architecture and Planning of McGill University who was always a positive teaching role model and whose enthusiasm and generosity eased my difficult transition into a new country, and played a crucial role in the development and refinement of my work. He also generously offered me access to excerpts from his primary research on human geography for the purpose of demonstrating the Phronesis-based approach. I'm also grateful to him for the many insightful conversations we had on the social construction of nature and the social and cultural meanings of multiple residency.

I also extend my thanks to Professors Fischler at the school of Planning and Professor Berns at the School of Architecture of McGill University for their advisory feedback on the developing drafts of this work. I am also indebted to my oral defence committee members, Professors Annemarie Adams, Vikram Bhatt, David Covo and Rene Sieber, whose insightful comments on the final draft of this work highlighted important issues. I'm indebted to Professor Covo, in particular, for his mentorship and kindness during this most difficult but rewarding journey.

I'm also indebted to Professor Ard Anjomani, the head of the doctoral programme in Planning at the School of Urban and Public affairs of the University of Texas, who was always generous with his time and invaluable advice on academic and personal matters.

Finally, I'm eternally grateful to my family for their unconditional love and support that enabled me to navigate the many tribulations encountered during the course of this work. Special gratitude is also due to my classmate Ehsan Daneshyar for his friendship and support and to all my friends in Canada and the United States.

I dedicate this work to the memory of my maternal aunt who passed away during the last stages of this work and who was a source of inspiration to me all my life. I also dedicate it to the late Professor Andrej Pino, my mentor at the School of Architecture at the University of Texas, who actively encouraged me to pursue doctoral studies and was a source of inspiration, in both his teaching and practice, to all his students.

Finally I dedicate this work to the citizen practitioners amongst us, hoping that I've done my small part in giving voice to the voiceless and acknowledging the heartfelt efforts of the professionals who engage them in order to achieve informed policy outcomes.

GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS

• **Citizen participation:** With the 1992 integration of citizen participation in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development Declaration (United Nations 1992), citizen participation gained wider acceptance. Its definition, however, is far from universal, as Aleshire (1970) notes, “The definition of citizen participation depends largely on one’s view of the citizen and his role in society” (369). In terms of policy, the most common definition of citizen participation in the literature is Nagel’s (1987), in which the author defines any directly or indirectly influential action by a citizen on policy decisions as citizen participation or “as an action that incorporates the demands and values of citizens into public administration services” (Zimmerman 1986, 172). While the above definitions appear on the surface to enable citizens to have their say in their governments’ policy-making processes, citizen participation remains, to a large extent, a one-way top-down, mostly passive information gathering or dissemination activity under the control of public officials and governments. Historically, citizen participation processes developed in response to increased citizen demands for government accountability and transparency, giving rise to two-way processes of citizen engagement.

• **Citizen engagement:** refers to “a particular type of involvement characterized by interactive and iterative processes of deliberation among citizens (and sometimes organizations), and between citizens and government officials” (Phillips and Orsini 2002, 3). This definition of citizen engagement transforms the notion of participation, shifting to a more equitable power dynamic wherein all stakeholders are mutually accountable for all of the outcomes.

• **Citizen practitioner:** A term derived from a dynamic definition of the concept of *Phronesis* (see below) as it is applied to urban design, planning, and social policy at the local government level and in the context of citizen participation/engagement. I have coined the terms “citizen practitioners” and “citizen praxis” to define the type of direct active participation/engagement by ordinary citizens, not activists, whose lay-expertise is legitimized by their life experiences, or praxis, and their local environmental knowledge of their respective locales. I have also coined the general term “mindful engagement” to typify the outcome of a Phronesis-based approach through the exchange of self-narratives, based on life experience, between citizen practitioners.

• **Citizen praxis:** A specific term that defines the type of direct active engagement of citizen practitioners that can be exemplified by, but is not limited to, the sharing of local place knowledge with their representatives and other professionals through early collaboration and exchange of self-narratives based on life experience, within the context of a particular project and for a particular locale.

• **Dialogue:** is defined as

A process that allows people, usually in small groups, to share their perspectives and experiences with one another about difficult issues we tend to just debate about or avoid entirely ... Dialogue is not about winning an argument or coming to an agreement, but about understanding and learning. Dialogue dispels stereotypes, builds trust and enables people to be open to perspectives that are very different from their own. Dialogue can, and often does, lead to both personal and collaborative action ... starting with dialogue and encouraging deliberation after people have had the chance to share their personal experiences with the issue at hand.

(NCDD, What are Dialogue and Deliberation? para. 4-6)

• **Deliberation:** is defined as “people coming together to talk about a community problem that is important to them...face to face...considering the costs and consequences of public policy decisions” (NCDD, What is Deliberation? para. 7). In Aristotle’s view “deliberation refers to the process of considering alternatives and reasoning to the best ... excellence in deliberation will be correctness in assessing what is conducive to the end [i.e. the goal], concerning which practical wisdom gives a true conviction.” (Aristotle 1999, Book 6, Ch. 9:1142b30) The National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation explains:

Deliberation emphasizes the importance of examining options and trade-offs to make better decisions. Decisions about important public issues like health care and immigration are too often made through the use of power or coercion rather than a sound decision-making process that involves all parties and explores all options ... Dialogue and deliberation processes tend to use skilled facilitators and carefully constructed ground rules or agreements to ensure that all participants are heard and are treated as equals ... Dialogue often lays the groundwork for deliberation. The trust, mutual understanding and relationships that are built during dialogue enable participants to deliberate more effectively, and to make better decisions.

(NCDD, What are Dialogue and Deliberation? para. 4)

• **Dreyfus Model of Human Learning:** A process of learning that is defined by five levels, the first three of which are quantitative in nature, while the fourth and fifth are qualitative. The model emphasizes the importance of gaining concrete experience as a precondition for the qualitative leap from the rule-governed analytical rationality of the first three levels to the intuitive, holistic, and synchronous performance of tacit skills of the last two levels. The model was developed by the brothers H. Dreyfus and S. Dreyfus (1986) to distinguish the processes of adherence and expertise in learning. In addition to their critique of artificial intelligence, the model they developed has become seminal to the study of expert systems, learning, and education.

- **Episteme:** “Science” is a kind of knowledge that is demonstrable (Aristotle [384 BC] 1999). It is also knowledge of truths that have an eternal or inviolate aspect of the universe. Physics, as a body of demonstrable knowledge or knowledge of mathematical theorems based on proofs is an example of episteme. Cherubin (n.d) explains, “*Episteme* is not quite the same as what we usually mean today by ‘science.’ First of all, *episteme* could involve knowledge of other fields beyond what modern sciences study. Second, modern science may well seek the kind of knowledge that is called ‘*episteme*,’ but it has not necessarily attained this knowledge” (part D, point 1).

- **Expert activity:** As posited by Flyvbjerg (2001) in *Making Social Science Matter*, expert activity occurs when context-dependent knowledge and experience meld research and teaching into a cohesive method of learning. Flyvbjerg explains, “Such activity is quite simply a central element of learning and in the achievement of new insight. More simple forms of understanding must yield to more complex ones, as one moves from novice to expert” (84).

- **Mindful engagement:** A general term coined by the author for the purposes of this dissertation that describes responsive and direct citizen engagement, extending the current definitions of citizen engagement and its predecessor, citizen participation, to typify the outcome of a Phronesis-based approach through the exchange of self-narratives, based on life experience, between citizen practitioners. The term “mindful,” whose synonyms are heedful, attentive, aware and centered, is often used in connection with meditation and stress reducing therapeutic

techniques in psychotherapy and the health sciences, as well as mindful-based practices like mindful meditation and mindful living connected to the growing mindfulness movement. The hallmark of this movement is personal awareness of one's limitations and potential along with actualizing one's capacity to initiate and accept change, especially in regards to one's place in a community of other individuals.

- **Phronesis:** (Greek: φρόνησις) In Aristotle is the virtue of practical thought, usually translated as practical wisdom or as prudence. Aristotle ([384 BC] 1976) calls it “a true state, reasoned, and capable of action with regard to things that are good or bad for man” (1140). Phronesis is the capability to consider a mode of action in order to create change, especially to enhance the quality of life. Aristotle contends that, “A person who is said to have practical wisdom is one who is (or is said to be) able to deliberate well. Practical wisdom cannot be a pure science (an episteme), in that pure sciences deal with things that cannot be otherwise than they are, but deliberation deals precisely with things that can be a variety of different ways. Deliberation involves reasoning about which way to act” (as cited in Cherubin n.d., part D, point 3). Thus, Aristotle ([384 BC] 1999) links the ability to deliberate well to practical wisdom by stating, “excellence in deliberation will be correctness in assessing what is conducive to the end [i.e. the goal], concerning which practical wisdom gives a true conviction” (p. 163). Cherubin (n.d.) explains that, “practical reason seems to involve being able to determine what is really (in truth) good for oneself and for humans generally or as a whole; assessing this honestly; and acting according to reason, based on this recognition of what is good and what is bad. Practical wisdom is itself not an art (a techne), but an excellence” (part D, point 3). Cherubin (n.d.) also notes

Aristotle's explanation that "aside from the fact that arts are supposed to have products and practical wisdom is not, there is also the difference that arts can be practiced well or badly, with excellence or without" (part D, point 3).

- **Phronetic planning research:** is the phronetic social science advanced by Oxford professor Bent Flyvbjerg (2001), who developed methods to counter rampant misinformation in planning, policy, and management. Flyvbjerg's methods emphasize improved accountability and the adoption of the reference class forecasting method for policy, a method for projecting future scenarios by reviewing past situations and their outcomes.

- **Phronetic research:** Research that is particularly suited for the social and applied sciences, which takes values as a point of departure and utilizes reflexive and inductive reasoning to interpret a rich supply of data, while examining each case in depth and within its context. Phronetic research has three fundamental components, which are context¹, value-rationality², and practical knowledge or praxis³ (also termed meaningful knowledge in epistemology).

- **Phronetic Critique:** My interpretation of Flyvbjerg's phronetic research as a form of epistemic rhetoric⁴ or deliberative rhetorical⁵ criticism aimed at researchers and practitioners in the applied

¹ Context is the interrelated conditions in which something exists or occurs: environment, setting (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2013).

² Value-rationality or value-judgement is a judgment assigning a value (as good or bad) to something (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2013).

³ Praxis is a customary practice or conduct (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2013).

⁴ A contemporary rhetorical perspective is where communication among participants is fundamental to the creation of knowledge in communities (Garver, 1994).

⁵ Also termed political rhetoric, aims at whether or not particular future actions should or should not be taken, i.e. decision-making in policy (Garver, 1994).

and social sciences. In this interpretation, such a critique serves three distinct purposes. First, it aims to help researchers and practitioners within those fields, to derive and apply experiential knowledge through Aristotelian “enthymematic⁶” reasoning, which uses generally accepted propositions to derive specific conclusions, supplemented with non-instrumental reasoning. Second, it helps professionals, academicians and ordinary citizens to become better judges of phronetic situations by reinforcing ideas of value, value-rationality, context, and experience. Third, phronetic critique can contribute to professionals, academicians and ordinary citizens understanding of themselves and society and thus help improve their interactions with each other.

•**Scientific research:** Research that is exemplified by inquiry in the natural sciences and based on the hypothetical-deductive scientific model, deductive reasoning, and discovery of general principles across large samples.

•**Self-narrative:** In a narrative exchange, ordinary individual citizens represent their life experiences as storylines embedding values in a coordinated description of the experienced events. Such representational narrative devices enable an individual to relay a linear progression of temporal events, as life experience narratives. It is situated knowledge only in the sense that the project-specific dialogue gives it form. The National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation

⁶ Aristotle emphasized enthymematic reasoning as central to the process of rhetorical invention, though later rhetorical theorists placed much less emphasis on it. An “enthymeme” would follow today’s form of a syllogism; however it would exclude either the major or minor premise. An enthymeme is persuasive because the audience is providing the missing premise. Because the audience is able to provide the missing premise, they are more likely to be persuaded by the message (Garver, 1994, edited by Anna Helmbrecht, 2012).

encourages the sharing of each participant's "personal stories and perspectives on the issue at hand. We ask 'how has this issue played out in your life?' rather than 'what do you think should be done about this issue?' or 'What's your take on this issue?' This builds trust in the group, establishes a sense of equality, and enables people to begin seeing the issue from perspectives other than their own. This is especially important when participants have different levels of technical knowledge or professional experience with the issue, or when some participants are not comfortable talking openly about contentious issues" (NCDD, What are Dialogue and Deliberation? para. 16).

- **Sophia:** Translated as theoretical wisdom, sophia is "knowing what follows from fundamental principles as well as having true knowledge of the fundamental principles themselves. It is connected to universal unchanging principles or truths" (as cited in Cherubin n.d., part D, point 5). Cherubin (n.d.) emphasizes that Aristotle noted that "people use the term 'sophia' in several ways. It can be used in a partial or limited way, as when people say that one who is an excellent craftsman is wise" (part D, point 5). Cultivating episteme or trying to gain real episteme would seem to be part of our attempts to gain theoretical wisdom or sophia. As to the importance of seeking sophia, Cherubin (n.d.) explains that "if we are to be able to deliberate well, it would be good to know exactly what we can deliberate about (what things can really change, through our action) and what we can't deliberate about" (part B, point 2). Cherubin (n.d.) notes that in Book 10 of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle explains that, sophia can be used as a basis for action but does not necessarily act as such: it may have no practical application in the present (though

some applications may be found in the future). However, when considered as a refinement of thought processes, sophia does have value, and provides the pleasure of contemplation of knowledge.

•**Techne:** Translated as art or applied science or skill. Aristotle calls *techne* a “trained ability of rationally producing” (Aristotle [384 BC] 1999, Book 6, Ch. 4:1141b1). Cherubin (n.d.) gives an example of this as “the ability to produce something reliably under a variety of conditions on the basis of some reasoning. This involves having knowledge or what seems to be knowledge (awareness) of the principles and patterns one relies on” (part D, point 2). Applied episteme, as is often found in technai (plural of techne, meaning arts, skills) also contributes information that can be useful in deliberation and helpful in maintaining life and producing things of value. As such, the contemporary fields of architecture, urban design, and planning can be considered examples of techne. Cherubin (n.d.) emphasizes Aristotle’s explanation in Chapter 7 that just as applied episteme “contributes information that can be useful in deliberation, and that helps us maintain life and produce things we value ... techne by itself is not a guide to action, one needs Phronesis to arrive at the correct course of action” (part D, point 1-2).

1. INTRODUCTION

After half of a century of political, social, and academic debate on citizen participation, it remains an urgent concern for governments worldwide. The relationship between citizens and their elected representatives is affected by many factors, not the least of which are the limitations of current political systems. Historically, this relationship has tended to be volatile. This has fuelled the need for methods of citizen participation that will address the issues at the heart of that relationship. Only within the last few decades of the twentieth century have notions of responsible citizenship and accountable government entered the mainstream of academic, social, and political thought. A basic level of trust between citizens and their elected representatives, as well as between citizens and the professionals with whom they interact on everyday issues and challenges, is now considered essential. Citizen participation approaches that are collaborative in nature are founded on this basic level of trust, as this dissertation aims to show.

This research advances one such approach, one that validates, in matters of policy, the creative contribution of individual citizens to projects that affect their daily lives. It applies the Aristotelian concept of Phronesis and the three fundamental components of Flyvbjerg's (2001) propositions on phronetic research—value-rationality, context, and praxis—in a conceptual framework to explore the following research question: *How can current architecture, urban design, and planning research methods and practices concerned with citizen participation/engagement in policy be redefined as learning systems in a Phronesis-dominant approach?* This dissertation examines the issues confronting citizen participation research in municipal planning, architecture, and urban design. It also explores the role of the individual

citizen practitioner, whose life experiences and practical knowledge—as expressed through a direct exchange with his or her professional and elected representatives—shape policy strategies and outcomes. Based on an extended application of Phronesis, this dissertation looks at ways of informing and guiding architecture and urban design processes and planning policies through more effective citizen participation/engagement in policy for the three fields. Such an effective engagement in policy is characterized as mindful engagement for both ordinary citizens and the professionals who represent them to use in transforming existing perspectives; this approach can complement existing practices.

1.1 Cultural Frame of Reference

The original impetus for this work was a challenge issued by eminent urban planner and political scientist Bent Flyvbjerg (2001) to fellow urban planners, architects, and social scientists to re-examine their disciplines through the lens of Phronesis. I was inspired by Flyvbjerg's contributions to his field and wanted to respond directly to his challenge. I accept his propositions on phronetic research as a point of departure for this work, while questioning some of his premises and conclusions. A point of divergence is my interpretation of Flyvbjerg's phronetic research as a form of epistemic rhetoric or deliberative rhetorical criticism aimed at researchers and practitioners in the applied and social sciences. In my interpretation, such phronetic critique serves three distinct purposes. First, it aims to help researchers and practitioners within those fields to derive and apply experiential knowledge through Aristotelian "enthymematic" reasoning, which uses generally accepted propositions to derive specific conclusions, supplemented with non-instrumental reasoning. Second, it helps professionals,

academicians and ordinary people to become better judges of phronetic situations by reinforcing ideas of value, value-rationality, context, and experience. Third, phronetic critique can contribute to their understanding of themselves and society and thus help improve their interaction with each other.

Another point of divergence is in his interpretation of Phronesis as integral to power politics in representative democracy. I interpret Phronesis as a treatment of expertise that hinges on the interplay between authority⁷ and knowledge, in a direct democratic participatory role situated in knowledge exchange. My work also diverges from Flyvbjerg's with respect to interpretation of the roles played by experts and ordinary citizens within direct rather than representative democracy. It is a response to the problem of political exclusion of ordinary citizens, on which Etzioni-Halevy (1999) states, "what we witness today, I argue, is an increasing exclusion of, particularly, the 'weakest' and most vulnerable individuals and groups at all levels, from the local to the global" (140). It is also a response to the problem of socio-political uncoupling described by Bang (2004a) as, "the political fact that political authorities cannot make and implement authoritative decisions for a society unless laypeople accept them and recognize themselves as bounded by them" (4).

⁷ Authority and expertise are often mistaken for each other in the popular media. The two concepts are distinct from each other. An expert is defined as having, involving, or displaying special skill or knowledge derived from training or experience (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2013). An authority is defined as a person in official capacity or command of or relating to an office, position, or trust (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2013). Therefore a person merely exercising legitimate authority is not by definition an expert, however, an expert whose authority is delegated by legitimate sources of authority, to access and control his/her expertise may be considered an authority. The concepts of authority and power are also distinct from each other and are often misconstrued. Power is defined as possession of legal or official control, authority, or influence over others. Power implies possession of ability to wield force, permissive authority, or substantial influence, as in the power to shape public opinion. Authority, however, implies the granting of power for a specific purpose within specified limits (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2013). To that end, the narrative exchange of local place knowledge in this dissertation characterizes the dialogue between ordinary citizens (local place knowledge experts), their elected representatives (agents of authority) and professionals (agents of expertise).

My own conceptions of citizen praxis and the roles of citizen practitioners are a natural extension of my treatment of expertise in a direct participatory democracy (strong democracy⁸) and an articulation of a new variety of “self-reflexive and cooperative layperson ... [who] acquire[s] an indirect influence over politics and policy,” (Bang, 2004a: 15) through project-specific local deliberation and dialogue with political representatives and planning, architecture and urban design professionals. Bang (2004a) describes this process of political engagement as follows: “Laypeople are enabled by the very communicative nature of democratic political authority to experiment with new modes of engagement and cooperation beyond the hegemony of the living constitution. These can acquire political salience and indirect influence, when political authorities are willing to listen and learn from them and incorporate new public values into their strategic decisions and actions” (15).

The Phronesis-based approach and its method of life-experience narrative exchange advanced in this dissertation is also a direct answer to Till’s (2005) call for a transformative participatory approach in architecture that includes non-instrumental “sense-making knowledge” leading to mutual understanding between “participants facing up to the contingencies of architectural practice and a new model of communication.” (Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 10)

This work presents the life-experience vernacular narratives of ordinary citizens and their representative professionals in an exchange of locally acquired place-knowledge, as a new

⁸ Strong Democracy: is defined as the participation of all of the people in at least some aspects of self-government at least some of the time.” (Barber 1984)

method of communication. Framed within a North American cultural context, it extends beyond Flyvbjerg and Till's European one. As such, it is a critique of the Western world's preoccupation with a universal conception of science in the Kuhnian tradition,⁹ as a presumptively effective means of achieving standardized and universal civilization. The work is essentially a participatory approach to policy, which challenges the dominant normative values of traditional architecture, urban design and planning through a shift in perspective that takes place at the individual level of participation.

With this work, I attempt to articulate a means for achieving relevant and effective communication between stakeholders engaged in the production of context-dependent knowledge, as well as a means for shaping project-specific policy actions within applied scientific disciplines such as architecture, urban design, planning, medicine, and engineering. In doing so, I juxtapose domains in which authority, knowledge, and decision-making are dominant factors. Within such a framework, all technical, ethical, and political debates are predicated on the kind of relationships that allow for the formation of individual perspectives. Through such relationships, consensus may be reached and beneficial outcomes achieved that are founded upon individual contributions rather than abstract group representations.

1.2 Problem Definition

Effective citizen participation outcomes can only be realized through meaningful forms of participation. Most citizen participation programs ignore this reality. Such ignorance of the

⁹ See Thomas S. Kuhn (1962) for an example of Kuhnian discourse on the evolution of paradigms. For a thorough treatment of "scientism" and its universal conception of science, see Stengers (1997).

centrality of value to the participation concept has resulted in confusion over the meaning, expectations, cause, and effect of relationships between participation programs and societal goals. Studies cited in Chapter 3 of this dissertation suggest that previous efforts to improve the effectiveness of citizen participation have often failed. In some cases, this has been due to poor planning or execution. Other efforts may have failed because administrative systems dominated by conventional notions of expertise and professionalism leave little room for participatory processes. A major obstacle to citizen participation/engagement is that professionals and decision-makers have difficulty accessing and hearing what citizens have to say. This is perhaps a result of the fact that their professionalization and specialization can lead expert to believe that non-experts have little or nothing to contribute.

Work done in various fields suggests that current architecture, urban design and planning research suffers from a lack of awareness that value, context, and praxis play important roles in making citizen participation meaningful (see studies by Rosener 1978; King, Feltey, and Susel 1998; Yang and Callahan 2005; and Petersen et al. 2006). In addition, although most of the research studies from the targeted disciplines highlight the usefulness of soliciting the input and participation of citizens at the beginning of programs and projects, they conclude that this is rarely done (Yang and Callahan 2005). These studies also show that lack of trust between stakeholders leads to disagreements over goals and objectives. As a result, citizen input is not integrated into architecture, urban design, and social policy. By contrast, considerations of value, context, and praxis represent the strengths of phronetic research and the depth and variety of its rich historical traditions. Within these forgotten—and, at times, misapplied—traditions we can

find relevant approaches to the challenges facing citizen participation/engagement in the fields of architecture, urban design and planning.

Yang and Callahan (2005) recently conducted a survey of 428 municipalities in the United States to address the shortcomings of the methodologies utilized by local governments in their citizen participation efforts. Their results indicate a lack of emphasis on value, an absence of will to solicit and utilize direct local knowledge from residents, and an overemphasis on quantifying measures and indicators. The authors explain, “We find that although conventional citizen participation methods are consistently used by many governments, broad-based and individual-based methods are utilized less frequently” (18); they also note, “Governments in large communities are found to be more likely to promote citizen involvement activities than are governments in smaller communities” (18).

I conduct integrative, methodological, historical and theoretical literature reviews of more than four decades of studies on citizen participation/engagement in policy, across multiple fields and disciplines that bear on Phronesis through a meta-research analysis, and then offer meta-research analysis of the work of Altshuler, Chong, Fischer, Ingram, Lindblom, Luberoff, Roberts, Schneider, Woodhouse, and other influential citizen participation researchers. I perform this analysis as a means of exploring strategies for citizen participation that may be enhanced by a Phronesis-based approach to designing and implementing municipal planning, architecture and urban design processes and policy.

To summarize, in this dissertation, I seek to analyze the feasibility and flexibility of a Phronesis-based approach to citizen participation/engagement methods and practices in policy. This research also examines the effect of this approach on the interaction between individual citizens and their professional and elected representatives in local governments, architecture, urban design, and planning organizations. The dissertation's recommendations rest on the premise that such an approach, with its emphasis on direct communication through the exchange of self-narratives, can make citizen participation in planning, architecture, and urban design policy more effective. This would, in turn, enhance current research on citizen participation/engagement; inform the research and practices of municipal planning, architecture, and urban design in matters of policy; and augment the policy design, development and implementation of non-profit organizations.

1.3 Research Objectives

The aim of this dissertation is to present a Phronesis-based approach to citizen participation/engagement in architecture, urban design, and planning policy that is more effective than existing approaches. It advances a new method for enabling face-to-face communication between ordinary citizens and their representatives in which local place knowledge is transmitted through the exchange of life experience-based self-narratives. To that end, the dissertation employs a mixed method that includes an evaluation of the current state of citizen participation/engagement research and practices in policy; it also includes methodological, historical, theoretical and integrative reviews¹⁰ of more than four decades of studies collected by

¹⁰ The analytical features and purpose of the reviews employed in this dissertation are the following: “give a new interpretation of old material [and] combine new with old interpretations, trace the intellectual progression of the

meta-research analysis in an attempt to identify issues and challenges and analyze recommendations for more effective citizen participation/engagement strategies in policy. The mixed method is comprised of primary, secondary and tertiary methods, each of which targets specific areas of discourse for the purposes of analyzing and reviewing the body of knowledge, constructing the theoretical argument and demonstrating the implications and viability of the proposed approach.

On the one hand, this research seeks to redefine individual citizens as legitimate and meaningful sources of local knowledge for architecture, urban design, and planning projects and policies that affect local environments. On the other hand, it offers local governments and architecture, urban design, and planning organizations a mindful-approach to engaging residents effectively and relevantly in designing, developing and implementing local policy. A Phronesis-based approach harnesses the expertise of the individual citizen and directs that local knowledge to municipal governments and architecture, urban design and planning organizations. This approach is intended to complement and transform existing urban design, architectural, and planning practices.

To summarize, the objectives of this research are:

- To evaluate the current state of citizen participation/engagement research and practice in policy by means of a mixed method that includes integrative, methodological, theoretical

field, including major debates, evaluate the sources and identify where gaps exist in how a problem has been researched to date, place each work in the context of its contribution to the understanding of the research problem being studied, describe the relationship of each work to the others under consideration, identify new ways to interpret, and shed light on any gaps in previous research, resolve conflicts amongst seemingly contradictory previous studies, identify areas of prior scholarship to prevent duplication of effort,” (Kennedy 2007, 139) and locate the Phronesis-based approach within the context of existing literature.

and historical literature reviews covering more than four decades of studies.

- To redefine ordinary citizens engaged in the harnessing and transmission of local place knowledge as citizen practitioners, and to redefine their role in local urban design, architecture, and planning projects and policy as citizen praxis.
- To articulate the rationale for a Phronesis-based approach to citizen participation/engagement in urban design, architecture and planning policy and case study research, an approach that utilizes the self-narrative of the citizen practitioner in direct communication with professional and elected representatives.

1.4 Methodologies

The subject matter of the dissertation is interdisciplinary. It is derived from studies in a multitude of disciplines and fields in the applied and social sciences and it involves an examination of multiple stakeholder perspectives. The focus, language, and discourse framework within these fields are far from uniform, and there are few areas of overlap with other fields. The assumptions, premises, and theoretical models of each field tend to be independent of one another; they do not readily conform to a unified perspective. However, in some common areas of study—for example, citizen participation and, to a lesser extent, Phronesis—similar conclusions and insights do emerge, even if they do so via different methodologies and paths of inquiry and in a plethora of terms and diversity of meaning, ascribed to the same concepts. In order to reconcile those differences and achieve a coherent and effective synthesis of the relevant literature examined, I have used a mixed methodology.

1.4.1. Three Research Methods

Necessitated by its interdisciplinarity, the dissertation utilizes a fully integrated mixed model design in a triangulation of three research methods: a primary method, a secondary method, and a tertiary method. The primary method is an analysis of a body of knowledge, which is intended to make a case about a field and its patterns and trends. The secondary method is a traditional literature review¹¹ that is comprised of comprehensive methodological, historical, theoretical and integrative reviews of existing knowledge using relevant primary research studies and secondary sources, collected through meta-research analysis, to identify knowledge gaps. The tertiary method is a philosophical treatise that constructs a theoretical argument, using references to explain terms, which define implicit and explicit assumptions and premises of scholarly discourse and offers critiques of other scholars' positions. Several methods were examined and found to be irrelevant to the purposes of this dissertation. Additionally, in Creswell's (2003) definition of methodology as a "strategy of inquiry," the author stipulates that it governs choice and use of specific methods, i.e., techniques and procedures of data collection/analysis (5). While there are multiple strategies of inquiry in the relevant body of literature for this dissertation, in general, three alternative groups can be identified:

1. Quantitative strategies of inquiry (e.g., experiments, surveys);
2. Qualitative strategies of inquiry (e.g., grounded theory, phenomenologies, ethnographies, narratives, case studies);

¹¹ While numerous precedents exist in the social science and humanities literature for using a review of the literature as a core methodology, they are not included in this dissertation because they are not relevant to its mixed methodology. For further interest, however, (see Hladkyi 2001; Matsuda 2001; Katz 2001; Skerritt 2001; Gamarra 2002; Christmas 2002; Mook 2000; Horowitz 2005; Haw 2005; Landau 2007; Jalava 2007).

3. Mixed strategies of inquiry (e.g., sequential, concurrent, transformative) (13).

Along with several diverging paradigms that feature in this work, the primary paradigm is phronetic research. Additionally, Phronesis as a type of knowledge (in the Aristotelian tradition) is presented as a guiding conceptual framework for this dissertation, which combines the elements of philosophical ideas, strategies, and methods into the three approaches to research (primary, secondary and tertiary) that make up the chosen mixed method. The selection of the mixed strategy of inquiry, which included the analysis and use of secondary interview material (framed by phronetic case study research criteria) and a comparative analysis of two competing paradigms and their two case studies, was determined by the following factors: the emergent life-experience narrative exchange phenomenon, the research question, the exploratory questions, the multiple examined paradigms of the literature reviewed, the nature and variety of stakeholders and the context of citizen engagement in policy affecting neighbourhood projects.

The semi-formal interviews in Central Ontario qualify as primary data since they were the original recordings, although not originally my interviews. They were previously conducted by Luka (2006), a specialist in another field (human geography), addressing a different topic (the social construction of nature and the social and cultural meanings of multiple residency). The respondents were neither purely in the applied or social sciences and professions, nor were they purely ordinary citizens. Because of the nature of the subject under study, it was deemed inappropriate for me to organize my own interviews and use them as primary research, as that would present a case of confirmation bias, in that I would be setting up my interviews, even

subconsciously, in a manner in which the three components of the phronetic approach are present, therefore compromising the legitimacy of the premise and argument advanced.

Mixed methods in social science research have been in use since the late 1980s and are presented under different names, such as, blended research, integrative, multi-method, multiple methods, triangulated studies, ethnographic residual analysis, and mixed research. There are numerous robust precedents in the social and applied sciences for using a mixed method (see Bahl and Miln 2006; Hudson and Ozann 1988; Luna, Ringberg and Peracchio 2008; Voorhees, Brady and Horowitz 2006; Botti, Orfali and Iyengar 2009).

Tashakorri and Teddlie (2003) posit that for a fully integrated mixed model design:

The mixing occurs in the method. *Mixed model* research is mixed in many or all stages of the study (from developing questions to the drawing of inferences). In the latter it is possible to have more than one paradigm and worldview mixed throughout a single study or a series ... fully integrated mixed model designs [are] the most advanced and dynamic. They incorporate multiple approach oriented questions ... inferences are made on the basis of the different analyses and the results are combined together at the end to form meta inference. This model combines concurrent and sequential possibilities and is interactive allowing change and modification to occur throughout the project.
(689-90)

Thurmond (2001) explains the premise for utilizing a mixed method and its benefits as, “increasing confidence in research data, creating innovative ways of understanding a phenomenon, revealing unique findings, challenging or integrating theories, and providing a clearer understanding of the problem” (254). Patton (2002) points out that achieving consistency across data approaches is not the goal of triangulation, which is a common misconception: inconsistencies do not weaken the evidence, but rather emerge out of the competing strengths of

different approaches and are a means for harvesting deeper meaning from the data. This uncovering of a deeper meaning in what is researched was a necessary requirement for a valid evaluation of a Phronesis-based approach in this dissertation, which involved the development of multiple approach-oriented exploratory questions and inferences from different analyses combined to form a meta inference. It also exposes its research question to a more rigorous analysis. To that end, Guion, Diehl and McDonald (2011) explain, “Triangulation is a method used by qualitative researchers to check and establish validity in their studies by analyzing a research question from multiple perspectives” (3).

Literature analysis and reviews, as well as theoretical argument facilitate an exploration of key assumptions of the proposed phronetic approach. Those are followed by a thematic analysis of secondary-use interviews to make a case for the existence of a phenomenon (life-experience narrative exchange of local place knowledge) and the patterns of a Phronesis-based approach (phronetic component patterns) in the research and practices of planners, urban designers and architects in their respective fields in particular, and other fields in general. Therefore, Chapter 5 includes the thematic analysis of excerpts from semi-formal interviews formerly conducted by a specialist (my supervisor, Nik Luka) in another field (human geography) addressing a different topic than this dissertation, whose respondents were neither purely in the applied or social sciences and professions nor were they purely ordinary citizens.

The two methods; meta-research analysis followed by a thematic analysis of interview material—derived from individual subjects in a variety of fields as well as citizen practitioners—

facilitate an exploration of key assumptions of the proposed phronetic approach. The mixed method also provides, among other things, a theoretical basis for demonstrating the efficacy and relevance of the life experience-based self-narrative of the citizen practitioner as a means of transmitting local knowledge in face-to-face communication with professional and elected representatives. I selected the mixed method after carefully considering other research methodologies and after determining that methodology's effectiveness in demonstrating the key concepts, assumptions, and propositions of the Phronesis-based approach. Each alternative methodology is presented along with a description of its degree of relevance and applicability to the Phronesis-based approach.

Through the meta-research analysis of collected studies in this dissertation, I examine representative samples of citizen participation/engagement studies in policy to highlight key issues in this area that could be mitigated through a Phronesis-based approach. I apply a specific construction of Aristotelian Phronesis in a conceptual framework in order to answer this research question: *How can current architecture, urban design, and planning research methods and practices concerned with citizenship participation/engagement in policy be redefined as learning systems in a Phronesis-dominant approach?*

As I maintained earlier, it is imperative to make citizen participation more effective and relevant. Insights from the literature point to the conclusion that this can only be accomplished if we first improve research on citizen participation. To this end, approaches that employ insights from Phronesis become useful. The three fundamental components of Flyvbjerg's (2001) phronetic

research—value-rationality, context, and praxis—constitute the phronetic lens I employ in the meta-research analysis. I also explore the impact of the Dreyfus Model of Human Learning (Dreyfus and Dreyfus 1986) on citizenship participation/engagement in policy and its relationship to the fundamental components of phronetic research.

The aim of the proposed Phronesis-based approach, in general, and the self-narrative interview method, in particular, is to bridge the gap between the agents of authority and expertise, on the one hand, and those of local knowledge, on the other. It facilitates a reciprocal knowledge exchange. It also serves to delineate notions of expertise, trust, accountability, and power dynamics and to articulate the roles that citizen practitioners can play in policy, in an alternative model of practice that includes both ordinary citizenry and professionals. Direct individual representation of citizen practitioners in the design, development, and implementation of policy for projects affecting their homes and neighbourhoods—projects that require non-abstract local knowledge to be successfully realized—is within the scope of this research and is explored in more detail in Chapter 2. However, what remains beyond the scope are the processes shaping individual citizen representation in policy-making bodies dominated by select groups of citizens (expert-citizens or elites) or representatives of interest organizations. Such representation may well play a positive role in balancing the power dynamics between government agencies and ordinary citizens, which are often determined by the existing constitutional framework and, as some studies suggest (see Dalton and Kuechler 1990; Chong 1991; Bingham, Nabatchi and O’Leary 2005), may act as a check on the power of policy-makers.

Additionally, this research does not espouse any of the variants of individualism¹²—economic, political, or methodological—nor does it promote methodological holism¹³ or collectivism¹⁴ in any of its variations. Although there will inevitably be some methodological and ontological discussion that touches on such ideologies, they generally remain beyond the scope of this research.

The analysis and use of life experience-based self-narratives provided by interviewees, a mix of professionals and ordinary citizens of various occupations has a twofold role: to validate the research findings and to facilitate the practical application of such findings. The thematic analysis will reveal the relevance of the concepts and propositions advanced in a Phronesis-based approach to local place knowledge. The original interview questions were semi-structured but further re-reading of the transcripts revealed some anomalies. It appears that whenever the interviewer veered from the prepared questions and engaged the respondents in an unstructured dialogue, punctuated by occasional leading cues, this breaking with protocol appeared to foster trust, which in turn, allowed self-narratives to emerge in an open environment. Current urban design, architecture, and planning processes seldom create such an environment, one that would allow an effective transfer of knowledge and not constrain interviewees to offer specific

¹² Individualism is a theory maintaining the political and economic independence of the individual and stressing individual initiative, action, and interests; *also*: conduct or practice guided by such a theory (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2013).

¹³ Holism is a theory that the universe and especially living nature is correctly seen in terms of interacting wholes (as of living organisms) that are more than the mere sum of elementary particles. Methodological holism maintains that at least some social phenomena must be studied at their own autonomous, macroscopic level of analysis, that at least some social “wholes” are not reducible to or completely explicable in terms of individuals' behaviour (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2013).

¹⁴ Collectivism is a political or economic theory advocating collective control especially over production and distribution; *also*: a system marked by such control. It may be contrasted with individualism. Jean-Jacques Rousseau was the first modern philosopher to discuss it (1762) Karl Marx was its most forceful proponent in the 19th century (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2013).

responses. The open-ended questions act more like catalysts for the production of self-narratives. The interviewer and the interviewee engage in a casual dialogue that blurs the line between participant and facilitator. Their sharing of self-narratives becomes a decisive factor in generating a feeling of trust. This method's key strength is that it provides the appropriate environment for demonstrating the main components of the phronetic approach (value-rationality, context, and praxis) and it situates self-narratives in a context appropriate for the transfer of local knowledge.

1.4.2. Two Examined Methodologies

The first of the two examined methodologies is the exemplary case study. Cases studies in general—and detailed scrutiny of an exemplary case study in particular—were among the methods I investigated for demonstrating the Phronesis-based approach. An effective method would, by definition, demonstrate the efficacy and relevance of the set of concepts, assumptions, and propositions advanced by the Phronesis-based approach. It would do so by emphasizing the generation of meaningful and relevant local knowledge by ordinary citizens and professionals together in an atmosphere of trust. If a case study is to accomplish this, it must not only avoid violating its own methodological rigor, but it must also adhere to its subject material—namely, the components of the phronetic approach.

As I note later, research suggests that conventional case studies focus mainly on deduction and general principles with generalizable outcomes. They pay less attention to the specifics of their subject matter or to the establishment of a trusting environment (see Campbell 1975 and

Flyvbjerg 2001). As such, they would not be a good fit for demonstrating the desirable outcomes of establishing trust, effectiveness, and relevancy, as well as the key components of the phronetic approach. Furthermore, to remain valid, a case study would have to operationalize situated local knowledge production from the self-narrative accounts of ordinary citizens and professionals without resorting to abstraction. Additionally, any interpretive conclusions would have to be confined to the project context of the specific neighbourhood or ecology. In other words, a phronetic case study is needed to amply demonstrate the propositions advanced by this research, but to employ such a case study would be to invalidate the goals of the research and could be viewed as self-fulfilling. However, the theoretical framework for designing an exemplary case study for policy research in planning, architecture, and urban design is provided in Chapter 4 (section 4.3) on phronetic grounds.

In the conclusion of his manual on designing case studies, Yin (2003) admits that it is very difficult to define an exemplary case study, and much more so to conduct one. In its emulation of the scientific method (the hallmark of natural science), Yin's case study manual is considered an authoritative resource for case study research. Its relevance to this dissertation is in the contrast it provides for phronetic case study research. I examine Yin's pronouncements on how to conduct an exemplary case study in detail in Chapter 4. Here it suffices to say that one of the core difficulties facing any researcher utilizing Phronesis to realign quasi-experimental case study approaches such as Yin's is that such approaches must be challenged on their own grounds; this is accomplished by casting doubt on an approach's theory, validity, and reliability. In essence, one must break down the approach's claim of conformity to the scientific method in order to

rebuild it with a phronetic conceptual framework. It is worth noting that many former adherents of the instrumental-rational approach to conducting case studies, such as Campbell (1975), have abandoned it for more meaningful approaches. Campbell (2003) describes Yin's definition of the exemplary case study as "a humanistic validity-seeking case study" (ix-x) as a goal that is unreachable for quantitative researchers, since the very methodologies they use to achieve it invalidate the data they seek to generalize and replicate. It is worth noting here that Phronesis, which seeks to balance instrumental rationality with value-rationality, takes a markedly different approach to the design of case studies, one that is grounded in context-laden practical knowledge.

The second examined methodology is the structured questionnaire, which is used in a variety of ways to gather data from samples and aggregate such data for research purposes. Two of the main problems with this method, and the grounds for its exclusion from this research, are its arbitrary subjectivism and the fact that it abstracts data from their context and agent. Regardless of how well designed a structured questionnaire is, its outcome will remain an aggregation of randomly collected structured answers instead of a set of self-narratives directly relayed by citizens in their own locales.

Flyvbjerg (2001) addresses arbitrary subjectivism in a quantitative or structural investigation where bias is significant in the choice of categories and variables. He gives the example of a structured questionnaire to be used across a large sample of cases and notes that the probability is high "(1) that this subjectivism survives without being thoroughly corrected during the study and

(2) that it may affect the results, quite simply because the quantitative/structural researcher does not get as close to those under study as does the case study researcher” (83).

1.5 Structure of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into six chapters and a reference list. Chapter 1 is an introduction that is followed, in Chapters 2 and 3, by integrative, methodological and historical reviews of the literature on Phronesis, expertise, tacit and explicit knowledge, and citizen participation/engagement in policy for the fields of architecture, urban design and planning since the 1960s. The issues covered in the two chapters and their main sections are organized according to their relevance and importance to citizen participation/engagement, where it concerns Phronesis, following its historical development. The chapters are further divided into subsections.

Chapter 2—Phronesis, Expertise, and the Natures of Knowledge—describes Phronesis from its Aristotelian roots to its modern interpretations. It also provides working definitions of “citizen participation/engagement,” “expertise,” and other perspectives on the nature(s) of knowledge and their theoretical links to Phronesis.

Chapter 3—Authority, Knowledge, and Institutionalized Planning, Architecture and Urban Design — reviews a history of user participation in the three fields and their theories and practices, issues of citizen participation in theory and practice, conceptualizations of participation in classical and contemporary democratic theories and practices, and how theories

of institutionalized planning, architecture and urban design account for Phronesis (vs. sophia). The first section's subsection compares two oppositional planning paradigms based on their treatment of citizen participation/engagement in policy. The subsection explores case studies of citizen participation strategies in the sustainable development of two cities in an in-depth comparative analysis of those two dominant planning paradigms. This analysis further illustrates the inadequacy of available strategies in making citizen engagement more effective and relevant. It also advances the Phronesis-based approach as a transformative perspective that can enhance and complement such strategies.

The chapter's last section, with its three subsections, reviews work focusing on the processes of reflection that involve an individual's life experience. The section also reviews learning systems that enable reconstructed interpretations of deliberative processes and dialogues between ordinary citizens and organizational representatives. This highlights research on subjective learning that compliments the notion of Phronesis and gives the citizen practitioner's self-narrative meaning and relevance in the act of local place knowledge exchange.

Chapter 4—Phronesis as Conceptual Framework—contains sections on Phronesis and citizen participation/engagement in policy that explore specific definitions I have adopted in this dissertation. These definitions are also provided in the Glossary of Key Terms and Concepts. Main concept definitions are presented—such as Phronesis, citizen participation/engagement, citizen practitioner/praxis, expert activity, mindful engagement, self-narrative, phronetic planning research, phronetic research, scientific research, episteme, sophia, techné, and the

Dreyfus Model of Human Learning. The chapter's first section, on Phronesis as a unifying concept, is divided into subsections organized according to the intellectual progression of the dominant theories and paradigms in planning, architecture and urban design fields culminating in the Phronesis-based approach. These subsections are: Philosophical Implications of the Phronesis-Based Approach; Theory of Practice: Bourdieu; and Structural-Functionalism; Social Conflict Theory and Critical Theory.

The next section—Applying a Phronesis-Based Approach for Case Study Research—presents a theoretical review of Phronesis-based approaches in other domains and disciplines in which an understanding of Phronesis plays an important role in delineating and resolving challenging issues. The section reviews the strengths and weaknesses of current case study research methodology and presents a phronetic analysis of case study research in urban design, architecture, and planning. The section that follows—A Phronesis-Based Approach to Citizen Participation/Engagement—explores the impact of such an approach on issues highlighted in the previous chapters. The last section of this chapter is a synthesis.

Chapter 5—Recognizing Citizen Practitioner Engagement as a Form of Praxis—describes and explores the notion of the citizen practitioner in its first and second sections. The chapter also describes the roles that citizen practitioners can play in shaping urban design, architecture, and planning engagement processes in policy, taking a Phronesis-based approach. The chapter provides a comparison of such roles with those played by expert-citizens. The chapter's third subsection—Demonstrations of Phronesis in Respondent Narratives—contains the subsection

Second-Homeowners in Central Ontario, an analysis of selected interview material with the stated group of participants. The respondents' citizen practitioner-narrative exchanges demonstrate key assumptions of the Phronesis-based approach, revealing the efficacy and relevance of the self-narrative of the citizen practitioner as a means of transmitting local place knowledge.

Chapter 6—Discussion and Conclusion—is a general summary of the preceding chapters. It includes this dissertation's recommendation for a Phronesis-based approach to redefine citizen engagement research methods and practices in matters of policy for urban design, architecture, and planning, along with general conclusions and directions for future research.

The main premise of this dissertation is the meaningfulness and validity of non-agenda driven subjective perspectives of ordinary citizens, based on their life experience, for the effective and relevant exchange and dissemination of local place knowledge, for policy formation in planning, architecture, and urban design. This premise drives the order of presentation of the chapters to follow, paralleling the historical evolution of ideas and concepts throughout the literature examined, which in turn informs and articulates the Phronesis-based approach advanced by this dissertation. The approach is emphatically an empowering one, seeking to validate and empower ordinary, individual citizens by increasing their credibility as local place knowledge experts and promoting their self-referential place knowledge for early inclusion in the formation of policy guiding planning, architecture, and urban design processes. The following chapters, therefore, through the mixed method, target specific areas of discourse for the of analyzing and reviewing

the body of knowledge (Chapters 2 and 3), constructing the theoretical argument (Chapter 4), and demonstrating the implications and viability of the proposed approach (Chapter 5).

1.6 Questions for Exploration

The dissertation explores several areas of expertise on citizen participation and Phronesis, within a multitude of fields and disciplines, to help advance not only our understanding of “how” to engage citizens in matters of policy, but to also answer questions of “why” and “what,” concerning the issues and challenges surrounding citizen engagement and participation. To enable this exploration, a contemporary interpretation of Phronesis is deployed as a useful linking mechanism, connecting strategies and practices of citizen participation/engagement in contemporary democracies on matters of local change with the roles that an ordinary citizen (as defined here) can play in such matters. A theoretical argument is built on this premise from different paradigms and analytical approaches and is woven through the following chapters to guide us in this exploratory process in order to answer the following exploratory questions:

1. What roles does the protagonist of this work (citizen practitioner) play in local matters, and what manner does recognition of those roles take?
2. In what way does the phronetic engagement of ordinary citizens differ from narrative exchange as ideal communication (i.e., Habermas’s communicative action)?
3. What happens in a narrative exchange? Can it be documented or demonstrated?
4. How does instrumental insight emerge from non-instrumental work?
 - What is the relationship between the philosophical, methodological, and

practical levels of the theoretical argument?

- How can we reconcile the non-instrumental nature of the exchange of self-narratives with the instrumental nature of urban design, architecture, and planning policy and processes?

Beyond the specific nature of the discourse delineated by the “what” and “how” questions above, there lies a more urgent need to examine our daily discourse, for its apparent lack of meaningful and relevant engagement with each other as individuals. As our communication with each other is becoming increasingly fragmented, the center of our engagement with each other has shifted. If the light at the heart of our communication age is slowly fading, it is, perhaps, prudent to ask ourselves why?

2. PHRONESIS, EXPERTISE, AND THE NATURES OF KNOWLEDGE: TACIT KNOWLEDGE VERSUS EXPLICIT KNOWLEDGE AS MANIFESTATIONS OF EXPERTISE IN PUBLIC POLICY

This chapter employs an integrative review that takes us from the Aristotelian roots of Phronesis and its theoretical links to historical and modern notions of expertise and the nature(s) of knowledge, to modern applications of expertise in planning, design, and public policy. This is accomplished through an exploration of expertise, lay expertise, direct communication and communities of practice and by addressing the debate on authoritative knowledge.

Chapter 2 does the following:

- 1) Discusses the contributions of prominent authors and researchers on citizen participation/engagement in policy and the notion of expertise, lay-expertise, and direct communication along with the debate on authoritative knowledge.
- 2) Introduces the Aristotelian notion of Phronesis and the concept of citizen participation/engagement (defined earlier in the Glossary of Key Terms and Concepts), as well as explores the historical and emergent differences between the processes of participatory democracy and those of representational and nominal democracies with regards to citizen participation/engagement and citizen activism.
- 3) Identifies the principal target audiences, issues, and challenges for citizen participation/engagement in policy, as well as the principal recommendations of the studies reviewed in order to evaluate the status of the research and practice of citizen participation/engagement in policy, where it concerns Phronesis, for the last fifty years.

Social policy research is particularly focused on the issues of citizen participation, especially in psychology, behavioural science, and the health sciences. For the last eighty years two similar concepts have evolved to become traditions of applied behavioural science theory, “action research” and “participatory research.” The latter has dominated research in the health sciences in the last decade and in some instances has subsumed “action research” in a hybrid approach to inquiry called “participatory action research” (Wadsworth 1998).

Participatory research in the health sciences is a parallel path of inquiry to Forester’s (1999) “deliberative practice” in planning and, to a lesser extent, the Phronesis-based approach to citizen participation/engagement in this dissertation. The differences in processes, however, between participatory research and the other two approaches emerged from its singular focus on the particular goals, objectives, issues and challenges particular to the health science environment and its users. This is also true of the application of participatory research to issues of empowerment in political science and political economy. This makes the focus and processes of the participatory research approach quite distinct from the other two approaches on both substantive and procedural grounds despite their similarity in orientation.

While it is sobering to note that efforts to increase the efficacy and relevance of participatory research methods in the health sciences have been given priority and funding in the last decade, the same could not be said for novel approaches to date to citizen participation/engagement in planning, architecture, and urban design. The participatory research website (PRAM) of McGill

University's Department of Family Medicine provides a relevant definition of participatory research in the health science, as follows:

The Royal Society of Canada has defined participatory research as systematic investigation, with the collaboration of those affected by the issue being studied, for purposes of education and taking action or effecting social change. The equally important goals of participatory research are to answer important health questions and benefit the partners in the research process, while developing valid knowledge that is applicable to other settings. Furthermore, participatory research integrates knowledge translation (KT) by involving those who need to act on the results as full partners throughout the process. The Canadian Institutes of Health Research have identified KT as a major priority, and propose integrated KT as a favourable means of achieving it.

(McGill University Department of Family Medicine, "Our Mission")

One of the distinguishing characteristics of the participatory research approach is its comprehensive manner of collecting information from as varied and diverse sets of resources and fields as possible. This is done in order to benefit from the experiences encountered and the lessons learned from a multitude of sources and to avoid repeating past mistakes. Andrea Cornwall and Rachel Jewkes (1995) explain the use of qualitative methods and define Participatory Research as follows:

Breaking the linear mould of conventional research, participatory research focuses on a process of sequential reflection and action, carried out with and by local people rather than on them. Local knowledge and perspectives are not only acknowledged but form the basis for research and planning. Many of the methods used in participatory research are drawn from mainstream disciplines and conventional research itself involves varying degrees of participation. The key difference between participatory and conventional methodologies lies in the location of power in the research process . . . Participatory research raises personal, professional and political challenges which go beyond the bounds of the production of information. (1995)

It is worth noting that methods of humanistic psychology that developed from the work of Carl Rogers (1951) in humanistic therapy in the 1950s, eventually gave rise to our modern participatory research methods. Rogers (1959) extended his core concepts in psychology to education with his conception of three groups of attitudinal qualities to enable experiential learning: realness, prizing, acceptance, trust and empathic understanding. Zimring (1994) explains Rogers' methods in psychology and education as follows:

There is, in the person, the ability to actualize the self, which if freed, will result in the person solving his or her own problems. The therapist [facilitator] was not to be an expert who understood the problem and decided how it should be solved. Rather, the therapist [facilitator] should free the client's power to solve personal problems. This position about therapy was controversial because it was contrary to the usual professional assumption that the client needs an expert to solve his or her problems. (1)

What can be surmised from all of the above is that participatory research efforts in the health sciences, education, and political science highlight a crucial shift in perspective towards better engaging citizens and empowering them on issues and policies that affect their well-being. However, due to its disciplinary-limited focus and uniquely shaped processes, participatory research remains outside of the focus of this study.

As stated in Chapter 1, section 1.1, the research undertaken here aims to establish a common ground for a dialogue between ordinary citizens and their elected and professional representatives. Ordinary citizens possess meaningful and relevant local knowledge of their home landscapes and surrounding neighbourhoods, but lack the authority and power towards effective change. City officials, planners, urban designers, architects, and other professionals

lack such knowledge, but possess the authority and credentials to direct change in such neighbourhoods. Keeping in mind that the notion of power is quite distinct from that of authority, the latter is also distinct from the notion of expertise, though the two notions are sometimes manifested concurrently in policy-making processes, as political science literature informs us. Therefore, in this dissertation, a distinction is made between the agents of authority, such as elected representatives, city officials, and other policy-makers, and the agents of expertise as exemplified by formally trained and credentialed professional planners, urban designers, and architects, among others.

The task becomes one of removing the obstacles to knowledge exchange between the agents of authority and formal expertise, on the one hand, and those of local knowledge, on the other. What would help to minimize these obstacles and invoke instead the preconditions of trust, validity, and credibility would be to have the exchange occur at the individual level, along the lines delineated by a Phronesis-based approach to citizen participation and engagement. The desired scenario is one where an ordinary citizen with local place knowledge would share this knowledge, in the form of a life experience narrative, with a professional citizen, whose own narrative of project-specific knowledge would facilitate and encapsulate this exchange. This collaborative effort to achieve desired outcomes for projects affecting the relevant neighbourhood is at the heart of this research.

Chapter 4 provides a background and reinterpretation of the Aristotelian concept of Phronesis and an analysis of the work of more contemporary writers on Phronesis, such as Winch (2001),

Moser (1998), and Flyvbjerg (2001). The chapter also explores the roles of the individual in his/her neighbourhood, that is, as a citizen practitioner whose life experiences and practical knowledge shape the neighbourhood and the policy strategies and outcomes for that neighbourhood.

Chapter 2 is the first of two chapters comprising integrative, methodological and historical reviews of the literature evaluating the status of the research and practice of citizen participation/engagement in policy and focusing on contributions made since the 1960s to citizen participation/engagement with respect to the preoccupations of Phronesis. This is in order to assess the state of past and current citizen participation/engagement debate, through material published from 1960 to 2013, and its impact on local knowledge expertise (lay-expertise) forming the premise for a Phronesis-based approach advanced by this research through face-to-face direct communication and exchange of life experience narratives between ordinary citizens and professionals. To that end, integrative, methodological and historical reviews of the literature on lay expertise and direct citizen engagement in policy through face-to-face communication while utilizing the framework of meta-research are necessary to inform the nature and scope of the research undertaken here.

While a broader literature review of citizen participation in policy through the framework of meta-research is useful for situating the research within the broad and controversial realm of citizen participation, a strategic, more focused review of the literature on lay-expertise and direct

citizen engagement through face-to-face communication is necessary to inform the nature and scope of the research undertaken here.

The conceptual and methodological progression of literary contributions to this body of knowledge comes from a multitude of fields and disciplines, each with many authors and thinkers. What follows, in each section of Chapters 2 and 3, are the contributions of key figures on lay-expertise and direct communication in each of those fields. The framework for the focused review of the citizen participation/engagement literature that follows is derived from meta-research (MR) guidelines defined by Arnold Riesman, Burak Konduk and Muhittin Oral (2003) in their seminal work that presents meta-research as “systematic reviews of the literature” from a multitude of fields and disciplines representing “research on research”(2). Since the methods utilized in conducting such reviews are numerous and varied, the researcher’s method of choice is often determined by the criteria and objectives of the study in question.

The two chapters that comprise these integrative, methodological and historical literature reviews (two and three) are organized and delineated according to their relevance and impact on the evolution of issues in citizen participation / engagement in policy, then further divided into sub-sections. There were four stages in the development of the literature reviews: problem formulation, literature search, data evaluation and analysis and interpretation. The reviews included only peer-reviewed articles and journals. A key objective in these literature reviews is to identify the principal target audiences for citizen participation research in policy that is relevant to Phronesis. This was done by compiling all author-identified target audiences for the

work that is relevant to Phronesis into representative categories and organizing them further into four principal target audiences:

1. Academicians.
2. Individual residents.
3. Government agencies at the federal, state/province, and local municipal levels.
4. Non-profit organizations and professional firms in architecture, urban design, and planning.

The literature search process for the reports listed and classified in the literature review was done in several different ways which describe the search procedures that were used:

- References were traced in papers, books, and peer-reviewed journals and found by sifting through library databases (Academic OneFile, Academic Search Online, Avery, Emerald, ERIC, Google Ngram Viewer, GPO Access, GreenFile, ICPSR, ICUD, IESBS, Ingenta, ISI, JSTOR (short for Journal Storage), LexisNexis, Library of Congress, MEDLINE, NEPIS, NetLibrary, OneSearch, Oxford Journals, PAIS, PapersFirst, PI, PQDT, ProceedingsFirst, ProQuest 5000, SAGE, ScienceDirect, TRIS Online, ULIDCS, WRDS, WorldCat) and search engines (Google Scholar, Metacrawler).
- A compilation/cross-section of literature review papers on citizen participation across seven fields and disciplines was developed.

- Key word searches were conducted in a number of databases, given a specific field or citizen participation related topic, cross-referenced to Phronesis, and based on key words (such as Survey, Classification, Taxonomy, and/or Literature Review) appearing in the report. These databases were searched for the last forty-five years. In the case of citizen activism, citizen participation, citizen engagement, deliberation, individual representation, empowerment and power dynamics, group representation, consensus and citizen partnerships, Phronesis, and phronetic research, over 350 references were identified in the WorldCat database alone. I then critically examined all aspects of each report's research design and analysis starting with its abstract and synthesized the valid results through meta-analytic methods, picking those that satisfied the literature review criteria including results showing contrary findings and alternative interpretations found in the literature.

Thus, only sources that clearly relate to the research problem in the most relevant areas of citizen participation and citizen engagement intersecting Phronesis were covered. This approach was repeated for each database. As a result, 298 articles in 22 different journals were examined and four representative study categories were selected. The findings of these representative studies identified specific community outreach and policy objectives that are impacted by Phronesis and can be facilitated by citizenship participation/engagement (or that identify when to solicit citizen participation/engagement).

2.1. Defining Citizen Participation/Engagement

The notion of citizen participation/engagement is central to democratic governance. In the public/civic arena literature, the notion is often portrayed as integral to democracy's "first principles" as a component of citizenship that is protected by democratic institutions (see Arendt 1979; Habermas [1962] 1989; Hajer and Reindorp 2001). While the term "citizen participation" dominated the earliest literature examined, for more than three decades (1961-1995), there was a marked shift in the language to another term, coined and conceptualized in the last decade of the literature reviewed, namely, "citizen engagement" (see definition in Glossary of Key Terms and Concepts). This shift from citizen participation to engagement was reflected in both research methods of inquiry and in practice. Explanations of citizen participation that emerged around the end of the last century showed a marked decrease in the perceived limits of participation and were inclusive of some features of engagement. An example of this revaluation can be seen in Wenger's (1998) description of participation as:

The social experience of living in the world in terms of membership in social communities and active involvement in social enterprises ... Participation ... is not tantamount to collaboration. It can involve all kinds of relations, conflictual as well as harmonious, intimate as well as political, competitive as well as cooperative. (57)

Citizen participation can be defined as "the deliberate and active engagement of citizens by the council and/or administration-outside the electoral process-in making public policy decisions or in setting strategic directions" (Graham and Phillips 1998, 4). While this definition appears to be inclusive of the processes of engagement, it remains a one-way, top-down activity exclusively under the control of public officials and governments. Citizen engagement, on the other hand, as

Phillips and Orsini (2002) explain, refers to “a particular type of involvement characterized by interactive and iterative processes of deliberation among citizens (and sometimes organizations), and between citizens and government officials” (3).

This definition of citizen engagement expands the notion of participation to include a shift in power dynamics to a two-way dialogue wherein all stakeholders are mutually accountable for all of the outcomes. It is worth noting that the citizen participation literature tends to be divided into two general areas: 1) power dynamics or 2) citizen participation methods and techniques. While citizen engagement is a further expansion of participation in terms of power relations, it does share some of its earliest methods and techniques with participation. With this in mind, the following are my principle findings across all of the studies grouped by category and method approach:

- Disseminating citizen participation/engagement data to stakeholders and stakeholder groups.
- Studies that emphasized the importance of information dissemination of citizen participation data to stakeholders and their groups stretch back to the earliest decades of research on citizen participation. The main objective given for this data is to help stakeholders and their groups make informed decisions that would result in better outcomes for effective participation. In the last two decades, the processes for making this data available evolved to include advances in media technology and the use of internet-ready platforms, as well as PPGIS (public participation

subset of Geographic Information Systems), which emerged because of the intersection of participatory democratic processes and spatial analysis techniques.¹⁵

- Effectively developing citizen participation/engagement methods and techniques, other than those involving the dissemination of data, for stakeholders and stakeholder groups within the context of participatory democracy and developing community objectives and plans.¹⁶

- Promoting engagement and collaborative citizen-expert partnerships with stakeholders and stakeholder groups, in ways other than the dissemination of data, to tackle specific issues and facilitate consensus building. Studies range from collaborative citizen-expert inquiry to an exploration of the value of local decision-making and solutions derived from local contexts.¹⁷

- Promoting measurable change through citizen participation/engagement in community decision-making. These evaluations dealt directly with the question of how citizen

¹⁵ See Aria and Pedlar 1997; Arnstein 1969; Bowman and Kearney 1985; Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 1997; Chavis, Stucky, and Wandersman 1983; Church et al. 2002; Cornwall and Jewkes 1991; Craglia and Onsrud 2003; Cunningham 1972; Florin and Wandersman 1990; Flynn, Slovic, and Mertz 1994; Ghose and Huxhold 2001; Igbaria 1999; Jacobs, 1961; Jankowski and Nyerges 2003; Mohai 1987; Ozawa 1993; Rossi 1961; Sewell 1979; Tauxe 1995; Wandersman et al. 1987; Webler and Tuler 2000; Weiner, Harris, and Craig 2002; White 1997.

¹⁶ See Abele et al. 1998; Arnstein 1969; Bang 2003, 2004, 2005; Barber 1984; Barnard, Cambell, and Smith 2003; Burby 2003; Carpinini, Cook, and Jacobs 2004; Carr, McAuliffe, and MacLachlan 1998; Corburn 2003; Creighton 2005; Crosby, Kelley, and Schaefer 1986; Cuthill and Fien 2005; Dekker and Uslaner 2001; Fiorino 1990; Fultz 2004; Force and Williams 1989; Gaventa 2004; Gawthrop 1984; Gericke, Sullivan, and Wellman 1992; Gutmann and Thomson 2004; Horlick-Jones et al. 2007; Jacobs 1961; Levine, Fung, and Gastil 2005; London 1995; O'Toole et al 2003; Marsh 2003; nunes Correia et al. 1998; Perkins 1995; Pattie, Seyd, Whiteley 2004; Reddell 2005; Roberts 2004; Russell et al. 1990; Salwasser 1994; Shannon 1990; Sheedy et al. 2008; Tanz and Howard 1991; Wandersman 1981; Wondolleck 1988; Yankelovich 1991.

¹⁷ See Brandenburg, Carroll, and Blatner 1995; Brendler and Carey 1998; Brody, Godschalk, and Burby 2003; Brosius, Tsing, and Zerner 1998; Carey et al. 1994; Carr and Halvorsen 2001; Cassidy 2007; Clift 2003; Fischer 1993; Francis and James 2003; Iles 2004; King, Feltey, and Susel 1998; Koonz 2005; Lowery, DeHoog, and Lyons 1992; Powell and Colin 2008; Stivers, 1990; Tauxe 1995; Wharf Higgins 1999; Yang and Callahan 2005.

participation/engagement in community decision-making promotes measurable change and showed a connection between citizen participation processes and positive changes in the community (as a physical locale or neighbourhood). A typical finding of said evaluations is a connection between citizen participation processes, relevant policy-making, and effecting positive changes in the community. The research typically observed that such measurable change occurred but that the evaluation was not able to capture a discernable agent or factor within citizen participation that establishes causality.

The diversity of studies outlined various issues and challenges for citizen participation / engagement in policy, indicating that current strategies and approaches are neither effective nor relevant, that they lack validity, credibility, value, trust and meaning in dialogues between citizens and their representatives or professionals, and also demonstrating an absence of will to solicit and utilize direct local knowledge from citizens and an overemphasis on the use of electronic communication and technology to supplant direct face-to-face contact with citizens. However, the studies do agree when it comes to recommended strategies. A typical recommendation points to the usefulness of adopting a structured framework based on an interdisciplinary approach that could address the issues of causality and relevancy facing research on citizen participation in policy.¹⁸

¹⁸ See Abelson and Gauvin 2006, Bingham, Nabatchi, and O'Leary 2005, Brody 2003, Collins and Ison 2006, Fainstein and Fainstein 1985, Glaser, Hall and Halperin 2006, Graham and Phillips 1998, Jackson 2001, Macintosh and Whyte 2006, Poisner 1990, Rosener 1978, Swindell and Kelly 2000, Webler 1995.

2.2. Phronesis and Sophia

In Aristotle's ([384 BC] 1976) words, Phronesis is a "true state, reasoned, and capable of action with regard to things that are good or bad for man" (1140). Phronesis involves practical knowledge and context-dependent judgment. While scientific knowledge (episteme) and technical knowledge (techne), by contrast, emphasize instrumental rationality and the quest for universal principles, leading the research in fields whose ultimate output is often material production.

The conflict between the social and natural sciences stems from their being often compared to each other on epistemic grounds, despite their different characteristics and the differing content of their studies. This begs the question of whether the social sciences should be called as such, and whether long-standing methods of inquiry borrowed from the natural sciences have any place within the social sciences. Flyvbjerg (2001) tells us, "It is indicative of the degree to which thinking in the social sciences has allowed itself to be colonized by natural and technical science that we today do not even have a word for the one intellectual virtue, Phronesis, which Aristotle saw as not only the necessary basis for social and political inquiry, but as the most important of the intellectual virtues" (4).

Aristotle valued Phronesis above the other virtues because he saw its core component, value-rationality, as a necessary balance to instrumental rationality and concluded that its lack would jeopardize the quality of life of the citizens in any society. Aristotle's view of the individual's role in nature was embedded within his pronouncements about Phronesis. Flyvbjerg (2001)

states, “The study of human activities, according to Aristotle, demands that one practice Phronesis, that is, that one occupy oneself with values as a point of departure for praxis” (70). In contrast to Plato (c. 428 B.C.) and Socrates (c. 470 B.C.), who favoured general standards and universals, Aristotle (c. 384 B.C.) assigned a leading role for context in understanding human behaviour.

On the problem of universals, Plato (c. 428 B.C.) initially conceived that a sharp boundary existed between the physical world—as perceived with the senses—and the world of ideals or universals, and then later posited that an individual may only possess an opinion or a haphazard guess about the physical world, while retaining actual knowledge about the world of universal ideals (MacLeod and Rubenstein, 2006). Plato (c. 428 B.C.) took knowledge to be absolute and general in scope, easily encompassing the world of ideals. However, since change does permeate the physical world, it would, therefore, render actual knowledge as a foundation for the world of ideals impossible.

Platonic realism’s premise—that knowledge can only be applied to the world of ideals while all else remains a matter of conjecture—is reversed by more contemporary forms of realism, which deny the reality of the world of ideals, but accept the existence of the physical world as the only reality. Nominal critiques of Platonic realism reiterate objections raised by contemporary realists to Plato’s premise on universals (Davenport 1979, 57).

Aristotle (c. 384 B.C.) not only dissented from his teacher's view on universals, but he also presented his own solution to the problem of universals. While Platonic realism was a deductive top-down process from universal ideals to particular copies of them, Aristotle's realism, by contrast, is an inductive and deductive process that begins in the study of particular phenomena and ascends to their ideal essences. He believed that no universal exists without being attached to existing things, particulars, or relations (Bocheński 1951). In other words, in Aristotle's (c. 384 B.C.) view, such ideal essences are inherent properties or instantiation of a particular substance or phenomenon, something akin to the shared human structures emerging out of the life experiences of individual human beings. Although we share commonalities based on stages of life, each life experience of an individual remains unique to that person's journey through life.

Aristotle (c. 384 B.C.) based his philosophic method on the arguments of the Eleatics, while at the same time rejecting their conclusions. Both dualists and monists within the two prominent schools of thought in the Philosophy of Mind discuss aspects of this characterization at length. In that regard, both Plato (c. 428 B.C.) and Aristotle (c. 384 B.C.) are considered early dualists, while the best-known dualist is René Descartes (c.1596), whose ideas had a profound influence on western philosophy, especially on the formulation of the mind-body problem.

In its emphasis on experience and the particular, Aristotle's vision is similar to the Dreyfus model, Flyvbjerg's proposal of a phronetic social science, and Bourdieu's theory of practice. Aristotle (c. 384 B.C.) posited that Phronesis, at its core, remains an individual endeavour, where value-rationality is practiced in context, while drawing upon life experiences, to achieve prudent

action. This phronetic emphasis on the individual sets it apart from the other two branches of knowledge: episteme, and techne.

In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle (c. 384 B.C.) delineates five modes of truth: episteme (demonstrable knowledge or science), techne (applied science, art, or skill), nous (intelligence), Phronesis (practical wisdom or prudence), and sophia (theoretical wisdom). Sophia involves “knowing what follows from fundamental principles, as well as, having true knowledge of the fundamental principles themselves. It is connected to universal unchanging principles or truths.” (Aristotle, [384 BC] 1999, Ch. 7: 1141b1-5). Cherubin (2005) posits a connection between sophia and Phronesis, asserting that they are two aspects of one thing (not a concept held by the Greeks) or two different occupations having the same quality, as the English may misconceive it. Similarly, “there is no etymological connection between ‘theoretical wisdom’ (sophia) and ‘contemplation’/‘theoretical knowledge’ (*theoria*). There will be some factual connection between them, but the connection is not definitional” (Cherubin n.d., section B, para 2).

Where it concerns the connection between Phronesis and techne, on the one hand, and sophia and episteme, on the other, Brogan (2005) explains:

Both being involved in the disclosing of what can be other, *techne* has to do with produced beings whose *arche* is in another, whereas *Phronesis* has to do with human being itself. Human being is also fundamentally constituted by otherness, not by virtue of being dependent for its being on another being but because it is characteristic of human being to be embedded in its situation and expressed in praxis ... the apprehension of eternal being in *episteme* and *Sophia* is the way of disclosing natural being as an eternal or universal being that has its *arche* in itself not in another. (174)

Aristotle ([384 BC] 1999) maintains that, Phronesis requires reflection on what constitutes a desired objective (Book 6, Ch. 7: 1141b10). Cherubin (2005) notes that, in addition, the decision-making process to bring about that objective is a skill acquired through actively accessing one's life experiences rather than through training. Cherubin (n.d.) paraphrases Aristotle, stating: "Practical wisdom involves being able to deliberate well, and deliberating well means being able to aim at and hit the best thing attainable to us by action" (section D, point 3).

Aristotle also posits that, "practical wisdom deals with both universal or general principles and particulars of everyday situations. Phronesis is itself not an art (a *techne*), but an excellence (*arete*)" (Aristotle, 1999, Book 6, Ch. 7: 1141b10). Cherubin (2005) explains that aside from the fact that arts are supposed to have products and practical wisdom does not, there is also the difference that arts can be practiced well or badly, with excellence or without. Phronesis cannot be practiced badly: one achieves it through deliberation based on access to life experiences or one does not. Additionally, Cherubin (n.d.) asserts that, "practical wisdom cannot be a pure science (an *episteme*), in that pure sciences deal with things that cannot be otherwise than they are, but deliberation, the hallmark of Phronesis, deals precisely with things that can be a variety of different ways. Deliberation involves reasoning about which way to act" (part D, point 3).

2.3. Expertise as Explicit Knowledge

The notion of expertise and the debate on authoritative knowledge along with the

establishment of experts, specialists, and technicians as manifestations of an elite class, has long roots that go back to Plato's (c. 428 B.C.) pronouncements on the "noble lie." Norton and Whitmire (2008) recount assertions made by Plato "claiming common labourers do not possess the training, nor the constitution required to properly rule, nor would they ever, [and that] administering the government is simply not within their nature" (2). The notion of citizen expertise, it would seem, is contingent on cultural norms, historical contexts, and dominant social values. It can take many forms and meanings, depending on the definition one uses to explain the motivation and goals behind participatory actions.

The concepts of expertise, expert knowledge, and expert are widely debated in epistemology. The definitions of an expert is far from uniform across fields and disciplines, such as philosophy, economics, psychology, management, law, health sciences, behavioural science, cognitive science, expert systems, and education, among others. Each has its particular definition of expert, applied to an area of formal knowledge acquisition, with no clear consensus on what defines an expert and the length of time it takes to achieve expertise (see Sackman 1975; Simon 1980). The field of law, for example, gives precedence to authority and argument in defining an expert, while an expert in the medical field is defined mainly through formal educational qualifications and specialized experience. When everyday knowledge—which has a bearing on lay-expertise as well as on formal-expertise—is also to be considered, the definition of what constitutes an expert is further muddled (see Cantrill, Sibbard and Buetow 1996; Linstone 1978; Pill 1971). Cantrill, Sibbard and Buetow (1996) inform us "that the definition should include any individual with relevant knowledge and experience of a particular topic, including patients and carers" (69).

While it is clear from the above passages that the nature of expertise is multi-faceted and encompasses both formal and informal knowledge acquisition, wide misconceptions about expertise and the identification of experts persist in both academic and non-academic circles. For the purposes of this research, the notion of expertise is expanded to include the discussion on relevant practice in its two varieties, professional practice and lay practice.

Additionally, when a practitioner seeks to improve his/her performance through the acquisition of relevant knowledge and through praxis, the process could be characterized as “deliberate practice.” Ericsson, Krampe, and Tesch-Romer (1993) explain the role of relevant experience in improving performance as a characteristic of deliberate practice. They note, “Continued improvements (changes) in achievement are not automatic consequences of more experience, and in those domains where performance consistently increases, aspiring experts seek out particular kinds of experience, which is deliberate practice” (365). Schön and Rein (1994) also describe this process in *Frame Reflection* as well as in Schön’s (1983) own work *The Reflective Practitioner: How professionals think in action*.

2.4. Tacit Knowledge and Communities of Practice

Collins and Evans (2002) are sociologists at the University of Cardiff who developed interactional expertise as one class within a classification system of expertise. They argue that three types of expertise take precedence: contributory expertise, no-expertise, and interactional expertise, whose import is to add credibility to individual perspectives that originate outside of

the group of contributory experts, without maintaining that such individual perspectives are as valid as in-group perspectives. This linguistic distinction of expertise diverges from those adopted by science and technology studies, which defines expertise in terms of power and social standing that is accorded an individual by an elite group. It is distinct from phenomenological theories of expertise, which identify embodied contributory expertise but not interactional expertise¹⁹.

Although both kinds of expertise possess tacit knowledge qualities, interactional expertise can only be acquired directly through verbal dialogue with experts rather than through secondary sources, such as books and formal training, while contributory expertise must be acquired through both linguistic and practical interaction with experts.

Collins (1990) developed an alternative critique of artificial intelligence (AI), based on the work of Turing (1950) and similar to Dreyfus and Dreyfus' (1986) model of AI. Collins' contribution was to expose the limits of AI performance in expert systems. The main supposition of expert systems is that decision-making in expertise can only be accomplished through a context of defined rules, standards and structures. This supposition has been challenged by Collins and Evans (2002), who showed that "experts recognize situations based on experience of many prior

¹⁹ Phenomenology is a philosophical method, with the philosopher engaged in investigating their own experience (Marton & Booth, 1997). Phenomenographers, on the other hand, adopt an empirical orientation, and then investigate the experience of others (Marton & Booth, 1997). As a qualitative research methodology, based on the interpretivist approach, the focus of interpretive phenomenology is the essence of the phenomenon, whereas the focus of phenomenography is the essence of the experiences and subsequent perceptions of the phenomenon (Hitchcock, 2006). Data collection methods typically include close interviews with a small, purposive sample with the researcher "working toward an articulation of the interviewee's reflections on experience that is as complete as possible" (Marton & Booth, 1997:130). As envisioned by Husserl, phenomenology is a method of philosophical inquiry that rejects the rationalist bias that has dominated Western thought since Plato in favor of a method of reflective attentiveness that discloses the individual's "lived experience" (Marton & Booth, 1997:130).

situations. They are in consequence able to make rapid decisions in complex and dynamic situations relying on recognition-primed decision-making” (236); it has been further challenged by Dreyfus and Dreyfus (2005) who posited, “[experts] recognize situations because they have meaning” (788). In a critique of expert systems literature, Dreyfus and Dreyfus (2005) suggest:

If one asks an expert for the rules he or she is using, one will, in effect, force the expert to regress to the level of a beginner and state the rules learned in school. Thus, instead of using rules they no longer remember, as knowledge engineers suppose, the expert is forced to remember rules they no longer use.... No amount of rules and facts can capture the knowledge an expert has when he or she has stored experience of the actual outcomes of tens of thousands of situations. (788)

It is, perhaps, this central concern with meaning, and how it attaches to situations, that provides an important link between the individual and social approaches to the development of expertise.

Having described the link between meaning and situational learning, we need to explore the role of meaning in the transmission of tacit knowledge within a community, such as a community of practice. The term community of practice derives from the apprenticeship learning research of cognitive anthropologists Barbara Rogoff and Jean Lave (1984). The construct legitimate peripheral participation was developed by Lave and Wenger (1991) based on their analysis of five apprenticeships. They used the term community of practice in reference to practitioner communities that assimilate their new members into their socio-cultural practices. While the term was originally attached to situated learning, its current usage is increasingly connected to knowledge management as a means for accumulating social capital and for transmitting tacit knowledge within a community or organization. The authors transformed traditional knowledge

management programs, which were predominantly based on explicit knowledge, by filtering tacit knowledge that cannot be readily “captured, codified and stored” through the context of a community of practice (Hildreth and Kimble, 2002). In terms of a phronetic approach, a community of practice may form by establishing a dialogue between, on the one hand, ordinary citizens who possess local knowledge and, on the other hand, elected representatives, professionals, planners, and architects. In this way, tacit knowledge can be shared through legitimate participation of all stakeholders.

On the subject of meaning as an everyday experience and its integral link to practice, Wenger’s (1998) recent work explores a process that he calls the ‘negotiation of meaning’, which he describes as follows: “Practice is about meaning as an experience of everyday life,” arguing that it is meaning as an experience that interests him and that this is located in a process that he calls the ‘negotiation of meaning.’ (52) The negotiation of meaning involves the interaction of participation and reification, two processes that form a duality. While reification is about making the abstract concrete, participation remains one of the key elements of legitimate peripheral participation²⁰ (Lave and Wenger, 1991). In the revised conception of community of practice,

²⁰ Legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) describes how newcomers become experienced members and eventually old timers of a community of practice or collaborative project (Lave & Wenger, 1991: 34). According to LPP, newcomers become members of a community initially by participating in simple and low-risk tasks that are nonetheless productive, necessary and further the goals of the community. Through peripheral activities, novices become acquainted with the tasks, vocabulary, and organizing principles of the community. Gradually, as newcomers become old timers, their participation takes forms that are more and more central to the functioning of the community. LPP suggests that membership in a community of practice is mediated by the possible forms of participation to which newcomers have access, both physically and socially. If newcomers can directly observe the practices of experts, they understand the broader context into which their own efforts fit. Conversely LPP suggests that newcomers who are separated from the experts have limited access to their tools and community and therefore have limited growth. As participation increases, situations arise that allow the participant to assess how well they are contributing through their efforts, thus legitimate peripheral participation provides a means for self-evaluation (Lave & Wenger, 1991: 34).

Wenger (1998) elevates participation above legitimacy and peripherality for being crucial in the negotiation of meaning and explains that in the negotiation of meaning, participation needs to work in tandem with reification. This is particularly important to the processes of planning, architecture, and urban design whose central preoccupation is in the making, designing, representation, and interpretation of experiences and objects. Wenger defines reification as follows:

The process of giving form to our experience by producing objects that congeal this experience into 'thingness' ... a wide range of processes that include making, designing, representing, naming, encoding and describing as well as perceiving, interpreting, using, reusing, decoding and recasting. (58-59)

Wenger points out that any community of practice will produce artefacts, such as tools, procedures, stories, and language, which reify some aspects of the community's practice. An important aspect of the participation/reification duality is balance between both constituent processes. Each needs to be in its proper proportion so that it remains in equilibrium with the others (Wenger 1998, 65).

As for technology use in knowledge management, and the prevalence of recent citizen engagement strategies advocating information technology (IT) and e-democracy, it is worth noting that technology remains an enabling tool with limitations, a tool that does not supplant direct communication and interaction between people and relationship-building. O'Dell and Grayson (1998) point out the need for relationships to develop for meaningful knowledge

sharing and transfer to take place. Therefore, rather than simply attempting to implement technological solutions, a key part of the management of knowledge is facilitating communication and interaction between people. Hildreth and Kimble (2002) go one-step further, by insisting on a relevant use for technology. The authors would argue that another role of technology in knowledge management is to make the implicit visible. The authors explain:

The ability to bring to the surface implicit assumptions, and the role that this can play in developing a shared understanding around a particular issue, is perhaps one of the best means of building an appreciation of what is tacit without going through the (probably wasted) effort of attempting to make it explicit. If the implicit can be made observable, which can be quite different from making it explicit, there should be little need for much of it to be actually made explicit.

(26)

2.5. Expressions of Expertise in Planning, Design, and Public Policy

An important study conducted by Fischer (2000) emphasizes the central role of citizen participation in participatory democracy. The author argues that “despite the enthusiasm for promoting democracy, most of the calls for more democracy and citizen participation occur at the same time that we witness the disturbing decline of democratic practices at home” (Fischer 2000, x). Fischer’s concern for the decline of democratic practices in North America comes after decades of reduced voting, ordinary citizens’ distrust of all levels of government, the shrinking of the middle-class and increasing poverty, rampant political corruption, and decreased transparency and accountability of political processes.

A pressing issue for participatory democracy is distrust and lack of a meaningful dialogue between citizens and policy-makers, which, Fischer (2000) points out, can derail democracy and

turn its inclusionary mechanisms into exclusionary processes. Within the last few decades, citizens have acquired their distrust of institutions and policy analysts as a result of the marginalization of their voice and power to make change to issues that affect their daily lives. Policy-makers, by contrast, cite ordinary citizens' lack of technical knowledge as a major obstacle to their ability to deliberate intelligently on matters of social policy. Fischer emphasizes this point as he notes, "given that citizen participation is one of the foundations of a strong democracy, such arguments may give us pause" (x).

Participatory democracy rests on the premise that citizen participation is a central tenet of a strong democratic society and is essential for the social, psychological, and educational wellbeing of the individuals and institutions that make up such a society. Other notions of democracy, such as representative or nominal democracy, put far less emphasis on the participatory role of citizens and far more on professionals, experts, and elected representatives, consigning the role of ordinary citizens to no more than voting. However, Fischer (2000) notes that the winds of change have been blowing in the last couple of decades towards more participation, rather than less. In this regard, Fischer asks, "Is it possible to innovate new forums that can constructively circumvent what may otherwise be a standoff between citizens and experts?" (11).

Here, Fischer (2000) alerts us to the issue of local knowledge and the concern that social policy be able to accommodate innovative bottom-up strategies initiated by ordinary citizens, which can be transformed, as a result, into meaningful initiatives. Fischer explains, "Part of the difficulty in

answering this question rests with political and social inquiry. Despite the contemporary emphasis on citizenship, democratic theorists largely remain distant from the level of the citizen” (10).

Fischer (2000) argues that policy-makers and policy theorists are so far removed from the daily experiences of ordinary citizens that they lack the perspective and ability to judge the effect of policy on everyday situations, and dismiss the value of social capital in the policy-making process. Policy makers and policy theorists’ isolation also makes them underestimate the creative ability of ordinary citizens to initiate bottom-up strategies. Ordinary citizens often tackle issues faced by their communities by applying social capital and other community resources to achieve positive outcomes.

The phenomenon of political individualization has taken root in many industrialized nations, and goes hand in hand with the decline of traditional forms of political organizations, as noted by Norris (1999) notes and described by other writers (see Braitwaite and Levis 1998; Mouffe 2000; and Putnam, Leonardi, and Nanetti 1993). Bang (2005) summarizes this situation in the following way: “Most stories describe how political participation, as a collective activity, has fallen prey to globalising market forces transforming virtuous citizens into atomized individuals exploiting the state as a means to realize their own interests and values” (159),

This phenomenon is set against a contrasting background of a compromised democracy, showing the effect of market forces leading to a dramatic decrease in social and political community and individual engagement. This is described eloquently by Barber (1998): “Democracy is making concessions to the market view of citizens as self-interested consumers and customers, who will punish government if it does not deliver the goods that they demand from it” (49).

We previously noted through Fischer’s work that citizen participation and participatory democracy are intertwined; later in this section, we will see through the work of Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) and Schneider and Ingram (1997) that policy analysis and design are central to understanding this relationship. Fischer (2000) also makes a case for comprehensive and integrated political and social inquiry, which also form the premise for this dissertation’s Phronesis-based approach and the notion of the ordinary citizen practitioner. Fischer argues that his analysis of political and social inquiry “illustrates how the case for local knowledge is buttressed by insights from contemporary epistemology and the sociology of science” (12). Fischer explains that in his own work he has attempted to integrate citizen and expert knowledge epistemologically to improve expert and citizen relations.

We can gain further insight into the role that policy analysis and design can play in citizen participation from the writings of an influential set of policy analysts, namely, Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) and Schneider and Ingram (1997, 2005). In theory, the policy-making process proposed by Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993), could be argued to support the phronetic ideal of the citizen practitioner, which will be covered in depth, in chapters 4 and 5. In particular,

a Phronesis-based approach to citizen participation/engagement assumes that it is advantageous for policy-making in a democracy to contain values and meaningful knowledge in the process of development, and to do so holistically rather than analytically. To make this possible, the authors argue against analytical policy-making by stating, “It cannot wholly resolve conflicts of value and interests” (Lindblom and Woodhouse 1993, 22). The authors posit that an analytical style of policy-making is detrimental to the processes of development, relationship building, and conflict resolution, as it appears to exclude values and meaningful knowledge from policy design. They argue for intelligent or holistic policy-making instead, demonstrating their potential support for the citizen practitioner notion as a means of mitigating this negative aspect within the political debate.

Findings from the latest studies in social psychology examining the relationship between cognition and culture appear to support their claims. Miyamoto and Ji’s (2011) socio-psychological study on analytical thinking versus holistic thinking in the North American population posits that socio-economic status affects access to power and that power attainment in turn affects cognition. Miyamoto and Ji argue, “Thinking is flexible, not rigid or innately pre-programmed. We are able to attune our style of thinking to the needs of the situation, however, the specific ways we might attune our thinking seems to depend on our cultural background” (Queen’s University 2011, para. 2). The study assessed the participants’ style of cognition, whether analytical or holistic. The study’s authors define the two styles of thinking as follows:

Analytical thinking is characterized by processing a focal object and its features independently from its surrounding context (for example, using adjectives to describe a

ball as ‘red’ or ‘round’). Holistic thinking involves a focus on contextual information and the relationships between objects (for example, using verbs like ‘kick’ or ‘play’ to highlight the connection between the ball and its environment).

(Queen’s University, 2011, para. 6)

Miyamoto and Ji explain that in North America, those with high socioeconomic status used more analytical thinking, in contrast to individuals with low socioeconomic status. They posit that the increase in socioeconomic status appears to also increase an individual’s perception of agency, which is a precursor to the attainment of power. With that in mind, it appears that this style of analytical thinking may be characteristic of elected representatives, city officials, professional planners, and urban designers as well as citizen-experts. A shift to a holistic style of thinking may be necessary for the above group when dealing with ordinary citizens in the context of local place knowledge exchange.

Additionally, one of Lindblom and Woodhouse’s (1993) minimum requirements for an “intelligent” political process include “that, insofar as feasible, policy actions take into account available information about social problems and opportunities, performance of existing programs, costs and other relevant matters” (25). In other words, in order for an “intelligent” political process to function along the lines delineated by Lindblom and Woodhouse, it would at minimum require the active engagement of citizen practitioners, demonstrating local knowledge in praxis.

In commenting on the political process, Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) state that all political participants “do not share a dominant common purpose; instead, each pursues some combination

of private purposes and his or her own vision of the public interest” (24). The individual experience (praxis) of the citizen practitioner could be described in a similar manner, that is, as a provider of meaningful knowledge. However, Lindblom and Woodhouse limit their theories to participants in the democratic process. Although this is the rightful place for the citizen practitioner, Lindblom and Woodhouse might argue that inclusion is not “feasible” given their focus on the costs and time limits of policy-making. This is a common posture for planners practicing conventional planning as well, who view the inclusion of individual citizens in large-scale planning and policy-making processes as impractical at best, citing costs and time limitations.

Schneider and Ingram (1997) also support the inclusion of diverse groups in the creation of policy design. The authors explain that “policy designs that enable citizens to participate, learn, and create new or different institutions, and that break down divisive and negative social constructions of social groups lay the foundation for self-correcting policy dynamics and a more genuine democratic society” (Schneider and Ingram 1997, 5). As the authors explain, in a “degenerative political process,” politicians seeking political gains categorize target populations into “deserving” and “undeserving” groups for resource allocation of benefits and punishments.

Policies stemming from such a process not only undermine the processes of democracy, but also alienate the public from the political process by reinforcing stereotypes and stigmatizing “disadvantaged” groups. The authors describe scientific policy design and degenerative policy

designs as contributing “to a political system of wide-spread apathy in which citizens vent their frustration through empty and divisive complaints” (7).

In contrast, Schneider and Ingram (1993) propose changes to policy design in order to “re-energize people and create an educated, enlightened, active citizenship” (7). These statements would lead one to believe that the authors might embrace the role of the citizen practitioner and a Phronesis-based approach to policy-making. However, as they further their proposal for new policy design, the authors continue to rely on structured analysis and limited inclusion by constructing “target groups” for such purposes. When the authors “design to ensure public involvement” (203-4), it is through businesses, private associations, and citizen groups rather than citizen practitioners.

As a whole, the authors seem to embrace the principles of Phronesis and its components as a viable means of mitigating the issues plaguing conventional policy-making. They also lend credence to the notion of the citizen practitioner. At the same time, the authors insist that individual citizen empowerment will occur either through better policy design or through the inherent “intelligence” of democratic politics, a path of implementation that diverges from that of a phronetic approach. In effect, Phronesis delineates values as first emerging from individual citizens and only later being codified as societal norms. Political analysts, however, postulate that the process occurs in the opposite direction. This difference in designating the source of values within the political process can determine the form that social and political inquiry must

take in order to achieve meaningful knowledge, without which no meaningful social policy can be possible.

As noted earlier, participatory democracy allows citizen participation to take a central role in achieving a strong democratic society, participation being vital for the social, psychological, and educational wellbeing of its individuals and institutions. Representative or nominal democracy, however, discourages direct participation of its citizens, consigning their role to no more than voting, and instead actively supports the participatory role of professionals, experts, and elected representatives.

Over the last couple of decades in North America we have witnessed a reversal of this dynamic, with direct citizen participation increasing and taking a variety of new forms, the most prevalent of which is citizen activism. A number of writers have noted this phenomenon, as Bang (2005) explains, citing Zadek (2001) and McIntosh, Waddock, and Kell (2004):

Today, many - probably most - new forms of citizen activism do not occur outside the political system in civil society. Rather, they take shape inside this system in various governance networks and partnerships between private, public and voluntary organizations, striving for making the production of political outcomes more effective through more heterarchical, communicative, participatory and deliberative modes of interaction and production. (160)

A multitude of writers have used the term “expert-citizen” or “citizen-expert” in a variety of combinations to denote citizen activism and expert activism within the context of civic republicanism (see Bang, Hansen, and Hoff, 2000; Bang and Dyhrberg, 2000, 2003). Studies by

Bang, Hansen and Hoff (2000) of the neighbourhood of inner Noerrebro in Copenhagen explain the nature of such expertise; as Band (2005) argues, “I see this relocation of republican discourse into the exercise of political authority and leadership as evidence of a new expert-citizenship, which I will call republican elitism, uncoupling republican values from democracy as we have come to know it” (160).

Bang and Dyhrberg (2003) emphasize that this form of citizen expertise is far from benign, that it does in fact mask a desire to govern exclusively in a new form of elitism not seen before; these authors propose that “expert-citizens manifest an intrusion of political authority into civil society and not something socially autonomous from that authority” (163). In the interest of effective governance, NGOs form a cooperative relationship with other expert-citizens by making use of the undifferentiated ethic of pluralism that is inherent to expert-citizenship. Among the dangers of this approach to participation “is not that expert activists are suppressing the ‘weak’ or reifying or distorting political communication. The problem rather is that they [exclude] in their strategic communication, certain conventional democratic values and practices in favour of those of success or influence” (Bang and Dyhrberg, 2003, 163).

Etzioni-Halevy (1993) suggests that cultural governance, which excludes everyday citizens from politics, often advances this form of citizen activism. Referring to the work of Etzioni-Halevy (1993), Bang (2005) emphasizes that this process removes laypeople

from exercising their creative political capacities as laypeople. Even in their most ‘strong’ and self-reliant versions, laypeople are in growing numbers excluded from partaking, even indirectly, [in] the constitution of ‘big’ politics and policy except as election times. Western political systems are, then, experiencing a serious coupling

problem, which in the long run may threaten not only their legitimacy but also their ability to handle complexity in an efficient and democratic manner. (174)

Writers (Easton, 1947; Etzioni-Halevy, 1993; Benhabib, 1996) have emphasized another form of citizen expertise that denotes lay-expertise or lay citizenship rather than activism, a form similar in meaning to the one utilized in this research. Here I have coined the terms “citizen practitioners” and “citizen praxis” to define the level of engagement by ordinary citizens, not activists, whose lay-expertise is legitimized by their life experiences and their local environmental knowledge. I have also coined the general term, “mindful-engagement”, which describes responsive and direct citizen engagement, extending the current definitions of citizen engagement and its predecessor, citizen participation, to typify the outcome of a Phronesis-based approach through the exchange of self-narratives, based on life-experience, between citizen practitioners. These terms are useful and, to the best of my knowledge, original. The terms encapsulate the roles ordinary citizens play in direct engagement with their representatives and locales in the shaping of policy for projects that directly affect their daily lives (see definitions in Glossary of Key Terms and Concepts).²¹

Bang and Sorenson (1997, 1999, and 2001) have used the term “everyday maker,” a somewhat similar term to the “citizen practitioner,” albeit without its ties to local environmental knowledge and its lack of “commitment for the construction of a reflexive community” in local pursuit of

²¹ Disclaimer: The author, to the best of his abilities, verified the originality of the two terms through key searches on multiple search engines including Google, Google Scholar, A9, Bing, Yahoo, Ask, msn, AOL, Alta Vista, Netscape, Snap, and Gigablast. Metasearch engines used included Browsys, Dogpile, Kartoo, Quintura, Zuula, and Planetsearch.

micro-politics (Bang, 2004a: 26),, to express the legitimacy of practical experience as a source of authentic knowledge. Bang (2005) define the term as follows:

The everyday maker is a form of lay citizenship shaped by everyday experience. It is their experience that is being sought in a range of partnerships and governance networks in neighbourhoods, and it is they who elites seek to ‘empower’ in new forms of collaborative governance. The everyday makers are a direct response to the development of elite attitudes amongst those who have replaced their old grassroots identity with a new professional expert activist identity. They consider knowing as doing, refusing to take on a professional, fulltime nor strategic citizen identity. They want to do things in their own way, right where they are, when they have the time or feel like it. Their engagement is more ‘on and off’ and ‘hit and run’ than that of the expert-activist. (162)

2.6. Synthesis

This chapter covered the contributions of prominent authors and researchers on the notion of expertise, lay-expertise, and direct communication along with the debate on authoritative knowledge. What emerged from their writing is that the nature of expertise is multi-faceted and covers both formal and informal knowledge acquisition. As stipulated earlier, an important aim of this dissertation is to establish a common ground for dialogue between ordinary citizens (local place knowledge experts) and their elected representatives (agents of authority) and professionals (agents of expertise). What would help to minimize real obstacles to such a dialogue, namely, trust, validity, and credibility, is to have the exchange occur at the individual level, along the lines stipulated by a Phronesis-based approach to citizen participation and engagement.

While the discussion’s focus remained on lay knowledge expertise and acquisition, by necessity it also involved historical and contemporary processes of identifying experts and their role in

relevant practice in its two varieties: professional and lay-practice. Additionally, the chapter explored the role of relevant experience in what is termed “deliberative practice” by Ericsson, Krampe, and Tesch-Romer (1993) as well as the work of Schön (1994) on “reflective practice.”

The first section presented a brief exploration of the Aristotelian notions of Phronesis (practical wisdom) and sophia (theoretical wisdom). We examined their connection and their differences, as well as their relationship to Aristotle’s three remaining modes of truth: episteme (demonstrable knowledge or science), techne (applied science, art or skill), and nous (intelligence). The section emphasized the relevance of Phronesis alone to the purposes and concerns of this dissertation in seeking effective and relevant strategies for citizen engagement that hinges on an individual’s experiential local knowledge and practical judgment to act on such knowledge. In the second section, the chapter presented a definition of citizen engagement as a notion central to democratic governance and public policy decision-making. Its first principles were explored through the policy and civic arena literature and through the work of its influential writers.

Section 2.4 (Tacit Knowledge and Communities of Practice) explained the relevance of interactional expertise in validating lay-experience and individual perspective, as a credible source of local place knowledge. It was also explained that in a classification system of expertise, it is only interactional expertise, in contrast to the other two types of expertise (contributory and no-expertise), that can be acquired directly through verbal dialogue. We examined interactional and contributory expertise as possessing tacit knowledge qualities

through the work of Collins and Evans (2002) and Dreyfus and Dreyfus (2005). It also became clear that only interactional expertise possesses a central concern with meaning embodied in context. It remains an important link between individual and social approaches to expertise development. Wenger (1998) further explored this notion of practice as meaning in a particular context. He described the roles of participation and reification as a duality in the negotiation of meaning in a community of practice and in the subsequent formation of a community of action.

It was clear through Wenger's work (1998) that participation, being the most important process governing a community of practice, must exist in equilibrium with the other constituent processes. Additionally, O'Dell and Grayson (1998) pointed out that technology's role was limited to being an enabling tool in knowledge management. They also explained that its prevalence of use in citizen engagement strategies does not supplant the very real necessity of face-to-face interaction and relationship building between people. Hildreth and Kimble (2002) additionally posited that the relevant use of technology in knowledge management could have the added benefit of making the implicit visible.

We noted in section 2.5 (Expressions of Expertise in Planning, Design, and Public Policy) the direct relationship between citizen participation/engagement and democracy. Fischer (2000) pointed out that the most significant problem confronting that relationship is the endemic distrust of government and institutions and the lack of meaningful dialogue between citizens and policy-makers. It was also noted that policy-makers regarded ordinary citizens' lack of technical expertise as a major obstacle in intelligent deliberation on matters of public and social policy. In

addition to Fischer, the section cited the work of policy analysts and designers Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993), and Schneider and Ingram (1997). Their work demonstrated that citizen participation and participatory democracy are intertwined. The authors explained that policy analysis and design could play a decisive role in that relationship when it allows the active engagement of ordinary citizens. This kind of engagement, they explained, allows ordinary citizens to demonstrate local place knowledge in praxis and to provide relevant information containing values and meaningful knowledge in the process of development.

The section also makes a case for comprehensive and integrated political and social inquiry, along the lines postulated by this research's Phronesis-based approach and the notion of the citizen practitioner. We learned that the degree by which ordinary citizenry's participatory efforts, including the transmission of local place knowledge, are accommodated and transformed into meaningful policy depend on the type of political and social inquiry that takes place. This inquiry is ultimately tied to the strength and kind of democratic system that is adopted. We also learned, as Barber (1998) argued, that the phenomenon of political individualization occurred concurrently with the decline of traditional forms of political organizations and was set against a background of compromised democracy.

It was also explained in this section that scientific and degenerative policy design contributed to the creation of an apathetic political system. The system limits inclusion in its processes to selected "target groups" of businesses, private associations, and citizen groups, while excluding the input and engagement of individual ordinary citizenry. We noted that policy analysts and

designers appeared to credit the notion of a citizen practitioner only conditionally. They postulated that individual citizen empowerment could occur either through better policy designs or through the inherent “intelligence” of democratic politics, a position akin to that of the reliance of market economics on market mechanisms to resolve internal conflicts. In contrast, the application of a Phronesis-based approach to citizen participation/engagement posits that effective, relevant, and holistic policy-making in a democracy necessitates the inclusion of values and meaningful knowledge in the policy development process, thus mitigating value and interest conflicts within analytical policy-making.

The last section explored the historical and emergent differences between the processes of participatory democracy and those of representational and nominal democracies, where it concerns citizen participation/engagement and citizen activism. We encountered two types of citizen activism, namely, ordinary citizen activism and expert-citizen activism. Bang and Dyhrberg (2003) argued that the latter type of activism (expert activism) representing the term “expert-citizen” is a new form of republican elitism threatening nominal democratic values and opposing non-expert citizen participation.

Bang (2005) also pointed out that strategic communication and alliances formed between expert-citizens and NGOs distort and replace conventional democratic values of society, in favour of those of influence and success. This results in the exclusion of ordinary citizens from any form of participation in the political process. Bang and Sorenson (1997, 1999, 2001) used the term “everyday maker” to define this type of ordinary citizen activist and to express the legitimacy of

practical experience as a source of authentic knowledge in a representative democracy.

This dissertation extends this understanding to the processes of direct democracy rather than to representative ones to define a legitimate source of local place knowledge. To that end, the terms “citizen practitioner” and “citizen praxis” describe the level of participation/engagement by everyday citizens in contrast to expert-activists, whose lay-expertise is legitimized by their life experiences, or praxis, and by their local place knowledge of their respective locales.

In Chapter 3, I will continue the analysis and review of the body of knowledge about citizen participation in policy that I undertook in Chapter 2. Chapter 2 explored the notion of expertise, lay-expertise, and direct communication and addressed the debate on authoritative knowledge; prominent authors and researchers have shown us that expertise is multifaceted and covers both formal and informal knowledge acquisition. We also explored Phronesis from its Aristotelian roots to its modern interpretations and looked at its theoretical links to citizen participation and engagement, expertise, and other perspectives on the nature of knowledge. Chapter 3 continues this exploration of Phronesis through a methodological review which includes a historical exploration of the rise of user participation in the three built environment fields since the 1960s, in order to ascertain how theories of institutionalized planning account for Phronesis (versus sophia) and what this implies for processes of reflection and deliberation in learning systems that parallel Phronesis.

3. AUTHORITY; KNOWLEDGE; AND INSTITUTIONALISED PLANNING, ARCHITECTURE, AND URBAN DESIGN

The main aim of this chapter is to provide a methodological review²² of the body of knowledge about citizen participation in policy while focusing on how theories of institutionalised planning, architecture and urban design are congruent with Phronesis (vs. sophia). Through its two case studies, the chapter then offers a comparative analysis of dominant approaches to evaluate the adequacy of available strategies in making citizen engagement in policy more effective and relevant.

The first section of the chapter contains a historical review for participation in the allied design professions and participatory research in the health sciences. This is followed by a historical review of influential frameworks on theoretical architectural and urban design discourse, drawing on the user's role in participatory practices in North America and its key issue leaders since the 1960s. The historical review includes community design along with prominent movements in architecture and urban design involving varying levels of user/expert interaction in building design. Following that are historical explorations of urban design theories and practices in relation to participation. The section moves to a clarification of the existing differences between the idealistic conceptualization and real-world practices of citizen participation, driven by the dynamics of power relations in a representative democracy, and its implications for this

²² Methodological Review: "A review does not always focus on what someone said [content], but **how** they said it [method of analysis]. This approach provides a framework of understanding at different levels (i.e. those of theory, substantive fields, research approaches and data collection and analysis techniques), enables researchers to draw on a wide variety of knowledge ranging from the conceptual level to practical documents for use in fieldwork in the areas of ontological and epistemological consideration, quantitative and qualitative integration, sampling, interviewing, data collection and data analysis, and helps highlight many ethical issues which we should be aware of and consider as we go through our study." (Kennedy 2007, 147)

dissertation's Phronesis-base approach. The section then offers a historical review of planning paradigms relevant to citizen participation, in order to in order to explore the decreasing popularity of rational planning approaches and the subsequent adoption of citizen participation processes within planning paradigms.

The last section of the chapter provides a historical review of work focusing on the processes of reflection as they relate to an individual's life experience and learning systems. The processes of learning systems enable us to reconstruct interpretations of deliberative processes and dialogues between ordinary citizens and organizational representatives. This in turn, highlights research on subjective learning, which compliments the notion of Phronesis and gives the citizen practitioner's self-narrative meaning and relevancy during local place knowledge exchange.

3.1. Citizen Participation and Engagement

Citizen participation has been studied and researched for several decades, in a multitude of disciplines and fields, including planning, urban design, architecture (implicitly, in its own variety of user involvement and client advocacy), and the social sciences (political science, sociology, public administration and health sciences). Research within some of these fields gave rise to a new sub-specialty of research that is collaborative in nature and places the input of research participants, patients, clients, stakeholders, residents, and citizens at the core of what is known as Participatory Research.

Social policy research is particularly focused on the issues of citizen participation, especially in psychology, behavioural science, and the health sciences. For the last eighty years two similar concepts have evolved to become traditions of applied behavioural science theory, “action research” and “participatory research.” The latter has dominated research in the health sciences in the last decade and in some instances has subsumed “action research” in a hybrid approach to inquiry called “participatory action research” (Wadsworth 1998).

Participatory research in the health sciences is a parallel path of inquiry to Forester’s “deliberative practice” (1999) in planning and, to a lesser extent, the Phronesis-based approach in this dissertation. The differences in processes, however, between participatory research and the other two approaches emerged from participatory research singular focus on the particular goals and objectives, issues and challenges particular to the health science environment and its users. This is also true of participatory research application to issues of empowerment in political science and political economy. This makes the focus and processes of the participatory research approach quite distinct from the other two approaches, on both substantive and procedural grounds, despite their similarity in orientation.

Interestingly, recent studies in the health and psychological science models as well as new theoretical models on the evolution of cooperation (see van Kleef et al. 2008; van Kleef 2009; Fu et al. 2012) seem to substantiate the premise and theoretical suppositions advanced by this dissertation for a Phronesis-based approach and its life-experience narrative exchange method. In terms of reflection and deliberation and choosing when to apply each, recent studies demonstrate

that reflection is best utilized personally by stakeholders when it is directed inward to evaluate their own expertise. However, best outcomes for cooperation, trust, mutual learning and relationship building are achieved when stakeholders interact frequently together to deliberate, in face-to-face engagement, i.e. narrative exchange of local place knowledge in pursuit of informed policy outcomes.

In Psychological science research, two studies shed new light on power relations and the evolution of cooperation. van Kleef et al. (2008) suggest that power may diminish a tendency to help others, in that powerful people's tendency to show less compassion towards others reinforces their social power. van Kleef (2009) also advanced a new model on the evolution of cooperation, in which emotion is conceived as social information. The author concludes that human societies best achieve high levels of cooperative behaviour when their individuals continuously interact, provided that populations exhibit at least a minor degree of structure. Building up on past studies on cooperation, Fu et al. (2012) demonstrated that people's first response is to cooperate, but stopping to reflect and rationalize encourages selfish behaviour. This observation highlights an interesting and counterintuitive truth, that rationalization and reflection have a negative side.

Faden et al. (2013), a leading group of health care professionals, took steps to redefine health care and research ethics by challenging the ethical foundation of medical research and practice. The group called for a learning health care system that is appropriate for our digital age and is based on morally obligatory participation. The authors reject the stark distinction between

medical research and clinical patient care, which has defined federal human subject research regulations since the 1970s. Importantly, the labels "research" and "practice" are seen as inadequate substitutes for what should be our fundamental moral concerns, and are not effective guidelines for ethical oversight. Faden et al. (2013) also refute the commonly believed assumption that research is ethically different from practice. The authors argue for a health care system in which clinical research and practice are integrated, and where every clinical interaction with patients is simultaneously an opportunity to provide needed care and to learn from patients to improve future care.

Faden et al. (2013) advanced a new ethical framework for the integration of research with practice. This framework for a learning health care system includes familiar guidelines of both medical and research ethics. Also included are new obligations that bind both professionals and patients to contribute, participate and facilitate learning, which will improve the quality of the health care system. The authors maintain that under our current system, enormously valuable learning opportunities are lost because physicians and researchers are prevented from capturing the rich information generated from thousands of daily interactions with patients, due to rigid oversight and consent rules. While it is encouraging to note that efforts to increase the efficacy and relevance of participatory research methods in the health sciences have been given priority and funding in the last decade, the same could not be said for novel approaches to citizen participation / engagement in planning, urban design, and architecture.

Participation in design research has recently received much needed attention from trade journals and a second generation of designers who have exhibited keen interest in pursuing alternative modes of design expression outside of traditional approaches. Such alternative modes often view the user as a co-author in the conceptualization and production of design outcomes. Most prominent among the recent journals dedicated to the dissemination of participatory design research is *CoDesign: International Journal of CoCreation in Design and the Arts*.

Binder, Brandt and Gregory (2008) posit that this newly found interest in participatory research within the design community is not a new phenomenon. The authors point out that since the early 1970s, design participation has experienced periodic cycles of resurging interest and decline. The authors explain this pattern through a brief history of design participation in the last three decades of the twentieth century:

Two transformational moves towards design participation (-s) began to emerge in the early 1970s: the early participatory design movement that began in Scandinavia and northern Europe, and the call from within the design research community to design for society and to include non-designers in design collaborations. Participatory design has its historical origins in a critique towards an approach to design that excluded the voices of most or all users and ignored many other stakeholders as well. An inspirational turning point in this critique was the Design Research Society's 1971 conference that called for design participation ...The conference was both an attempt to put design in the service of societal needs and an indication of a maturing self-consciousness among designers who were ready to leave a traditional craft orientation in exchange for a modern repertoire of more openly transparent design methods.

(2)

The emerging landscape of design portrayed by Sanders and Stappers (2008) is precisely one where an emphasis on collaborative idea generation and a turn towards designing for social

purpose are reshaping both our notion of design and how we regard users. As they see it, design practice must begin to nurture collective creativity, so that the people we are accustomed to calling 'users' are instead seen as active and competent participants in design practice. As design and design research are becoming more closely integrated, participatory ideation at 'the fuzzy front end' of design is growing in importance. (2)

Binder, Brandt and Gregory (2008) emphasize the need for designers to emulate the roles assumed by planners for inclusion in policy decision-making. The authors argue that the design professions need to reach out beyond traditional boundaries and processes, to enable their participatory efforts to gain a foot-hold in policy-making circles. This is precisely the goal envisioned in this dissertation for architects and urban designers, who have longed for their participatory efforts to gain inclusion in policy-making but lacked a relevant participatory approach to achieve that aim. Binder, Brandt and Gregory (2008) explain:

Tracing developments since the early calls for participation, we can see that within some fields such as urban planning, computer systems design and informatics, participatory approaches gained important results, both in terms of novel designs and in terms of new political and juridical regulations of planning processes. Scandinavian participatory design began with a democratic agenda in which new computer technologies seemed ideally suited for political negotiation of their full specification and influence in society ... What eventually made participatory design successful within computer systems design was the involvement of workers in early 'technology projects' concerned with office automation and machine shop programming that revealed that 'specification' was far from straightforward. The skills of users could not be easily explicated or codified and rather than a negotiation of specifications, systems development came more and more to look like a genuine design discipline.

(3)

Binder, Brandt and Gregory (2008) point out that in the period from the 1970s to the 1980s, the participatory agenda's initial impulse for multi-party inclusion in design decision-making was hurt by the movement's political agenda to gain influence on design specifications. The authors regard cooperative design and participatory prototyping, two approaches to system design, as chiefly responsible for bringing users closer to inclusion within the creative processes of design. Ironically, despite this increase in user inclusion, Binder, Brandt and Gregory (2008) maintain that "designing for skill and work practices in context" (3) resulted in compromising the ideology of participatory design in the 1990s, as they explain:

It effected a reorientation of how relations between design and use were conceived. Instead of artificial intelligence, we got situated action and instead of a model of the designer as rationale planner, we got the designer as reflective practitioner ... The claim often heard in the debate of the 1990s that users are unable to contribute to the design of new technologies with which they are not familiar seems now widely to be turned on its head. Today many companies and researchers question how successful design can be made without exploring people's everyday practices and aspirations and, ultimately, involving the people for whom designs are intended

(3)

In response, Lee (2008) calls for using the previous term of Design Participation instead of Participatory Design, in order to avoid confusion with interpretations of user participation as collaboration or involvement:

For Lee, the notion of participatory design echoes the ambitions of designer-led control of the design process. As an alternative, she proposes a commitment to tactics that may eventually lead to a redefinition of designers' roles towards acting as *developers*, *facilitators* and *generators*. [She] reports on three participatory projects, ranging from one-to-one engagement with private clients to collaboration with tenant groups seeking a say in large-scale housing projects to novel attempts to redefine participation and engagement in shaping public campaigns.

(Lee in: Binder, Brandt and Gregory 2008, 3)

As we conclude our historical review of participation in the allied design professions and participatory research in the health sciences, we move to a historical review of user participation in the built environment field; architecture, urban design and planning.

To begin with, it is necessary to explain the roots of the key notion of the “public good” which had a profound influence on the ideology of planners, architects and urban designers in the twentieth century. In the literature on participatory democratic theory, it is often attributed to Rousseau’s (1789) secular use of the phrase “general will” in Article Six of the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen* during the French revolution. As Rousseau states, “The law is the expression of the general will. All citizens have the right to contribute personally, or through their representatives, to its formation. It must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes. All citizens, being equal in its eyes, are equally admissible to all public dignities, positions, and employments, according to their capacities, and without any other distinction than that of their virtues and their talents.” (Swenson, 2000: 163)

However, it must be noted that the phrase "general will" predates Rousseau’s secular use of it referring explicitly, in theology, to the general will or volition of the Deity. Reiser (2010) informs us that most prominent of Rousseau’s critics included Benjamin Constant and Georg Hegel. While Hegel objected to Rousseau’s account of the general will claiming that it lacked objectivity in its portrayal of the ideals of reason and that this can only lead to Tyranny, Constant

rejected the “total subordination of the citizen-subjects to the determinations of the general will.” (252) In this dissertation’s main participatory focus, Constant’s critique echoes my own objections to Rousseau’s belief that individuals must abandon their claims of natural right and subjugate their individuality to the political will of their rulers through a social contract.²³

The impulse towards “the public good” in the domain of planning, which emerged in the first half of the twentieth century, translated into competing conceptual positions within architectural discourse on the role of users in building design. In the following decades, deteriorating social, cultural, economic and environmental conditions increased public demand for user involvement in community and building design. The response within the field of architecture, from academics and practitioners alike, was an array of theories and conceptual manifestos modeled in practice as architectural interventions, paralleling within the field of planning what came to be called planning redevelopment and neighborhood rehabilitation initiatives.

Such interventions were dominated by conceptual positions based on prevailing theories in the social sciences. As a result, architecture, urban design and planning, in different measures, suffered a crisis of identity and underwent substantive transformations to their processes of theory generation and practice implementation. Certain limitations of those dominant conceptual positions on citizen participation and expert/user interaction will be examined in this and the following chapters, and their usefulness to this dissertation and their limitations will be revealed.

²³ See Rousseau’s theory of the natural human and his most important work *The Social Contract*, outlining the framework of classical republicanism as a basis for a legitimate political order.

Three prominent frameworks are generally identified in the literature on architectural theory and urban design, and in particular, user participatory roles in building design. Those frameworks dominated architectural, planning and urban design discourse, in theory and practice, in the latter half of the twentieth century. They are:

Positivist/postpositivist frameworks: Kostoff (1985) informs us that these frameworks centre on quantitatively measurable phenomena, validating expert scientific knowledge while neglecting considerations of subjectivity. Structuralism, however, deals with meaning but neglects individual human choice in lieu of how structures determine behaviour. These frameworks often disregard the user's perspective in order to situate the user's role as a function of the structures they inhabit. This in turn, would enable the production of universal, mathematical patterns of idealized human habitats that could be easily generated and duplicated.

Kostoff (1985) maintains that positivism dominated architectural theory from the postwar period until the early 1960s. Positivism ideology permeated the International Style, from its fascination with new technologies and functionalism to its rationalization of architectural production and disregard for historical and cultural contexts. Key figures of modified functionalism are le Corbusier, Gropius, van Eesteren, Sert, Kunio Mayekawa, Ernesto Rogers and Alfred Roth. Although functionalists did possess a social agenda, functional reductionism caused by a lack of consideration for a user's perspective and the imposition of arbitrary solutions, based on abstract geometries devoid of ornamentation, often resulted in sterile monotonous living spaces. Contemporary building science research and architectural technologies, behaviourism, operations

research, and system theory continue to display a positivism/postpositivism perspective, which is often united with structuralist ideas.

Although structuralism's origins reach back to Ferdinand de Saussure's lectures as early as the beginning of the twentieth century, Kostoff (1985) maintains that it entered the architectural debate in the early 1950s, in response to modern functionalism and gained academic popularity in the 1960s and 1970s. Aldo van Eyck (1953) along with a group of young architects described structuralism as the structural principles underlying urban growth at the next significant unit above the family cell. Structuralist cultural models are based on structural linguistics and mathematical concepts of structure and emphasize socio-cultural analysis of the built environment.

An example of postpositivist/structuralist-influences is Bill Hillier and Julienne Hanson's space syntax theory in the late 1970s, which included simulation tools to help architects project future outcomes of their designs. Another example from the same period is Christopher Alexander's *Pattern language*, which emphasizes users' participatory role as a function of the structures they inhabit in housing design. Alexander's (2004) recent collaboration with mathematician Salingaros, is on an intersection of *Pattern language* with complexity theory.

Phenomenology experienced resurgence in interest with the early works of Christian Norberg-Schulz (1971). Hays (1998) explains that both phenomenology and structuralism defer "the commonsense perception of architecture as a vessel of meaning filled from outside, or as a

collection of behaviors and uses considered as its content.” (xiii) The difference between the two theories is that while structuralism prioritizes system over subject, phenomenology does the reverse.

Structuralism in urban design introduced other concepts, such as a sense of place, an emphasis on individual interpretations and identification with surroundings, advocating user participation in the design process and an appreciation for values in vernacular building forms. In the mid-1970s, poststructuralism advanced a perspective of reality as a social construct.

Postmodernism in architecture, itself based on structuralism, introduced the semiotic perspective in which a building can symbolize a different value and meaning than that intended by its designer. Hays (1998) maintains that architectural theory, in the mid-1980s, was no longer dominated by structuralism which gave way to more radical heterogeneous interpretive techniques, which eliminated traditionally maintained oppositional boundaries.

Constructivist frameworks: Madison (2001) explains that such frameworks discard universalism in order to prioritize a common interpretation of individual human experience, while rejecting any shared context to such experience. This perspective, Madison informs us, “leads to relativism, incommensurability, moral particularism and nihilism” (ix). In architecture, pro-constructivist authors like Tschumi (1994) often advance a strictly individualistic view, justifying architecture devoid of social engagement and a retreat into formalism.

Formalists like Eisenman (1984) believe that social or political issues have no significance in architecture, and neither does a user's perspective. The constructivist position has been associated, to a large extent, in architectural education, with Tafuri, Eisenman, and Hays, despite the presence of critical thought aspects in their work.

Critical frameworks: Eagleton (2003) posits that such frameworks neglect individual autonomy and perspective, to advance an ideologically deterministic model of social processes and mechanisms along with an interpretation of participation as 'empowerment' for politically excluded groups. According to Surber (1998), critical theory's deterministic framework (dialectical materialism) is a modern expression of Marxism, with a worldview centered on science.

Manfredo Tafuri and the School of Venice brought critical theory into architectural discourse. In Tafuri and La Penta's (1976) view, an architect's role should be limited to technical or administrative functions. This view accelerated the neglect of socio-political considerations in formalism. Critical theory in architectural discourse is represented by such scholars as Michael K. Hays, Giancarlo De Carlo, Diane Ghirardo and Kenneth Frampton, along with some postcolonial and feminist critiques of architecture. Giancarlo De Carlo's (1969) views, which are shared by Frampton and Ghirardo, are centered on the value of user participation and an active opposition to consumerism. Those views, however, have been subsumed by aesthetic interpretations of critical theory, especially in academic discourse and the media.

Eagleton (2003) argues that critical theory has lost its efficacy and cultural relevance. He maintains that critical theory's dominance in the years between 1965 and 1980, as an interdisciplinary critique of global, socio-political conditions, has been weakened by the disengagement of postmodernism from socio-political analysis.

The current architectural debate is between the proponents of critical theory and the advocates of a post-critical, "projective" practice who refute the critical approach's relevance to architects' everyday design practice. Robert Somol and Sarah Whiting's (2002) "projective" perspective proposes pragmatic problem-solving in lieu of theoretical critique for an architectural field that should be inwardly focused. The authors also maintain that rather than resist commercialization, "projective" architecture should look for opportunities to exploit it within capitalist society.

The insider's view of architecture (a view represented within the profession) often differs essentially from the view of architecture represented within philosophy and the social sciences. Architects tend to disregard the voices coming from outside the discipline. Architecture, however, does enter into a dialogue with contemporary philosophical ideas, but most often ends up interpreting philosophical discourse solely in aesthetic terms. The consequences of design choices, for example, are commonly not given due reflection on their broader socio-political and ethical considerations. We will examine the reasons for this later in the section.

Within currently dominating architectural theory approaches, as our historical review of those theories has shown, it is paradigm interpretation that often widens the gap between theory and

practice, while giving little consideration for individual context-sensitive perspectives and ethical considerations. This is in contrast to the other applied sciences. Agrest (1991) identifies the source of the separation between architectural theory and practice as the essential opposition between critical and normative discourses, as the author explains, “Architecture tends to make an absolute separation between theory and practice, between analysis and synthesis. This difference, however, could be better expressed in the difference between discourses: an analytical, exploratory, critical discourse and a normative discourse. Most theories are developed within the first category, while practice falls into the latter.” (1) Additionally, the author emphasizes that critical discourse, as opposed to a normative one, “allows for questions to grow, to acquire a depth, to open fields, and not to be stopped short by the normative will trying to find immediate answers.” (1)

Till (2009) gives a succinct explanation for the mismatch and distance between theory and practice. The author posits that architects often refute the fact that external factors and people have an influence on shaping architecture in all its phases. Till (2009) argues, “They feel more comfortable in a world of certain predictions, in linear method, in the pursuit of perfection ... The inescapable reality of the world must be engaged with and not retreated from.” (1) The field of architecture may accomplish this aim by engaging the political, social and economic realities of the world through direct engagement of its architects with users in the design, development and implementation of public policy.

After reviewing influential frameworks on architectural and urban design theoretical discourse bearing on the user's participatory role, we move to a historical review of participatory practices in North America and its key issue leaders since the 1960s, beginning with community design.

Wates and Knevitt (1987) inform us that the term 'community architecture' can be traced back to the early 1970s when Fred Pooley, then President of the RIBA, used it to refer to the provision of architecture for the community by local authorities. The authors state that "the term 'community architecture' embraces community planning, community design, community development and other forms of community technical aid. For them, community architecture is the name used in the UK, while social architecture is used for the same concept in the United States." (17) While Hatch (1984) points out that "social architecture aims to create critical consciousness among citizens," (7) Hamdi (1991) posits that "community participation is the term covering all the scales and techniques, which refer to the processes involving professionals, families, community groups, and government officials in shaping the environment." (75) The definition of community architecture (social architecture) was later challenged by architects and planners, and made more inclusive of the processes of participation and the implicit notion of 'empowerment' as an end product of participation.

According to Jenkins and Pereira (2009), there were disparate professional and political perspectives between early European community architects emphasizing design quality as a process of participation and North American advocacy planners (some of whom were also architects) who concentrated on community empowerment as an end-product of participation.

Blake (2003) points out that the advocacy planning approach came as a response to the social unrest movements of the 1960s, where planners represented poor communities to oppose comprehensive redevelopment and gentrification. Comerio (1987) argues that there exists a need to improve design in community architecture, and also to pursue the political end product of participation. The author maintains, “We should recognise that the social motivation behind community design does not, and should not, preclude good design” (26).

Comerio (1984) informs us that community design stood for an alternative style of practice based on the idea that professional technical knowledge without moral and political content is often inadequate. Comerio (1987) points out that while North American community designers influenced community design in Europe, an influence that remained localized and non-replicable, they drew their inspiration from European designers and projects, such as, “Giancarlo De Carlo (University of Urbino), Lucian Kroll (Medical Dormitories at Louvain La Neuve in Belgium), Ralph Erskine and Vernon Gracie (Byker Housing in Newcastle), Nicholas Habraken (flexible designs for housing in the Netherlands).” (19)

Comerio also explains that in addition to being inspired by European participatory architects, North American community architects drew their political inspiration from a different source, “their political heroes were the rebellious and self-reliant Third World squatters.” (19) This political influence came in the wake of the grassroots movements of the 1950s and 1960s (e.g. the civil rights and women’s liberation movements) in the United States, which changed the face of policy decision-making affecting the built environment and caused, in the case of municipal

and government-funded projects, a nation-wide adoption of minority and women's rights considerations in Citizen Design Review Boards.

Jenkins and Pereira (2009) explains that some of those government-sponsored, community development-focused programs, such as community action agencies and Office of Neighbourhood Development, were integrated with planning, urban design and architectural processes utilized by not-for-profit community-based development corporations working with community design centres and their associated academic institutions. Hamdi (1991) points out that the Model Cities Program of 1967 to 1973, which was activated by the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, gave citizens the right to participate in policy-making. Jenkins and Pereira (2009) also describe the impact of this program on community participation in the processes of planning and urban design:

The Model Cities Program of 1964 to 1973 on the practices of planning and urban design provided grants and technical assistance to communities to participate in the planning and implementation of urban development activities which were influenced by the neighbourhood organiser and sociologist Saul Alinsky, and Davidoff's advocacy approach in planning and urban renewal was another major stimulus.

(43)

Comerio (1987) cautions us, however, that citizen empowerment through institutionalized community participation did not often translate into a better quality of life and an increased role in participation for ordinary citizens, as he explains:

The consequences of these effects may not always have been positive, however, and the institutionalisation of citizen participation through Design Review Boards and citizens' committees was not always effective in improving the quality of life... In this changed political economic context the politically oriented model of empowerment was replaced by an economically oriented model and community design started to be replaced by community development.

(26)

This replacement had its roots in the late 1970s, when a dramatic shift occurred in institutionalized community participation from a political and academic emphasis on preliminary design and social regeneration, to what Jenkins and Pereira (2009) describe as:

an instrumental (and professional) basis in community design centres (CDCs) – focusing on a complete design service for project implementation, largely through the influence and nature of government funding. This trend continued in the 1980s as CDCs adapted to a new, more conservative, political and economic regime with many of those that survived being transformed into private practices, or retaining only intermittent activities related to particular 'crises'. In the 1970s there were still some 50 to 80 CDCs in the US but by 1987 only 16 remained, 12 of which were from the earlier period. CDCs were forced to become more entrepreneurial, accessing finance from government programmes but also charitable foundations, private philanthropists, universities and the American Institute of Architects (AIA) chapters and corporations with social responsibilities activities. Pressures from the profession were also a factor in their demise.

(41)

Jenkins and Pereira (2009) also describe the political conditions that lead to the institutionalization of community architecture as a response to the changing context of policy, as they explain:

Community architecture was really only a movement in the sense that it promoted a range of activities within the profession which incorporated some form of wider social participation in developing the built environment. As such, arguably Community Technical Aid (CTA) encompassed community architecture... A key issue concerning

the emergence of these movements and their consolidation (and eventual demise) was the changing policy context that led to the growing professionalisation of community-oriented activities, both of the activists and other professionals, as well as the growth of more general engagement with individuals and community groups through Citizens Advice Bureaux from the 1970s.

(30)

In 1964, the Architectural Renewal Committee in Harlem challenged the construction proposal of a new freeway that would pass through the northern part of Manhattan. It was one of the first community design centres and the first to test the advocacy planning approach. Jenkins and Pereira (2009) describe the evolution of community design centres as they state:

It was typical of its time in having a fairly radical political objective of empowerment as well as urban development per se. Community design centres flourished in the 1970s with some 80 existing across the whole of the US. These were at first staffed by young inexperienced professionals with a strong ideological orientation and, despite the technical assistance given to hundreds of neighbourhoods, the successful projects and programmes were usually small, local and non-replicable; however, some have evolved to be significant influences. For example, the Community Development Group (CDG), founded in 1969 at the School of Design of North Carolina State University, has provided design and planning assistance to communities in the state of North Carolina for three decades.

(40)

Jenkins and Pereira (2009) explain that in the 1970s, community design centres (CDCs) became the main vehicle for advocacy planners (and architects) to provide technical assistance to local communities on planning and architectural issues. This response was also hastened by a speech delivered at the 100th Convention of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) by the Executive Director of the Urban League urging direct public accountability by architects. The authors explain:

To a great extent these came to depend on government funds, which initially flowed from federal agencies such as the Housing and Urban Development agency (HUD). One of the lasting conceptual impacts of these activities was the 1969 analysis of community participation by Sherry Arnstein, the Chief Adviser on Citizen Participation to HUD, whose 'ladder of participation' (Arnstein 1969) is still constantly used as a reference for community participation, despite critiques.

(40)

Toker (2007) points out that historically there were two phases in the development of community design centres; the idealistic phase that lasted until the end of the 1970s and the entrepreneurial phase, which lasted until the late 1980s. Toker (2007) explains:

During the idealistic phase, in an effort to help low income people define their own planning goals and effectively present them to city hall, community design centres became advocacy groups, providing professional and technical support, including information, management know-how and design assistance. They provided, free of charge, a wide array of services, ranging from helping individuals cope with the local red tape and economic problems of remodelling a house to creating plans and designs for developing an entire neighbourhood.

(315)

Toker (2007) informs us that in the 1980s economic pressures forced community design centres to change from a political model of empowerment to an economic one, turning some into private practices while others closed down. Some centres, however, remained active only in response to crisis conditions. The author explains:

The whole process became less academic. The typical university affiliated design centre of the idealistic phase provided general planning and preliminary design services. By contrast, the community design agencies of the entrepreneurial phase took one problem and finalised it in an entrepreneurial manner. As a result, funding for planning, social

activism and advocacy became increasingly scarce and led to an increasing focus on financing projects at the expense of broad community revitalisation goals.

(315)

The ideology underlying community architecture practices and methods posed some serious challenges to the norms of conventional architecture and its established practices and methods. Those challenges persisted for the next few decades, and were based on essential differences in the perspectives held by practitioners and theoreticians, in each of the two types of professional participation in the architecture, planning and urban design fields. Wates and Knevitt (1987) outline the differences in methods and user/expert interaction between conventional architecture and community architecture, as they state:

Conventional architecture:

Status of user for [is that users are] passive recipients of an environment conceived, executed, managed and evaluated by others: corporate, public or private sector landowners and developers with professional ‘experts’.

User/expert relationship [is] remote, arm’s length. Little if any direct contact. Experts – commissioned by landowners and developers – occasionally make superficial attempts to define and consult end-users, but their attitudes are mostly paternalistic and patronising. Expert’s role [is as a] provider, neutral bureaucrat, élitist, ‘one of them’, manipulator of people to fit the system, a professional in the institutional sense. Remote and inaccessible.

Primary motivation [for] **private sector** [is a] return on investment (usually short-term) and narrow self-interest. [For] **public sector**: social welfare and party political opportunism. [For] **experts**: esteem from professional peers. Response to general national or regional gap in market, or social needs and opportunities.

Method of operation [is] top-down, emphasis on product rather than process, bureaucratic, centralised with specialisms, compartmentalised, stop-go, impersonal, anonymous, paper management, avoid setting a precedent, secretive.

Ideology [is] totalitarian, technocratic and doctrinaire (Left or Right); big is beautiful, competition, survival of the fittest.

Community architecture:

Status of user: users are – or are treated as – the clients. They are offered (or take) control of commissioning, designing, developing, managing and evaluating their environment, and may sometimes be physically involved in construction.

User/expert relationship [is a] creative alliance and working partnership. Experts are commissioned by, and accountable to, users, or behave as if they are.

Expert's role [is as an] enabler, facilitator and 'social entrepreneur', educator, 'one of us', manipulator of the system to fit the people and challenger of the status quo: a professional as a competent and efficient adviser. Locally based and accessible.

Primary motivation [is] Improvement of quality of life for individuals and communities. Better use of local resources. Social investment. Response to specific localised needs and opportunities.

Method of operation [is] bottom-up, emphasis on process rather than product, flexible, localised, holistic and multidisciplinary, evolutionary, continuous, personal, familiar, people management, setting precedents, open.

Ideology [is] pragmatic, humanitarian, responsive and flexible, small is beautiful, collaboration, mutual aid.

(24–25)

Toker (2007) posits that community design, by the mid-1990s, can best be described as exhibiting a collaborative decision-making focus, in contrast to advocacy approaches of decades past. Change from community design to community development meant that rehabilitating projects involved helping residents with house ownership rather than working with community groups. In that regard, there are several successful initiatives that are worth mentioning, including the Urban Homesteading Assistance Board (U-HAB) in New York and the Asian Neighbourhood Design (AND) in San Francisco. Jenkins and Pereira (2009) describe the continued evolution of community design centres as they state:

Community design centres have retained their activities in the US through the 1990s into the new century, with some 46 university-affiliated programmes and 26 independent design centres registered with ACSA (Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture). In recent years various new CDCs have been formed as new government and other charitable foundation funding becomes available and architecture schools increasingly

recognise the value of such engagement as part of education ... The Association for Community Design support[s] CDCs in capacity building in architecture and planning across a range of base organisations such as universities, NGOs and other 'not-for-profits' ... These represent the three main institutional bases for CDCs. Most are based in large cities across the US, although serving both urban and rural populations at need. While most focus on planning and architectural design, others specialise in education and training. Most have a predominance of architects in comparison to planners ... The legal basis is either independent non-profit, volunteer or university affiliated and they vary extensively in the detail of their mission and objectives as well as staff and activities.

(42)

It is worth contrasting some traditionally influential figures in community design such as Henry Sanoff, Rex Curry and Michael Pyatok with others, leading a new direction in community design through the new urbanism movement, such as Andres Duany, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk and Peter Calthorpe. In Jenkins and Pereira's (2009) view, however, new urbanism is merely spatial determinism disguised as community design, and does not merit serious consideration for advancing the participatory role of the user in building design. The architect Christopher Alexander is another prominent figure whose approach to user participation was discussed previously. A fairly recent example of Alexander's community design work is the design of the Eishin School, in Japan.

While the above historical review of community architecture (social architecture) highlighted the most prominent issue leaders, there are other forms of community participation that also had a limited influence. They serve to illustrate the range of participatory responses that were generated throughout the decades leading to the new millennium. Foremost among those are Independent non-profit CDCs, which are more stable than university-based organisations. Some examples are Asian Neighbourhood Design (AND) in Berkeley, California, the Community

Design Center of Pittsburgh (CDCP) and The Urban Homesteading Assistance Board (U-HAB) in New York.

Other forms of community participation include volunteer organisations, which link and coordinate service provision for service providers and community organisations. Such organizations also offer reduced fee work through networking with existing architectural practices, conduct action research for communities and offer charrette-type community design processes that stress implementation methods. One prominent example is the Minnesota Design Team (MDT).

Finally, Jenkins and Pereira (2009) point out that despite the existence of a long tradition of community-oriented design practices and their link with higher education institutions in the United States, there remains room for improvement, as they explain:

Despite the impressive number of higher education institutions with their outreach programmes in the US, this is still a minority activity for architecture and arguably fills part of the gap in state-funded welfare activity through the reliance on charitable institutions and social responsibility of the corporate sector. As such, wider social participation in architecture is not necessarily achieved, since the majority remain excluded from engaging with the dominant architectural realm – reinforced in this case by the strong tradition of individual house building in the US.

(47)

Jones, P. (2013) gives us a succinct account of his professional motivation for participation as an emerging architect in the 1960s as he explains:

When I studied architecture in the late 1960s, orthodox modernism had reached a crisis because buildings had become construction-driven, ignoring issues of context and meaning. I discovered that there was an alternative modernist line, deeper and more subtle, headed by architects like Asplund, Häring, and Scharoun ... Meanwhile I became increasingly concerned by the way people have been excluded by bureaucracies and specialists from decisions about the buildings they inhabit. This provoked my interest in participation and in the vernacular, which shows how people built for themselves before architects took over.

(Jones, 2013, People at SSoA: Online)

De Carlo (1969) emphasizes the need for architecture to expand beyond its traditional boundaries in order to transform its foundational theories and practices into a responsive, multi-disciplinary participatory model. The author explains:

In reality, architecture has become too important to be left to architects. It is necessary to develop new characteristics in the practice of architecture and new behavior pattern in its authors. Therefore all barriers between builders and users must be abolished, so that building and using become two different parts of the same planning process. Therefore, the intrinsic commitment of architecture and the forced passivity of the user is fused to create a condition of creative and decisive equality where each—with a different impact—is the architect, and every architectural event—regardless of who conceives it and carries it out—is considered architecture.

(11)

In the latter half of the twentieth century, several prominent movements in architecture and urban design emerged in North America. Those movements involved varying levels of user/expert interaction in building design. Although they remain outside of the focus of this dissertation, a brief review of those movements' key figures and prominent works will follow. This will serve to illustrate the implicit inclination of architects and urban designers, whose have historically shared professional roles, towards a larger and more meaningful response in addressing the economic social-political and environmental challenges of modern society. This inclination is

present despite its opposition to the norms of traditional theory and practice in the three fields of architecture, urban design and planning. They are as follows²⁴:

New Urbanism: emerged in the 1970s and 80s influenced by models for the reconstruction of the "European" city proposed by architect Leon Krier, and Christopher Alexander's "pattern language." New Urbanism principles are integrated in municipal smart growth legislation in Maryland and several other states and exert some influence on architecture, planning and public policy. In the United States, New Urbanism is represented by the Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU).

Examples:

- In the mid-1990s, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) adopted the principles of the New Urbanism in its multi-billion dollar program to rebuild public housing projects nationwide.
- University Place in Memphis (2010) developed by McCormack Baron Salazar.
- Seaside, Florida (1981).
- Stapleton, Denver, Colorado, redeveloped by Forest City Enterprises.
- San Antonio, Texas (1997) as part of a new master plan, created new regulations called the Unified Development Code (UDC).
- Mountain House, Tracy, California (2001).

²⁴ For sources (see Grant 2006; Weaver, Martin and Matero 1997; Pearson 2001; Dean and Hursley 2002, 2005).

- Mesa del Sol, New Mexico, designed by architect Peter Calthorpe, and is developed by Forest City Enterprises.
- 1995, I'On, Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, was designed by the town planning firms of Dover, Kohl & Partners and Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company.
- Haile Plantation, Florida (2007).
- Old York Village, Chesterfield Township, New Jersey.

Key leaders, architects and planners:

- Michael E. Arth
- Larry Beasley
- Christopher Charles Benninger
- Peter Calthorpe
- Andrés Duany
- Leon Krier
- James Howard Kunstler
- Sim Van der Ryn

Historic preservation/Architectural conservation: Weaver, Martin and Frank Matero (1997) define the term as, "professional use of a combination of science, art, craft, and technology as a preservation tool." (1) It is associated with its parent fields of historic environment conservation and art conservation.

Architectural conservation organizations:

- AIC-ASG (The American Institute for Conservation - Architectural Specialty Group).
- IHBC (The Institute of Historic Building Conservation).
- APT (The Association for Preservation Technology International).
- International Council on Monuments and Sites.
- The International Scientific Committee on the Analysis and Restoration of Structures of Architectural Heritage.

Key leaders:

- James Marston Fitch
- Carolyn Kent
- William Morris
- W. Brown Morton
- William J. Murtagh
- Lee H. Nelson
- Charles E. Peterson
- John Ruskin
- Eugène Viollet-le-Duc
- Walter Muir Whitehill

Organic Architecture: Pearson (2001) defines it as, “a philosophy of architecture which promotes harmony between human habitation and the natural world through design approaches so sympathetic and well integrated with its site that buildings, furnishings, and surroundings become part of a unified, interrelated composition.” (72)

Key architects:

- Alvar Aalto
- Anton Alberts
- Laurie Baker
- Claude Bragdon
- Nari Gandhi
- Antoni Gaudi
- Bruce Goff
- Neville Gruzman
- Hugo Häring
- Hundertwasser
- Kendrick Bangs Kellogg
- John Lautner
- Imre Makovecz
- Eero Saarinen
- Hans Scharoun
- Gustav Stickley
- Louis Sullivan
- Rudolf Steiner
- Frank Lloyd Wright
- Bruno Zevi
- Toyo Ito

Community Design projects across North America: Projects range in participation from community consultation to community design.

Examples:

- Portland, Oregon city repair project is community co-designing and collaborative decision-making run by community volunteers without involvement of local government or professionals.
- Peer-to-peer urbanism is a form of decentralized, participatory design for urban environments and individual buildings where participants freely exchange knowledge about construction methods and urban design schemes.
- Rural Studio is a design-build architecture studio, based in Newbern, in Hale County, run by Auburn University in rural west Alabama which teaches students about community architecture (social architecture) practices to provide safe, well-constructed homes and buildings for poor local communities. Founded in 1993 by architects Samuel Mockbee and D. K. Ruth, and is currently lead by UK-born architect Andrew Freear. The program builds five houses, each year (one house by students in their second-year of studio, three thesis projects by groups of 3-5 students in their fifth year and one or more outreach studio projects built by outreach students and international post-graduates of architecture or design).

Projects:

2010–2011

- \$20K House Phase X, Faunsdale: Jacob Beebe, Erika Henriksson, Eric Schmid and Sandra Yubero.

2009–2010

- Safe House Museum, Greensboro: Cassandra Kellogg, Chris Currie and Candace Rimes

2008–2009

- Thinnings Pavilion, Payne Lake, Talladega National Forest: Anna Bevill, Lori Fine, Ian Hoffman and Roger Mainor.

2007–2008

- 20K - Bridge Greensboro: Betsy Farrell, Drew Merkle, Rand Pinson and Ashley Snell.

2006–2007

- Hale County Hospital, Greensboro: Blair Bricken, Nathan Foust, Nicholas Gray and Heidi Schattin.

2004–2005

- Perry County Learning Center: Dereck Aplin, Sam Currie, Amy Bell, Angela Hughey and Turnley Smith.

2003–2004

- Newbern Volunteer Fire Department, Newbern: Will Brothers, Elizabeth Ellington, Matthew Finley and Leia Price.

2002–2003

- Music Man House, Greensboro

2001–2002

- Antioch Baptist Church: Jared Fulton, Gabe Michaud, William Nauck and Marion McElroy.

2000–2001

- Bodark Amphitheatre, Newbern

1999–2000

- Glass Chapel, Mason's Bend, Hale County

1998–1999

- Seed House

1997–1998

- HERO Children's Center, Greensboro

1996–1997

- Goat House

1995–1996

- Wilson House, Mason's Bend, Hale County

1994–1995

- Yancey Chapel, Sawyerville, Hale County

1993–1994

- Hay Bale House, Mason's Bend, Hale County

Community engagement practice:

Examples:

- TYIN (2008) built projects by actively engaging the local populace in the design and building of projects, in poor and underdeveloped areas of Thailand, Uganda, Sumatra and Norway.
- Shelter: connect workshop, led by filmmakers Richard Neill and Lee Schneider, which builds participants' storytelling skills.
- Public Interest Design Institute (PIDI), led by Bryan Bell of Design Corps, using the Harvard Case Method and social/economic/environmental design principles (SEED) for projects.
- Structures For Inclusion 1-13 (2000-2013)

Key Architects:

- Anne Frederick, director of Hester Street Collaborative
- Sam De Jong, project designer with BNIM
- T. Luke Young, Program Coordinator with Architecture for Humanity

Examples:

- Owe'neh Bupingeh Preservation Plan and Rehabilitation Project, Ohkay Owingeh, New Mexico: Atkins Olshin Schade Architects, The Ohkay Owingeh Housing Authority
- Grow Dat Youth Farm, New Orleans, Louisiana: Tulane University City Center, New Orleans City Park,
- Congo street revitalization work, Dallas, Texas: Brent Brown of building community workshop community design center.

This historical review of the rise of participatory roles and relationships between users and experts in the processes of architecture, urban design and planning, in theory and practice, was necessary to explain and situate those participatory roles within this dissertation's exploration of the relationship between authority and knowledge. What remains is to clarify the existing differences between the idealistic conceptualization and real-world practices of citizen participation, driven by the dynamics of power relations in a representative democracy, and its implications for Phronesis-based approach. Till (2005) alerts us to the existence of a dichotomy in the conceptualization of citizen participation between its theoretical ideals and the reality of how it is practiced. This, the author maintains, runs parallel to the existence of a similar gap in conceptualizations of democracy, as Till (2005) explains:

The story of participation runs parallel to that of democracy, and one does not have to be a great political theorist to detect that the soothing Hellenic etymology of democracy – *the people's rule* – is disturbed by undercurrents of power, manipulation and disenfranchisement. These undercurrents are equally true in participation. We should be surprised, therefore, that the term participation is so willingly, and uncritically, accepted as being for the common good. It is the unequivocal acceptance of participation as a better way of doing things that is both its strength and its weakness. The strength in so much as it encourages all parties to engage in it, its weakness in so much as this engagement can be uncritical, and thus oblivious as to how to act in the face of the dangerous undercurrents.

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 2)

The previous historical review of participatory efforts in building design in architecture has made it apparent that some fundamental hurdles to participation are endemic to the profession. The profession of planning with its extensive literature on planning and participation, by contrast, have dealt to varying levels of success with such hurdles, with some difficulties remaining, in its

theoretical discourse, to willingly address the influence of power relations on the profession. Till (2005) explains the challenges facing the architectural profession in addressing its reluctance to integrate participation in its practices, as he argues:

The issues inherent in participation have been traced in other disciplines, notably planning, but not often in the field of architecture ... forming a simplistic dialectic: inclusive/exclusive, democratic/authoritarian, bottom up/top down ... is too easy, leaving as it does the original terms unscathed and the new terms unanalysed ... mainstream architectural culture is in a state of denial about participation, a denial that is tantamount to rejection but without the need to be explicit about it. My argument is that participation presents a threat to normative architectural values. Once this threat is identified, it is possible to overcome it and see participation not as a challenge to architecture, but as an opportunity to reformulate, and thus resuscitate, architectural practice.

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 3)

Participation is now at the heart of plan-making and strategy development, as well as being an inseparable element of individual planning decisions. As for the future of participation in planning, architecture and urban design and, in particular, the future role of planners, Richardson and Connelly (2002) ask:

Are we really seeing the emergence of a new paradigm of participatory planning, where resolving differences of interest over the uses of space, and seeking consensus in the making of places become intrinsically participative activities? Or is public participation just something that planners have to do, part of an increasingly audited system where planners need to show how they have established community support for their plans?

(77)

In Till's (2005) view, such a paradigm is unrealistic not only for the profession of planning but also for architecture, urban design and the field of participation, as he posits:

Idealised conditions of mutual cooperation, uncontested knowledge bases, open

communication and eventual consensus. In reality, such ideals do not exist, and it is dangerous to hope blindly that they might. Better instead to accept that no participatory process, no matter how well intentioned, is going to completely dissolve the power structures and inequalities of the various parties. Any theory of participation in architecture must include the notions of authority and otherness. One aspect of participation makes confrontation with difference inevitable, and this is that the users will bring to the table their personal beliefs.

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 8)

Richardson and Connelly (2002) argue that participation has long been a planning tool for both planning strategy development and individual planning decisions. The authors maintain that reluctance in the field of planning theory to initiate a relevant discourse on power relations may be at the heart of its ineffective implementation of participation in planning processes.

Richardson and Connelly (2002) maintain:

The planning system has had to engage with the public for many years, and in consequence planners and planning academics have been led to explore these issues both theoretically and practically. Similar issues arise in related fields: wherever architects and other built environment professionals come to engage more with the public they will encounter parallel debates and face the same ethical and political challenges.

(77)

A similar view is held by Till (2005) who emphasizes that politics are also influential on the field of architecture. "Participation presents a threat to many of the central tenets of architecture and the profession does what it can (either knowingly or by default) to resist that threat. The denial of the political realm is one such mechanism by which that threat is suppressed." (Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 5)

The author characterises architects' failure to adapt a realistically transformative participatory model of practice to the field's denial of political influences on its theoretical underpinnings and

its processes in practice. The author attributes this observation to the architect Renaudie, as Till (2005) states, “In the negotiation of the personal with the social, the individual with the collective, political space emerges ... there is not the space to develop the argument here, but it is neatly summarized by the French architect Jean Renaudie who writes “The stubborn refusal of some people to admit to the influence of politics on architecture, and the narrow assertion by others that architecture is politics and nothing else, result in the same thing: inefficiency in practice.” (Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 34)

The issue here is that within the complicated politics of participation, the normative application of the term ‘participation’ hides varying levels of involvement that are possible in participatory processes. Till (2005) argues that the deliberate placement of certain levels of participatory control by Arnstein (1969) in her ladder of participatory hierarchy points to the compromised status of participation in contemporary democratic theory. Till (2005) explains:

These degrees are identified in Sherry Arnstein’s oft-quoted ‘ladder of participation’ in which she sets out a hierarchy of participatory control. At the bottom of the ladder is ‘manipulation’ and at the top is ‘citizen control’. Interestingly the word ‘placation’ sits just over halfway up the ladder. This is strange: that placation should be awarded an above average rating in this ladder of expectation – that placation is effectively deemed as an acceptable outcome of participation. To understand this apparent problem one has to understand that Arnstein’s simple diagram is embedded in a much more complex politics of participation.

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 2)

This level of complexity is explained by Pateman (1970) in her critique of revisionism in democratic theory. The author attributes to Rousseau’s (1762) work in *The Social Contract* a necessary level of comprehension of the nature of political systems that is needed for

participatory democracy. Pateman (1970) argues:

Rousseau's entire political theory hinges on the individual participation of each citizen in political decision-making and in his theory participation is very much more than a political adjunct to a set of institutional arrangements; it also has a psychological effect on the participants, ensuring that there is a continuing interrelationship between the workings of institutions and the psychological qualities and attitudes of individuals interacting with them. It is their stress on this aspect of participation and its place at the centre of their theories that marks the distinctive contribution of the theorist of participatory democracy to democratic theory as a whole ... it might be noted here that as Rousseau's political system [as] described in *The Social Contract* is a direct, not representative system, it does not conform to Schumpeter's definition of classical democracy.

(22)

In essence, Pateman (1970) argues that the notion of participation, as presented by classical democratic theory, is at odds with the notion of participation posited by contemporary democratic theorists, which in practice prioritizes the power of the state over that of the people in representative democracy and negates the opportunity for full participation to occur. In such cases, as Pateman (1970) notes in her analysis of workplace participation, the state resorts to pseudo-participation to impose its pre-determined decisions. "Pseudo-participation covers techniques used to persuade employees to accept decisions that have already been made." (68) Pateman (1970) explains that when there is an unequal distribution of power or authority between members in a decision-making body, partial participation occurs when "the final power to decide rests with one party only." (71) In contrast to pseudo-participation and partial participation, Pateman (1970) describes full participation as "where each individual member of a decision-making body has equal power to determine the outcome of the decisions." (71) Till (2005) explains that the notion of full participation is viewed by contemporary democratic theorists as a threat to the stability of representative democracy, as he states:

Participation serves as a part of an educative process through which ‘the individual will eventually come to feel little or no conflict between the demands of the public and private spheres ...it increases the feeling among individual citizens that they belong in their community’. Pateman contrasts this essentially transformative model of participation with the democratic theories of the 1960s. These suggest that wider public participation may present a threat to the stability of the political system ... A power relationship is clearly established here, with the stable authority of the state paramount. If participation acts as a palliative to ensure that stability, then that is acceptable. If participation acts as an agent in the transformation of the values of the state, then it is not acceptable ... Thus the function of participation is solely a protective one.’ Protecting, placating, participation is really no more than a placebo.

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 2-3)

In architectural practice, the above power relationship is expressed as a threat to the authority of the expert and placatory participation is used to protect the authority of the expert, as Till (2005) posits:

Whilst much of the rhetoric of architectural participation resonates with the Rousseau model of transformative action, the reality is actually closer to the later model, in which architectural participation can be seen as a means to get the presumed support of the citizen user for actions that have already been determined by professional agents. One of the main advocates of architectural participation, Henry Sanoff, argues that: ‘participants *have a sense* of influencing the design process....it is not so much the degree to which the individual needs have been met, but the *feeling* of having influenced the decisions’. This is an explicit example of placation, with the authority of the state replaced by the authority of the expert, and the citizen beguiled by the term participation into a sense of feeling good whilst in fact being passive in the face of decisions already made by experts ... Still worse is when this soothing gesture becomes downright manipulation – when the act of participation is in fact one of imposition under the false guise of inclusion ... this sentiment from US community designer[s].

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 3)

Till (2005) considers that both full and partial participation to be unsuitable for architectural practice if the goal of participation is user empowerment, as he explains:

Full participation is an ideal, but an impossible one to achieve in architecture. It depends on each party being in possession of the requisite knowledge *and* in there being transparent channels of communication. Neither of these pertains in architecture where the expert knowledge of the architect and the tacit knowledge of the participant user remain on different levels, and where the lines of communication are compromised by codes, conventions and authority. Whilst partial participation acknowledges this differential in power, it still assumes that the final power resides with the person with the most knowledge, in this case the architect. This may be a realistic analysis of architectural participation, but not one to aspire to if one believes that the goal of participation is the empowerment of the citizen user and not of the expert.

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 3)

Citing transformative theory by planning theorist Friedmann (1987), Till (2005) posits that what is needed in architecture practice is a new kind of participation which is “realistic enough to acknowledge the imbalances of power and knowledge, but at the same time works with these imbalances in a way that transforms the expectations and futures of the participants. Let us call this type of participation *transformative participation* as an active signal of its opposition to the passive nature of placatory participation.” (Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 4) Till (2005) maintains that if participation presents a threat to the central tenets of architecture then it must be because of an inherent conflict between the ideals and reality of architectural practice, as he explains:

Architects cling to a perfected model of practice, neatly and simplistically summarised in an idealised version of the Vitruvian triad—commodity, firmness and delight. Idealised commodity (solve the ‘problem’ of function in as efficient a manner as possible). Idealised firmness (advance on technical fronts as a sign of progress). Idealised delight (a polishing of forms in accordance with prevailing aesthetic sensibilities). The problem is when these ideals meet the reality of the contingent world; a threefold undermining of the values of the ideals takes place. Contingent reality first upsets the carefully laid plans of utility (users can be so annoyingly unpredictable). Secondly it ignores many of the values held high by architectural culture (for example the public hardly share architects’ obsession with the refined detail). Thirdly it brings into play issues that are overlooked by

the Vitruvian triad (most notably issues of the social and political world).

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 5)

Till (2005) maintains that it is the issue of user concerns and desires that often collide with architects own idealized conception of practice, which ultimately results in a pseudo-participatory architectural process. The author clarifies:

Most obviously this happens by bringing forward and prioritising the desires of the users. Where clients are generally concerned with economy, efficiency and longevity—all issues which elide with the Vitruvian triad and thus ones that the architect is comfortable with—users bring other concerns to the table. It is in this way that participation presents a threat to normative architectural values, and so it is not surprising that most architectural participation tends towards the pseudo corner of Pateman's construct, because only there are the values left unscathed behind a veneer of social engagement.

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 5)

Barki and Hartwick (1989) mark a distinction between the terms 'user involvement' and 'user participation,' indicating that participation refers to the actions users perform during a given design process, while involvement relates to a psychological state in which users are more concerned about the importance and personal relevance of the designed process.

Focusing on the actual engagement (participation) of users in projects affecting their personal lives, in order to influence a real-world architectural practice, is dependent upon the kind of built environment to be considered. In the case of private dwellings, it is easier to determine the user group, but it is much more difficult in the case of public buildings. In the latter case, identifying

a user within the context of a given project's projected utility may help. The term 'user', as Till (2005) informs us, "is probably the most commonly employed term in architectural participation and identifies a different category from the client. Real participation must engage the user over and above the client, whose priorities are so often similar to those of the architect." (Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 7)

Different contexts can frame a categorization of individuals according to the way they use a given architectural artefact (i.e. structure). Eason (1987) identifies three types of context-specific users: primary, secondary, and tertiary. Primary users are those persons who actually use the artefact; secondary users are those who will occasionally use the artefact or those who use it through an intermediary; and tertiary users are persons who will be affected by the use of the artefact.

Beyond the identification of users is the deeper issue of identification with users, in architectural practice. It highlights a duality in the role of the expert, as possessor of both specialized knowledge and the situated knowledge of a citizen in everyday life. Till (2005) cautions:

Experts feel most comfortable when the object of their scrutiny is abstracted, because then their specialist knowledge can be applied without disturbance ... in the context of participation the architectural imagination presents a problem, in so much as it is an internalized impulse and thus not available for mutual understanding with the other participants. Drawings, which for the architect may be pregnant with possibilities, remain mute to the outsider. A participatory process that is based on the principle of making the best sense [as a new kind of knowledge] will lead to architecture capable of accepting difference and architecture that is responsive to change over time, since it avoids the stasis of any universalizing tendency.

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 8)

Till (2005) emphasizes that in order to situate architecture knowledge in the social and political reality of ordinary citizens' lives, architects should distance their experiential knowledge from instrumental universality and abstraction, while immersing themselves and their practice in the physical and social world of the user. In this way, Till (2005) argues, the architect (as an embodied citizen) can navigate between the world of the user and expert with equal ease, as the author explains:

Architectural knowledge should not be applied as an abstraction from the outside, but developed from within the context of the given situation. This in turn calls for a new type of knowing ... to develop this knowledge from within, the architect must project themselves into the spatial context, physical and social, of the user; the architect becomes 'an activist, working on behalf of and *as* a dweller ... architects are prone to deny their experience as users, to forget that they too are embodied citizens. What is called for is the ability to move between the world of expert and user, with one set of knowledge and experience informing the other.

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 8)

As engagement is a two-way process that enables knowledge exchange between users and experts to be transformed, in Till's (2005) view engagement would necessitate:

That the user should have the opportunity to actively transform the knowledge of the architect. This will only happen if the architect first recognises and then respects the knowledge of the user. What is necessary is for the architect to acknowledge the potentially transformative status of the users' knowledge and to provide channels through which it might be articulated. The architect (as citizen expert) needs to listen to, draw out and be transformed by the knowledge of the user (as expert citizen). The process becomes two-way and expansive ... one can see how participation, through bringing the users' knowledge into the design process at an early stage, far from presenting a threat to architectural production actually presents an opportunity to reinvigorate it through challenging the very limits and constraints of specialist knowledge.

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 8)

This process of engagement as deliberation, in which socio-political issues are acknowledged and negotiated through special dialogues, would also mean replacing the normative architectural image of design as a problem-solving endeavour with Forester's (1985) conception of design as sense-making, as he points out, "Sense making is not simply a matter of instrumental problem-solving, it is a matter of altering, respecting, acknowledging, and shaping people's lived worlds... If form giving is understood more deeply as an activity of making sense together, designing may then be situated in a social world where meaning, though often multiple, ambiguous and conflicting is nevertheless a perpetual practical accomplishment." (14)

Till (2005) explains how this could be achieved in architectural practice:

As opposed to the instrumentalist knowledge of problem solving, sense-making is developed through knowledge from within in which the participatory process is founded on the will to achieve mutual understanding ... in order to achieve this mutual understanding one needs new models of communication. Thirdly, sense-making brings with it uncertainty and imprecision that demand the participants face up to the very contingency of architectural practice

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 12)

Till (2005) encapsulates the transformative participatory approach as seen through the lens of best 'sense-making' knowledge as a journey that must, by necessity, lead to new kind of communication that is founded on everyday language with ordinary citizens. The author explains:

A more empowering form of architecture ... achieved through an acceptance – of the political aspects of space, of the vagaries of the lives of users, of different modes of communication and representation, of an expanded definition of architectural knowledge and of the inescapable contingency of practice. This acceptance leads not only to a revitalised, and more relevant, form of participatory practice, but also to a revitalised, and more relevant, form of architectural practice.

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 13)

Till (2005) postulates that a new communication model is needed to accomplish this acceptance of difference in participation, one based on ordinary everyday language and employing some version of the time-honoured practice of story-telling, which he describes as:

If one starts a participatory process through a ‘what if?’ question, and then develops the answers through the forms of stories, two things happen. First the stories arise out of experience of the world and thus have a grounding in reality; secondly the ‘what if?’ allows stories to imagine and to project new spatial visions ... whilst at the same time not shutting down possibilities and opportunities. The role of the architect becomes to understand and draw out the spatial implications of the urban storytelling. This role requires both knowledge and imagination, but in both cases these attributes are externalized and shared, rather than being internalised and exclusive

(Till, in: Jones et al., 2005: 13)

In the above passages, we explored the existing differences between the idealistic conceptualizations and real-world practices of citizen participation and their parallels in democracy. We also analysed their implications for the status of participation in architectural practice. We then noted that Till’s (2005) account of what would constitute a transformative participatory approach for architectural practice is, in effect, a validation of this dissertation’s Phronesis-based approach and its life-experience narrative exchange method of communication.

We now move to a review of urban design theories and practices as we explore their overlap with the fields of architecture and planning. Larice and MacDonald (2007)²⁵ inform us that while individual buildings are within the realm of architecture, the realm of urban design encompasses groups of buildings, streets and public spaces, neighborhoods and districts, and entire cities. Because urban design is an inter-disciplinary field that combines all the built environment professions, including urban planning, landscape architecture, architecture, and civil and municipal engineering, urban designers are often not accorded the same measure of artistic control as those of designers in fields like architecture. Urban design work is usually practiced by urban design professionals, identifying themselves as such, as well as by urban planners, architects and landscape architects.

Urban designers focus on creating functional, attractive, and sustainable urban spaces and on drawing connections between people and places, movement and urban form, nature and the fabric of the built environment. Although modern urban design is often considered as part of the field of urban planning, urban design methods and processes, however, derive from and transcend planning and transportation policy, architectural design, landscape architecture, development economics and engineering. Urban designers accomplish that by synthesizing and developing the many aspects of place-making, including social equity, environmental stewardship and economic considerations.

²⁵ For sources (see Hardinghaus 2006; Larice and MacDonald 2007; Hillier and Hanson, 1984; Gosling and Maitland 1984).

Urban designers' tasks may include design guideline preparation, regulatory framework formulation and controls legislation development, all of which overlap with urban planning. Other tasks, such as the design of particular structures and spaces may overlap with architecture, landscape architecture, transportation engineering and industrial design. Urban design tasks may also entail facility and place management to guide the use and maintenance of urban and public spaces. Historically, the rise of the urban design movement in the latter half of the twentieth century may be viewed as a response to the adverse impact and proliferation of car usage and designs that accommodate such usage.

Urban design theory focuses mainly on the design and management of the totality of public spaces and how they are experienced on a daily basis by people, including parts of privately owned spaces like building facades or home gardens.

The term 'urban design' first came into use in 1956, during the Urban Design Conferences series at Harvard University, which resulted in the creation of Harvard's Urban Design program in 1959-60. The works of Jane Jacobs, Christopher Alexander, Kevin Lynch and Gordon Cullen became the basis for urban design studies at Harvard. Other important writers on urban design theory include Peter Calthorpe, Andres Duany, Mitchell Joachim, Jan Gehl, Allan B. Jacobs, Aldo Rossi, Colin Rowe, Robert Venturi, William H. Whyte, Bill Hillier and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk. Kevin Lynch's *The Image of the City* was essential to the movement in 1961, particularly by replacing the traditional usage of two-dimensional master plans of the previous fifty years with mental maps to understanding the city. He also introduced the concept of legibility in

reading the city and reduced urban design theory to five basic elements: paths, landmarks, edges, nodes and districts.

Another work that had a great impact on urban design in 1961 was Gordon Cullen's *The Concise Townscape*. Cullen created the concept of 'serial vision', which defines the urban landscape as a series of related spaces. He did this through an analysis of the traditional artistic approach to city design by theorists such as Camillo Sitte, Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker.

Jane Jacobs' the *Death and Life of Great American Cities*, published in 1961, was also influential on urban design theory. She developed her ideas with the help of her architect husband, Robert Hyde Jacobs, Jr., in which she blamed the Modernism of CIAM for the alienation experienced by city dwellers, including the increase in crime and other negative urban problems. We will revisit her work in more depth later in the chapter. In 1966, Rossi's *Architecture of the City* introduced the concepts of 'collective memory' and 'historicism' to urban design theory. Rossi also proposed the use of a 'collage metaphor' to understand the juxtaposition of new and old forms, which share an urban space. Other notable works include Venturi's *Learning from Las Vegas* (1972) and Colin Rowe's *Collage City* (1978).

As mentioned previously in the chapter, in 1984, Bill Hillier and Julienne Hanson's *The Social Logic of Space* introduced the concept of Space Syntax. The authors proposed it as a predictive tool to explore how movement patterns in cities can contribute to both positive conditions of urban life, such as urban vitality and economic success, as well as negative outcomes like anti-

social behaviour. The popularity of those works resulted in terms, such as 'livability', 'historicism', and 'sustainability' among others, to enrich the field of urban planning. Peter Calthorpe's *The Next American Metropolis* (1993) also added an important dimension to urban design, in which he introduced the concepts of sustainability through medium density living and Transit Oriented Development. The latter concept led to a design manual for building new (TOD) settlements.

We've noted previously that urban design shares certain aspects of its theory and practice with the fields of architecture and urban planning. Additionally, urban design is often considered to be closely linked with the planning field. The difference between them, however, is that while urban design focuses on the proactive design of urban areas, urban planning practices is often focused on the management of private development by establishing regulatory development controls.

Modern planning emerged as a new profession in the late nineteenth century out of the older 'place' profession of architecture, specifically landscape architecture, and in response to deteriorating social and health conditions within North American central cities. Therefore, planning as a new field was mainly focused on issues of urban design. Ildefonso Cerda's *General Theory of Urbanization* (1867), Camillo Sitte's *City Planning According to Artistic Principles* (1889), Robinson's *The Improvement of Cities and Towns* (1901) and *Modern Civic Art* (1903), and the later *City Beautiful* movement all reflected this preoccupation.

Planning paradigms and dominant theories remained closely linked to the field of architecture for most of the twentieth century. In the latter half of the century, driven by external criticism to perceived physical planning ill effect on central city conditions, dominant paradigms began to diverge between the two fields, most notably in practice. Two features of North American cities brought about these degraded conditions: industrial pollution from rapid industrialization and the lack of concern for the health and well-being of low-income workers by employers and government. Planners strove to alleviate those conditions and prevent their future propagation. Planning contributed its earliest notions of “the public good” to enable the passing of zoning ordinances throughout North America and to give voice to the concerns of ordinary citizens. These latter activities remained a principal preoccupation of planners until the second half of the last century. Scott Campbell (1996) gives a late twentieth century interpretation of the objectives of planning. He argues that in modern times such objectives have become flexible and relative to each planner’s ideological placement of them within the “planning triangle” (34) bounded by social justice, environmental equity, and economic effectiveness. A brief historical review may be in order, to explore the adoption of citizen participation processes within planning paradigms following the decrease in popularity of rational planning approaches.

In the early 1960s, the rational comprehensive planning approach (or synoptic model) began to replace physical planning as a dominant planning paradigm in the social guidance or top-down tradition. Lane (2005) characterizes synoptic planning as, “having four central elements: (1) an enhanced emphasis on the specification of goals and targets; (2) an emphasis on quantitative analysis and predication of the environment; (3) a concern to identify and evaluate alternative

policy options; and (4) the evaluation of means against ends” (page 289). While the idea of citizen participation was included in the synoptic planning model, its inclusion was hindered by dominant attitudes and perceptions of the public interest, which required only minimal participation.

Lindblom’s (1959) theory of incrementalism states that functional decisions in planning can only be made incrementally, while “muddling through a small number of policy approaches that can only have a small number consequences and are firmly bounded by reality, constantly adjusting the objectives of the planning process and using multiple analyses and evaluations” (81). Lane (2005) maintains that while citizen participation in this less centralized theory includes a number of “public interests” or stakeholders in addition to planners, in practice, such participation would be minimal and more reactive than proactive in its response.

Etzioni’s (1968) mixed scanning model is both tactical (functional) and strategic. He maintained that “organizations could accomplish this by essentially scanning the environment on multiple levels and then choose different strategies and tactics to address what they found there” (282). Lane (2005) explains that, in this model, the planner or the organization is still at the center of the citizen participation process, which remains minimal because its objectives do not include the notions of consensus or reconciliation of varied points of views.

By the early 1970s, planners began to develop new bottom-up approaches, based on a social transformation planning tradition, such as advocacy planning, transactive planning and

communicative action approaches, which fully integrated citizen participation within their processes. It is important to note that differences began to emerge in this period, and persisted until our present day, between the processes and theories of planning research and those of planning practice. The most notable efforts to address such differences are those of Flyvbjerg (1996), who coined the term “dark side of planning” (383). Flyvbjerg (1991) defined it as, “the real rationalities that planners employ in planning practice, as opposed to the ideal rationalities of the benevolent planners that often inhabit planning textbooks” (1998).

Flyvbjerg (1996) argues that “distinguishing between rationality and real rationality is as important for the understanding of planning, as distinguishing between politics and Realpolitik is for the understanding of politics. The real rationalities of planners are called "dark" because it turns out that what planners do in actual practice often does not stand the light of day, i.e., actual planning practice often violates generally accepted norms of democracy, efficiency, and equity and thus of planning ethics” (384). This distinction is important for the application of planning processes, and in particular, those employing citizen participation strategies in matters of policy. In the meantime, it would be worthwhile to thematically review some important efforts to develop conceptualizations and typologies of citizen participation in fields, such as public policy, policy development, sociology, administration, sustainability and the environment.

Arnstein (1969) gave an early and enduring contribution to discussions of citizen participation in the form of a ladder. The ladder represented the various levels of participation that may occur in a particular society depending on its system of government. Direct citizen participation is

featured in the ladder in a descriptive abstracted manner without defining the process or approaches that may lead to it. Arnstein describes other methods of participation, mainly group-initiated, in more detail:

The heated controversy over “citizen participation”, “citizen control” and “maximum feasible involvement of the poor,” has been waged largely in terms of exacerbated rhetoric and misleading euphemisms. To encourage a more enlightened dialogue, a typology of citizen participation is offered using examples from three federal social programs: urban renewal, anti-poverty, and Model Cities. The typology, which is designed to be provocative, is arranged in a ladder pattern with each rung corresponding to the extent of citizens’ power in determining the plan and/or program. (48)

Additionally²⁶, Burns et al. (1994) modified Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation into a ladder of citizen power, which presented a model of the citizen as a consumer, in which access to power is viewed as a choice between alternatives. The ladder’s premise rests on the assumption that citizens are expected be active in decision-making for public service.

Other ladders of citizen involvement have emerged, more recently, refining Arnstein’s work into subsets of participation, without departing from Arnstein’s preoccupation with indirect citizen participation and group dynamics. A few examples of such ladders are that of Wiedemann and Femers (1993), which presents citizen participation in terms of administrative and government-oriented mandates, and that of Dorcey, Doney, and Rueggeberg (1994), which frames citizen participation along typical stages of planning processes, with certain approaches occurring at

²⁶ For a succinct overview of some of the most dominant theories and theoretical frameworks on citizen participation, see Wilcox (1999).

certain decision-making benchmarks. Another notable ladder is that of Conner (1988), which presents citizen participation as a method of dispute resolution in public policy processes.

Each of the above presents a different conceptualization of citizen participation with its own unique orientation and approach. This diversity is typical of citizen participation literature, which traverses the spectrum of variable types and definitions of who the “public” might be, following complicated stakeholder typologies and models. It must be noted, however, that few, if any, of these endeavours deploy *Phronesis* in any form.²⁷

In addition to the above typologies identifying the stakeholders of a participatory process, the literature includes a few authors who have developed integrated frameworks and matrices that connect ‘public’ frameworks to those of ‘participation’ (see Jackson 1995, 2001; Konisky and Bierle 2000). Later, this section will offer an overview of what the various processes, frameworks, and approaches are, as well as of ‘when’ and ‘why’ they are to be utilized. Their aim to facilitate, develop, measure, and implement participation efforts will also be explored.

The preoccupation with indirect citizen participation, its group-oriented processes, and its remedies for the challenges of citizen participation goes beyond Arnstein (1969), Habermas ([1962] 1989), and the pluralist theorists such as Cole and Cole (1954), Hampshire (1959), Dahl (1961) and Kallen (1988). The preoccupation characterizes policy and planning cultures in general, because of the relative ease of adopting group-oriented processes in a representative democracy and the rational nature of its didactic reasoning. By contrast, direct participation and

²⁷ See Jackson 2001; Langton 1978; Thomas 1995.

individual praxis, with the latter's mandate for a strong democracy, are often ignored or merely given lip service.

Research in public policy and administration conducted by Nancy Roberts (2004a) delineates the nuances in the two positions most often adopted by advocates of citizen participation, as she states:

The subject of citizen participation has a long lineage dating back to the Greek city-states. Two questions have been central to its history: Who is a citizen and how should the citizen participate in governance? Responses to these questions have varied depending on the political and administrative theory one champions. Those who value indirect citizenship participation, or representative democracy, cite the dangers, costs, and logistical difficulties of involving all members of a society. Those who value direct citizenship participation cite increased state legitimacy and the benefits of social learning when all citizens are involved. (2)

Regardless of the path one takes towards more effective participation and engagement, the problems confronting participation require comprehensive consideration. Such problems can be assessed by asking the following questions: Does citizen participation in architecture, urban design, planning and social policy decision-making promote measurable change? Is there an effective and relevant approach to gathering feedback from citizens in order to value and transform such feedback into satisfactory parameters? Is there an effective approach to applying citizen participation to policy and design processes that leads to positive change? In fact, providing answers to these questions could uncover deeper issues of political exclusion in the lives of citizens.

Roberts (2004b) describes the political process that affected the intensity and level of citizen participation, noting that while citizens depended on officials and administrators for policy decisions and implementation in the first half of last century, during the second half they became more involved. The author then writes, “This trend is expected to grow as democratic societies become more decentralized, interdependent, networked, linked by new information technologies, and challenged by ‘wicked’ problems” (315).

Direct citizen participation, in the last decades of the twentieth century, was a time of great passion and political activism. Those years of direct citizen activism were sparked by a convergence of public sentiment, environmental and social turmoil, and media sensationalism that brought into the limelight issues of equity, civil rights, and institutional and corporate accountability. This was also a time of reflection on societal norms and values, which resulted in a re-evaluation of the increasingly controversial roles played by bureaucrats, elected officials, professionals, and scientific experts in shaping the urban landscape.

One of the principal representative studies of this aspect of the literature is by Judy B. Rosener (1978) on the role of meaning and value context in participation. She states:

Citizen Participation mandates proliferate, but there is little agreement among and between citizens and administrators as to their goals and objectives. While citizen participation takes on meaning only within a value context, most citizen participation programs fail to acknowledge this reality. Ignoring the centrality of value to the participation concept has resulted in confusion as to the meaning, expectations, and cause and effect relationships between participation programs and societal goals. (457)

As Rosener notes, since most citizen participation processes are detached from their value processes and so lack meaning, the effectiveness of such processes to achieve their intended goals and objectives remains suspect. The author advances a recommendation for evaluating effectiveness, as she explains, “Little is known about the ‘effectiveness’ of participation. It is suggested that the use of evaluation research methodology, which forces the articulation of heretofore ‘hidden values’ and assumptions, can produce an acceptable framework for both the conceptualization and measurement of citizen participation effectiveness” (Rosener 1978, 457).

In a study of citizen participation in public administration, King, Feltey, and Susel (1998) found conclusive evidence that efforts to increase citizen participation are, at best, ineffective. They argue, “There is considerable evidence to suggest that these efforts are not effective. Some efforts appear to be ineffective because of poor planning or execution. Other efforts may not work because administrative systems that are based upon expertise and professionalism leave little room for participatory processes” (317). Many other studies have also demonstrated that efforts to improve citizen participation’s level of effectiveness and relevancy have not been effective.²⁸

On the subject of participation barriers, King, Feltey, and Susel (1998) recommended non-conventional strategies be employed to improve participation’s (level of) effectiveness and relevancy. The authors’ findings emphasize the importance of understanding the nature of the

²⁸ See Crosby, Kelly, and Schaefer 1986; Deleon 1992; Fischer 1993; Forester 1989; Kathleen and Martin 1991; Kweit and Kweit 1981, 1987; Parsons 1990.

relationship between public administrators and citizens and how to imbue that relationship with mutual interest, investment, and trust:

The question of how to engender effective and satisfying participation processes is the central issue in this research. Our findings indicate that effective, or authentic, public participation implies more than simply finding the right tools and techniques for increasing public involvement in public decisions. Authentic public participation, that is, participation that works for all parties and stimulates interest and investment in both administrators and citizens, requires rethinking the underlying roles of, and relationships between, administrators and citizens. (King, Feltey, and Susel 1998, 317)

Insights gleaned from the work of contemporary environmental writers may further help us to examine citizen participation/engagement phronetically and anchor it in a social policy context, specifically where it involves ethics, which is at the heart of Phronesis.

Haughton and Hunter (1994) remark on the sparseness of the discourse on planning sustainable cities. The authors state, “This lack of debate may in part reflect the disdain with which cities have long been regarded, with commentators from the nineteenth century to the present day challenging the very basic premises of urban living, demanding a more rural life style, a return to nature” (10). The authors contend, “From this perspective, cities are almost inherently undesirable in environmental terms, not just because they are polluted, degraded places in which to live, but because they are held to distort rural economies and foster lifestyles which are energy-intensive and remote from contact with nature” (10).

This view of urban living reflects at its core the desire to live in harmony with nature and calls for prudence to guide human behaviour towards a middle path devoid of extremes of behaviour. Ethics reside at the heart of the citizen participation/engagement debate, as it does in Phronesis. Phronesis would help to mediate the power politics of the processes involved, as well as bring personal learning and accountability to its individual stakeholders. It would seem that bringing Phronesis back into our quest for knowledge could not have happened at a more opportune time: Phronesis is perfectly suited for moderating our response to nature and to the communities we inhabit with its emphasis on prudent action in context with our surroundings. It has a similar effect on citizen participation/engagement, in which context plays a leading role.

Joan Martinez-Alier (2003) asks pertinent questions regarding the internal and external effects generated by cities. The author asks, “What are the internal environmental conflicts in cities, and are they sometimes successfully pushed outwards to larger geographical scales” (104). The author makes a further observation when she states “It would seem that the more prosperous a city, the more successful it is in solving internal environmental conflicts and also in displacing environmental loads to larger geographical scales” (104). With the latter observation, Martinez-Alier reinforces a point previously made by Haughton and Hunter (1994) concerning the distortion effect on rural economies caused by cities. In addition to the unsustainable economic practices of cities, what is of significant negative impact is city dwellers’ typical attitude towards nature or lifestyle ascription.

Here, the debate returns to the question of ethics and in particular to the necessity for a prudent demonstration of ethical behaviour towards ourselves and towards the context within which we exist, namely, nature. Martinez-Alier (2003) concludes, “Cities are not environmentally sustainable by definition; their territory is too densely populated with humans to be self-supporting. A world where urbanization is rapidly increasing, and moreover where urbanization is characterized by urban sprawl, becomes an ever more unsustainable world” (104).

The inherent conflict between urban economic growth, in which architecture, urban design and planning policy strategies are a key influence and the need for citizens to protect their natural and socio-economic resources often leads concerned citizens to mobilize to gain a voice in the debate. Some, as in the case of expert-citizens, are motivated by the pursuit of personal agendas, while others, like ordinary citizens or citizen practitioners, are driven to action because of the adverse effects it exerts on their domiciles and neighbourhoods.

Gould, Schnaiberg, and Weinberg (1996) comment on that inherent conflict, explaining that “one of the dilemmas in managing ecological scarcity in a liberal industrial society is the need to satisfy both the demands of private capital and public agencies for economic growth and the demands of citizens for maintaining public health, as well as the recreational and aesthetic amenities of their natural habitats” (5). As for the origin of the conflict, the authors point out that, “The problem emerges from the sharply delineated differences between the economic logic of expanding industrial production and the ecological principles of sustaining natural systems”

(5). On the positive side, the literature contained a small number of studies that observed the need for one or another component of Phronesis, without naming them as such. There was no indication that the researchers took up Phronesis as a concept.

One such study was conducted by Darren Sharp (2006), in which the author states, “a number of social science epistemologies embrace ‘practice’ as a representational category to explain the relationship between structure and agency, such as Giddens’ (1984) and Bourdieu’s (1977) theories of structuration” (16). Although Giddens and Bourdieu’s contributions are sociological rather than policy-making perspectives, they remain clearly relevant. As Sharp explains, “missing from most of these accounts is any engagement in practice-based research to construct knowledge about their domains” (16). The author argues that action research possesses an empirical method that can be the means to further knowledge on user-led innovation.

Another study by Petersen et al. (2006) postulates that within the context of community risk-assessment it is important to present individual participation in the form of collaboration in order for municipalities to incorporate it in their policy-making processes. The authors’ findings describe the usefulness of utilizing a case study approach in explaining the policy advocate role of the Southern California Environmental Justice Collaborative, whose research and influence led to a positive policy change. The authors then elaborate on the role of the collaborative as they explain, “The study also highlights the role of the collaborative in helping to change the framing of the issue from individual to cumulative risk assessment, so that the regulatory agencies began to reflect this broader thinking in their policy-making. The collaborative structure and

methodology, regional focus, relationships with key decision makers, and its reputation as an important source of both credible science and “people power” were seen as contributing to its effectiveness” (Petersen et al. 2006, 1).

Abraham Wandersman (1981) provides insights on interdisciplinary approaches to citizen participation and a framework map of citizen participation, characterizing these as “environmental, ecological, and social, [while] individual differences between community members include the parameters of their participation, the mediators involved, along with the effects of such participation on the community” (27). Such an interdisciplinary approach is appropriate to transferring and situating the knowledge and lessons learned in other disciplines for the benefit of planning processes. Although Wandersman’s research on citizen participation predated the literature on citizen engagement, it nevertheless provides a necessary transition towards a more comprehensive and effective research of engagement methods and techniques.

In May 2007, the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), a global think-tank organization on citizen engagement strategies for local governments, hosted the International Workshop for Champions of Participation in Local Government. A conference summary published by IDS addressed the event’s focus on emerging issues surrounding citizen engagement strategies adopted globally by local governments (with some emphasis on Canadian local municipalities). Citizen engagement was seen as an effective and emergent planning process, exemplified by the lessons learned and strategies adopted by the workshop participants themselves.

Serena Cassidy (2007) presents the most comprehensive table of citizen engagement/participation in the literature. The study provides a detailed summary of methods of citizen engagement used by organizations such as the National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation (NCDD). Cassidy's research also included examples of best practices, in which the information was organized into the following categories: description of method and/or process, definition of method, practical application, projected policy outcomes, and rationale for method.

Categories of actions relevant to citizen participation were suggested by the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) (2000). The categories, in the order of their occurrence during a participatory process, are as follows: inform, consult, involve, collaborate, and empower. The Canadian Policy Research Network suggests that citizen engagement should begin at the midpoint of these processes. This was followed in 2009 by another wider collaboration among North American practitioners and institutions to develop improved principles for citizen engagement. As a result, the Public Engagement Principles (PEP) Project was developed in 2009 as an online collaboration by the National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation, the International Association of Public Participation, the Co-Intelligence Institute, and other practitioners and researchers in the fields of citizen engagement, collaboration, mediation and conflict resolution.

It is clear from the above that the field of citizen engagement is still undergoing rapid transformation with notable iterations of engagement emerging out of collaborative efforts with other fields, like deliberation, conflict resolution, conflict management and public administration.

This resulted in the formation of new types of engagement that may seem promising but are yet to be proven in effectiveness and relevance. Foremost among those types is deliberative citizen engagement, a mix of processes garnered from the deliberative democracy movement, slow democracy theory and citizen engagement practices.

Clark and Teachout (2012) explain that current destabilizing economic and political conditions are giving rise to new forms of democracy with a corresponding effect on new types of deliberative processes in citizen engagement. The authors advance “slow democracy” as a viable new form of local democratic deliberation that “encourages democratic decision-making at the local level by members of the community. It forgoes the ideological divisions of left vs. right and promotes self-governance through processes that are inclusive, deliberative, and citizen-powered” (1).²⁹

The seven core principles for public engagement are meant to reflect “common beliefs and understandings” among those involved in those fields. Other than serving as a guide for municipalities and institutions to customize their own citizen engagement strategies in matters of policy, it also reflects somewhat of a consensus among practitioners and researchers on the constituent qualities needed to improve citizen engagement in North America. They are as follows:

Core Principles for Public Engagement

1. Careful Planning and Preparation

²⁹ For a consolidated study on the theory, research, and practice of deliberative citizen engagement (see Nabatchi et al. 2012, Clark and Teachout 2012).

Through adequate and inclusive planning, ensure that the design, organization, and convening of the process serve both a clearly defined purpose and the needs of the participants.

2. Inclusion and Demographic Diversity

Equitably incorporate diverse people, voices, ideas, and information to lay the groundwork for quality outcomes and democratic legitimacy.

3. Collaboration and Shared Purpose

Support and encourage participants, government and community institutions, and others to work together to advance the common good.

4. Openness and Learning

Help all involved listen to each other, explore new ideas unconstrained by predetermined outcomes, learn and apply information in ways that generate new options, and rigorously evaluate public engagement activities for effectiveness.

5. Transparency and Trust

Be clear and open about the process, and provide a public record of the organizers, sponsors, outcomes, and range of views and ideas expressed.

6. Impact and Action

Ensure each participatory effort has real potential to make a difference, and that participants are aware of that potential.

7. Sustained Engagement and Participatory Culture

Promote a culture of participation with programs and institutions that support ongoing quality public engagement.

(NCDD Online, Core Principles for Public Engagement 2012, 1)

Sheedy et al. (2008) explain that both citizen participation and citizen engagement reflect a “two-way interaction or dialogue process” between the government and its citizens, as opposed to “one-way processes” of consultation and communication traditionally utilized by governments. The authors contend that “citizen engagement ... emphasizes the sharing of power, information and a mutual respect between government and citizens” (4). In terms of policy development, Sheedy et al. maintain that citizen engagement should be utilized at all phases and is “best seen as an iterative process, serving to infuse citizens values and priorities throughout the policy cycle. In processes of citizen engagement, citizens represent themselves as individuals rather

than representing stakeholder groups” (4). This last point reiterates the main premise of this research concerning the highly individual nature of the dialogue between citizens and their elected representatives/professional experts. It echoes the need for direct and earnest communication between all stakeholders in order to achieve meaningful and effective deliberation and collaborative partnerships in identifying, designing, and implementing policy strategies. Finally, Sheedy et al. (2008) comment on the need to change the stereotypes prevalent on both sides of the dialogue on citizen engagement, as is made clear in the following:

One of the biggest cultural obstacles to citizen engagement comes from staff and decision-makers’ inability to listen to what citizens have to say. This is a cultural issue that has largely arisen from professionalization and specialization that leads experts to believe that non-experts have nothing or little to contribute (i.e. “What could Joe at the bus stop have to say about a complex policy issue?”). While it is certainly true that experts have greater technical knowledge than lay people, in the world of politics, decision-making is informed by more than facts; moreover, experts themselves often disagree on facts. Most public policy decisions are underpinned by value assumptions and value choices. Different values lead to different sets of priorities – perspectives are informed by experiences and personal beliefs. While not a content expert, the “lay person” has valuable experiential knowledge to share. Thus, many experts benefit from exposure to and training in citizen engagement, bringing them to an appreciation of the role of citizen input and priorities in a policy process. (25)

The dichotomy between content experts and lay-experts hinges on the role that value ascription plays in the perspective held by each group of experts, and on the manner in which knowledge is exchanged. What is clear, however, is that such an exchange would be mutually beneficial to both groups, making public policy processes both relevant and inclusive.

3.1.1. Illustrations of Different Approaches: A Comparative Analysis of CP Strategies in RCP and Transactive Planning Processes

This section describes strategies based on two competing planning paradigms that characterize the approaches utilized by planners in case studies of two cities from two different continents: Miramar, Florida in the U.S. and Dundee, Whitfield in the U.K. The section then offers a comparative analysis of the two approaches, outlines their strengths and weaknesses, and points out emerging new directions for each planning approach from informed research and praxis.

The first case study is a rational comprehensive planning perspective³⁰ demonstrated by a representative U.S. case study in Miramar, Florida. The city of Miramar is chosen because of its aggressive growth strategies that have promoted new development along its western wetlands despite oversight from the South Florida Regional Planning authorities, who are the final arbiters of its comprehensive master plan.

The city planners use predominantly rational comprehensive processes to advance what is presented as sustainable development, but is in reality invasive and harmful wetland development, while at the same time paying scant attention to the older downtown core in its eastern borders. The processes that led to the adoption of the Comprehensive Master Plan for the

³⁰ Rational comprehensive planning (or synoptic approach) is based on instrumental rationality when analysing and making decisions (goal-rational) (Larsen 2003). This centralized planning process consists of six successive steps connected by feedback loops. They create the possibility to incorporate changes into planning as a result of new information or experiences (Mitchell 2002). Several modelling and analyzing techniques are used, especially quantitative analyses (Larsen 2003; Mitchell 2002).

city of Miramar will be explored along the political, environmental, and planning changes that the city experienced in its recent past. The city's current policies on sustainable development are realized through a rational comprehensive planning approach.

The second case study is a transactive planning approach³¹ as demonstrated by a representative U.K. case study of Dundee, a neighbourhood in Whitfield, Scotland. In this case, members of city government and residents were both aware of the value of, and desired to form, a planning partnership from inception to implementation of the master plan. This resulted in a high degree of satisfaction by the residents and validated the transactive processes utilized by the planners.

In the 1970s, Dundee experienced numerous social upheavals compounded by infrastructure failures, leading to decay and an urgent need for redevelopment along more sustainable grounds. The processes of sustainable development in the planning of housing in the Dundee neighbourhood involved a transactive planning approach. This was characterized by mutual learning and direct negotiation with, and participation by, citizens, planners, and public leaders. This project housed 12,000 residents in 4,700 homes and accomplished most of the goals and objectives of its participants.

³¹ Transactive planning approach is a communicative rationality model, based on human communication and dialogue between planners and citizens affected by planning. A subjective, decentralized approach conducted in an open atmosphere combining planners expertise and experiential citizen knowledge, which is transformed into shared measures (Larsen 2003).

3.1.1.1. Case Study: The City of Miramar, Florida, United States

The first case is an example of a rational comprehensive planning approach to citizen participation strategies in sustainable development. The city of Miramar was founded by A. L. Mailman as a bedroom community between Miami and Fort Lauderdale. Founded in 1955, Miramar was an early example of planned and controlled growth. The city has a linear shape that stretches from east to west along the southern boundary of Broward County and the northern boundary of Miami-Dade County. This unusually narrow political boundary configuration is mostly wetlands. Most of the city land lies in the 100-year flood plain except for a small area at the northeastern edge of the city. The total land area in Miramar encompasses 31 square miles and, in 2003, its population was 90,359. The city is located in southeastern Broward county, midway between Fort Lauderdale to its northeast and Miami to its southeast. North of Miramar are the cities of Hollywood and Pembroke Pines. Miramar's borders are adjacent to two other municipalities, the unincorporated Broward and Miami-Dade counties. The Everglades runs along the city's western edge, which is officially designated as Broward County Water Conservation Area 3A.

According to the South Florida Regional Planning Council, the city faces issues endemic to the region that go as far back as 1850. In that year, Congress passed the Swamp and Overflowed Lands Grant Act, which allowed Florida and all other states to claim "swamp and overflowed lands" for the exclusive purpose of making them productive through drainage and the construction of levees. Federal and state pro-growth policies continued unabated until the latter

half of last century, causing considerable damage to the delicate equilibrium of the South Florida Everglade ecosystem (City of Miramar Website, Founding the City, 2007b, 3).

In the late 1970s, people in South Florida were becoming aware of the environmental impact of past projects on the Everglades system: in particular and very fundamentally, the fresh water supply was being affected. The Everglades replenishes the Biscayne Aquifer, which provides the drinking water for South Florida. The lowering of the water table brought on by draining the system resulted in salt water entering in coastal wellfields, which necessitated the need to move these fields inland, closer to the Everglades (City of Miramar Website, Founding the City, 2007b, 3).

The outlook for the future of managed growth for Miramar and its region is discouraging. Its sustainable development strategy, which loosely follows Smart Growth guidelines seems likely to fail: similar strategies had failed to contain sprawl and curb the over-development of nearby cities, such as Miami, and of other counties in the South Florida region. Continued population growth will add to the existing strains on the environment of the region. Development density along the coastal ridge has reduced the ability of natural systems to provide protection of the coastal area from such natural forces as hurricanes. Westward growth has also encroached on wildlife habitat. Without proper protection, residential communities in the western areas of Miramar adjacent to the Water Conservation Areas threaten fresh water needed for environmental stability of the Everglades system and urban potable water consumption.

According to the US Environmental Protection Agency³²:

How and where communities locate, design, and develop affordable housing affects their overall approach to growth as much as it does the household budgets of their residents. Communities that seek to grow and develop more sustainably can begin by asking themselves the following questions:

Is affordable housing in my community well located, near transportation choices, and away from sensitive natural areas?

Are new housing developments designed to encourage walking, connect to nearby uses and amenities, and incorporate parks and open space?

Are affordable homes being constructed with materials and techniques that reduce energy and water use and improve resident health and well-being?

If the answer to one or more of these questions is "no," then a community is unlikely to be growing in a manner that is economically or environmentally sustainable.

(EPA Website, Smart Growth, 2009)

Substantial excerpts from the city's ordinance are included below to illustrate the legal and administrative complexity of urban development processes, through which both ordinary citizens and developers must navigate to achieve their objectives. This level of complexity is typical of medium-size municipalities in the United States and, to a larger extent, Canada despite the differences in the legal, social, and governing structures of the two neighbouring countries. Information on the city's governing structure and planning strategies is provided by the city of Miramar's website, as follows:

³² *Smart Growth Guidelines for Sustainable Design and Development* is a resource for communities that seek to locate, design, and develop housing — particularly affordable housing — in a way that reduces household costs, improves residents' quality of life, and invests public resources more sustainably. The guidelines can serve as a checklist for local officials, state or regional policy makers, developers, and community members to ensure that programs, plans, and proposed developments incorporate the elements needed at the location, site, and building levels to result in more sustainable, affordable housing.

Until March 13, 1991, the City was governed by a “Strong Mayor-City Council” form of government. Under this form of government, the Mayor served as the Chief Administrative Officer, supervising the day-to-day activities, and was responsible for carrying out the policies established by the City Commission. All department heads were appointed by, and reported directly to the Mayor. The City Commission, through the budgetary process and enactment of legislation, functioned as the policy-making body. The transition to a “City Manager-City Council” form of government took place at 12:01 A.M. on March 13, 1991, the day following the municipal election. The City Manager is appointed by the City Commission to serve as the administrative head of the municipal government and to provide recommendations to the City Commission on policy issues. He is responsible for the daily activities of the municipal government and is charged with carrying out the policies established by the City Commission. The City Commission is elected by the residents of Miramar, and is comprised of four members and the Mayor. The City Commission sets the policies of the City through the budgetary process and enactment of ordinances and resolutions.

(City of Miramar Website, Government Structure 2007a)

Miramar also provides information on the processes governing resolutions, as follows, “A resolution or ordinance may be proposed either by the administration (the City Manager and his staff) or by the Mayor or one of the Commissioners. They are both passed by a majority vote of the Commission; however, an ordinance must be voted upon on two separate occasions before taking effect. The Mayor and the City Commissioners are elected at-large, with the City Commission designated by seat numbers. The Mayor and the City Commission are elected for four-year terms. (City of Miramar Website, Resolutions/Ordinances, 2007c)

Miramar’s 1972 Comprehensive Land Use Plan and subsequent update provide the framework for its future development. With a 2003 population of 90,359, Miramar is now Florida’s 16th largest city with more residents than Miami Beach, West Palm Beach, or Boca Raton, despite the fact that two-thirds of its land has not yet been developed. As Herson and Bolland (1998) point

out, the various ways in which land-use planning regulations have been wielded have served to emphasize the important influence these governments have on the physical location of their residents (3).

Kaiser, Godschalk, and Chapin (1995) argue that the vision to look beyond immediate concerns and issues to the needs of the future is a key attribute of the land planner. By systematically evaluating the outcomes of past planning attempts, the planner enables the community to learn how to plan more effectively (Kaiser, Godschalk, and Chapin 1995, 29). In theory, such is the ideal role of the planner in guiding the land-use planning process; however, in reality, the practice is quite different, as an examination of the governing and authority structure of the city quickly reveals. According to the Miramar website, the governing and authority structure of the city's departments and commissions is as follows:

The city commission, on the other hand, has been given authority over the Land Development Code by state law, the Charter of the City of Miramar and its Code of Ordinances. The planning and zoning board shall act as an advisory board to the city commission on the following matters, except for variances from minimum yard requirements in which case the board shall have final authority. The Planning and Zoning Board of the city acts as the Local Planning Agency, while the Planning and Zoning division is itself only one of three components of the Community Development Department. The other two components are the Building Division and the Economic Development and Revitalization Division of the city of Miramar.

(City of Miramar Website, Government Structure, 2007a)

The laws that govern the land development in the City of Miramar are disclosed by the City of Miramar's website as follows:

The Land Development Code of the city of Miramar was enacted pursuant to the requirements and authority of Chapter 163, Part II, Fla. Stat. (the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act) and the general powers confirmed in Chapter 166, Fla. Stat. (Municipalities) and the Constitution of the State of Florida. The purpose of this Land Development Code is to implement further the comprehensive plan of the city by establishing regulations, procedures and standards for review and approval of all development and use of land and water in the city in addition to and in more detail than those in the plan.

(City of Miramar Website, Government Structure, 2007a)

The Planning and Zoning Division of the city of Miramar employs only a few planners and administrative staff and so historically a local planner's role remained subservient to the city's prevailing political culture. That role oscillated between implementation of actions mandated by the state since 1972, when Florida began enacting growth management policies, and negotiating the older tradition of laissez-faire accommodation of industrial and commercial development interests.

The goal of the land-use planner is not simply to accommodate federal and state mandates for growth-management development, but also to guide the market toward producing good communities. Currently, the local planner in Miramar can be seen as a technical manager of change whose duties can be summarized by the following description, published by the Planning and Zoning Division of the city of Miramar:

The planner guides citizens, developers and builders in the processing of site plans, plats, site data records, rezoning, conditional uses, and variances. Processes all temporary use permits. Assists in processing occupational licenses. Provides technical assistance to the City Commission and the Planning and Zoning Advisory Board. Reviews all non-single-

family structures and signs for adherence to Community Appearance Board regulations. Reviews site plans, plats, rezoning, and other land development applications to determine compliance with the City's Land Development Code regulations and Comprehensive Plan. Ensures proposed development uses are consistent and compatible with surrounding zoning districts and uses. Tracks and monitors development within the City. Maintains and updates the City's Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code and conducts special studies.

(City Of Miramar, Planning and Zoning Division 2003, 1)

For three-quarters of a century, the golden tool of local governments in the United States has been local land-use regulation and its accompaniment in tax revenue generation. Federal and state statutes tend to allow land-use development strategies that extend tax-incentives to subsidize new development in rural, undeveloped land and in greenfields. Weak growth-management policies based on land-use incentives enable new development in critical, sensitive, and natural hazard areas. Such statutes and policies escalate population growth and present city planners with a challenge of crisis proportions. McElfish Jr. (2004) points out that the South Florida region and municipalities are awash with failed examples of such policies, which led to services and infrastructure failures and loss of natural habitats with the accompanying social, environmental, and economic ills. The author explains, "while planning and zoning laws establish the rules for land development, fiscal concerns affect planning and zoning choices as well as individual property owner choices" (McElfish Jr., 2004).

According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Office of Policy Development and Research analysis report (2009), the city of Miramar, along with the entire South Florida region, faces a failing infrastructure in regards to transportation, waste

management, water supply, overtaxed school systems, and community services. These problems are compounded by unrelenting pressure applied by the construction and development industry for continued growth westward into wetlands and open spaces. Indeed, in 2003, Miramar was on the verge of developing one of the last remaining open spaces in the region. This plan is a source of conflict with local residents and environmental groups seeking to protect the finite natural resources of their respective communities. The strains these developments generate by depleting natural resources can threaten residents' quality of life through congestion, pollution, and urban sprawl and lead to higher costs for services.

It is evident that citizen participation in Miramar is limited to formal hearings, done at the discretion of the city council: a token action at best. A board made up of notable citizens and civic leaders issued recommendations for the articulation of the goals and objectives within the city's comprehensive plan. In reality, according to a report by the Institute of Development Studies (2007), the board was dominated by business leaders and cared little for the needs of residents in Eastern Miramar and future assistance for senior citizens and the disadvantaged population of the city.

This outlook is reflected in Miramar residents' perception that further development will lead to negative outcomes for their quality of life and sense of place. *Miami Herald* staff photographer J. Albert Diaz, who documented life in the new suburbs of Broward County for two years, started the Miami Herald Project Survey, which was the source for this citizen response. Other *Miami*

Herald staff writers extended the project by assembling a series of articles based on questions posed to planners, policy-makers, and residents about the city's unprecedented growth and their reactions to it. According to journalist Daniel de Vise (2001), Broward residents had had enough. Their letters responding to the *Miami Herald's* survey questions demonstrated that citizens "overwhelmingly oppose pushing Broward's suburban sprawl west into the river of grass" (de Vise 2001, 2). The residents stated that, "Unchecked growth can only add to the stress on overtaxed schools and roads [which] upset the delicate equilibrium of the South Florida ecosystem and gobble up the wide open spaces that drew them to Broward in the first place" (2).

Revisiting the City of Miramar in 2010, a report issued by the Miami-Dade Urban Sprawl Redevelopment Partnership (2010) found that social, environmental and economic conditions have continued their steep decline since this dissertation's case study report in 2003. It is evident that the lack of effective citizen participation and the compromised municipal planning approach, originally identified in Miramar, have contributed to this decline. The partnership's report also indicates that an Adaptive Management Plan that incorporates increased citizen participation necessitated the formation of the redevelopment partnership as a last-ditch effort to keep conditions from deteriorating further.

3.1.1.2. Case Study: Dundee, Whitfield, United Kingdom

The case of Dundee is an example of a transactive planning approach to citizen participation strategies in sustainable development. According to the European Academy of Urban Areas, the original 1960s housing project in Dundee, Whitfield housed 12,000 people in 4,700 houses of

mixed styles. The houses quickly dilapidated because of inferior construction, vandalism, and lack of social services that eventually led to massive unemployment. In 1990, 70 percent of Dundee's residents had an income of less than \$10,000 a year; while the city of Whitfield's total unemployment was 12.5 percent that of Dundee's was 47.5 percent. Schwedler (2007) pointed out that lack of insight in planning coupled with shady construction practices "blurred the distinction between public and private space" (2). Schwedler further explained that the living conditions and amenities in those houses were terrible, from lack of adequate heating to widespread mould. As well, the houses were separated by large spaces that further contributed to the social isolation of residents.

Schwedler (2007) pointed out that in early 1985, a grassroots effort by community residents began the "Whitfield Talks." These talks mobilized concerned citizens from the community along with members of Districts and the Regional Council, which included government planners from the city of Whitfield. The national government was also approached for help in developing Dundee along sustainable grounds, which coincided with the national government's own initiatives to redevelop the area. Thus, a congruence of local and national stakeholders' made it possible for funding and logistical support to be allocated to the community in a timely manner. The following aspects characterized the project:

- Participants: community residents, local government planners and administrators, regional government policy-makers, national government officials, representatives of the European Union, and members of several NGOs.

- Finances: public-private partnerships, local government, and national government.
- Goals and Objectives: Increasing public awareness and participation, implementing sustainable development, and improving living conditions.
- Methods: Direct public participation, transactive planning approach, participatory management structure, and a pilot project.

Schwedler (2007) points out that the sustainable development in Dundee, Whitfield followed nine principles, which were formally adopted for implementation in 1994 by the Dundee Whitfield Partnership:

- A multi-sectoral approach, involving physical, economic, and social renewal;
- A partnership concept that includes the participation of central government, local government, the private sector, and the community;
- A concentration of resources intended to provide a critical program mass;
- Direct involvement of the Scottish Office in setting up and in chairing partnerships;
- Integration of Dundee more fully into the structure of Whitfield;
- Improved accessibility within Whitfield;
- Upgrading of open spaces and recreational facilities;
- Creation of a better residential environment;
- General improvements to the environment.

(Schwedler 2007, 4)

The role of the planners in the sustainable development of Dundee was to mediate in the deliberation with stakeholders and generate a reflective understanding of issues. The planners facilitated an environment of mutual trust that enabled Dundee citizens to define relevant problems and explore alternative sustainable strategies, all of which were in line with their community goals. Two full-time planners worked on the project and personally met and facilitated meetings between all stakeholders.

The role of the public was to define relevant problems and explore alternative sustainable strategies that were in line with their community goals. Dundee citizens also participated and guided subcommittee deliberations for the coordination of the implementation process.

According to Schwedler (2007), Dundee's sustainable development planning and implementation structure was composed of two sections: a board and sub-groups "that deal with various aspects of strategy planning and implementation in the areas of housing and environment, community services, employment and training and monitoring and evaluation" (3). Community residents are represented by four members in each of the sub-groups and ten representatives for the board. The board is serviced by the Partnership Strategy Team, which handles the day-to-day running of the Partnership (Schwedler 2007, 3).

The process was highly participatory and the stakeholders were diverse, including residents and members from the Whitfield City Council, the Chamber of Commerce, police departments, local

health boards, employment services, and local trusts. As a result, a variety of interests were expressed; all worked together to reach consensus.

Social dysfunction and out-dated technical planning frameworks were the two main problems defined as contributing to Dundee urban decay needing to be addressed through a transactive approach; such an approach would, it was hoped, lead to sustainable development of the community. Schwedler (2007) reported that this approach to sustainable development garnered high participation, with a lot of support and trust by residents of the community and other stakeholders. The process of implementation, however, did take a long time to accomplish.

3.1.1.3. Comparative Analysis

Rational comprehensive and transactive approaches to planning are, according to Campbell and Fainstein (2003a), polar opposite paradigms, the former being a top-down approach and the latter a bottom-up one. Consequently, their procedures are oriented to make best use of their primary methods of collecting data. Rational comprehensive planners rely on formal methods of involving the public through public hearings and committees that harness the community's goals and objectives through its leaders. Such an approach embodies the role of the planner as expert and, as such, is open to criticism of elitism and renders its processes and outcomes irrelevant for ordinary citizens.

In the case of Miramar, this role of the planner was evident in all the formal processes, which culminated in the adoption and implementation of the city's comprehensive master plan. This

role was also evident in the prominent voice that business entities had in articulating the goals and objectives of the community, as if business leaders alone represent the public interest. The city's planners retreated into a technical role and abdicated their social responsibility for the community's senior citizens in Eastern Miramar, immigrant families, and low-income residents.

By contrast, transactive planners rely on their mediator roles to form mutually educational partnerships among the multitude of interest groups comprising a community in order to induce maximum participation in the design and implementation of desired outcomes. The transactive planning approach emphasizes the deliberative nature of citizen participation in articulating and implementing the values and desirable outcomes of the community. In order to form an inclusive participatory framework that can address the socio-political, economic, and environmental concerns of the community, the transactive planner utilizes his/her role as a mediator, rather than as a technical expert.

In the case of Dundee, an all-inclusive deliberation process occurred between citizens and civic leaders through planner moderation to reach consensus. This resulted in the identification and resolution of problems associated with neighbourhood deterioration and its subsequent re-development along sustainable grounds. This process ultimately contributed to achieving desired sustainable outcomes for the ensuing development. Compared to the residents of Miramar, Dundee residents expressed a greater level of satisfaction with the outcomes and demonstrated

higher levels of participation in the processes of planning. This result seems to confirm the positive impact of inclusive citizen participation on sustainable development outcomes.

In view of the two approaches that were applied to their respective case studies, this comparative analysis reveals three main challenges or obstacles to achieving better outcomes for sustainable development. The first obstacle is one of informing planning methods and processes with lessons from practice, regardless of the kind of planning approach used. For rational comprehensive planners, the challenge remains one of inducing trust between public and private interest groups, as well as of providing for more effective citizen participation and feedback as early in the design process as possible. This should be done while maintaining coherency and strengthening implementation outcomes.

Hudson (1979) informs us that in the past, rational comprehensive planners more often than not neglected their objectives of social justice, environmental protection, and economic efficiency. The author explains that planners replaced their role as social mediators with that of objective technical experts at the service of political aspirants and powerful special interest groups. More recently, this technically bound and socially compromised role of planners has been less prevalent. In the past, rational comprehensive planners more often than not abandoned their objectives of social justice, environmental protection, and economic efficiency. They also abandoned their role as social mediators to become mere tools in the hands of political aspirants and powerful special interest groups. More recently, this technically bound and socially inept

role of planners has been less prevalence; most current practices are informed by sounder theoretical principles than those at play at the discipline's infancy.

For transactive planners, however, the challenge remains one of balancing desired outcomes for sustainable development with participatory processes. This is especially true when participatory processes become time consuming and lack effective coordination. Learning from best case practices and adjusting transactive processes to reflect organizational and temporal constraints may lead to better outcomes for sustainable community developments of the future.

The second obstacle is the socio-political climate, which harbours informal discrimination and segregation throughout all occupations despite the protection and enforcement extended by legislation. Progressive policies for social equity and justice help to counter such destructive sentiments in present day society, but the vision of a complex, vital, and non-stratified society that is needed for sustainable development to occur is yet to become a reality.

The third obstacle is that of existing economic methods of production. Sustainable development would benefit from globally coordinated and locally applied environmentally responsive methods of production. Those could include locally generated knowledge production and utilize bottom-up methods and creative ordinary citizen strategies in order to accomplish a just and equitable means of producing and distributing resources for both current and future generations of community residents. Although we have come a long way in the last few decades in terms of greening our environments and passing legislation for its protection, we still have a distance to

go. Wiedemann and Femers (1993) inform us that industries remain reluctant to alter their methods of production in fundamental ways that would be better for the environment and concurrently make such products affordable for everyone. The author asserts that industries and economic interests, instead, use their powerful influence in our political system to legitimize their entrenched and destructive methods of production and distribution in the name of economic progress and stability.

Although there has been some advances made in some industries in terms of greening their practices, Iles (2004) maintains that the majority of industries are still overly reliant on fossil fuels and antiquated methods of production, as well as an over reliance on the automobile and its accompanying networks of highways and byways for distribution. Additionally, Corbum (2003) explains that whenever a product is deemed environmentally sustainable, it is also immediately marketed at a higher cost, removing it from the reach of the majority of citizens and further entrenches existing inequity in society.

3.2. Rational Comprehensive Planning

The rational comprehensive planning paradigm emerged in the 1950s as a successor to planning's early roots in physical planning. While the debate, principles, and criticisms of rational comprehensive planning are extensive and covered in detail by numerous sources in the literature, this sub-section limits the discussion to those elements that concern citizen participation/engagement processes.

Campbell and Fainstein (2003b) define comprehensive planning as “the rational, synoptic planning model based on setting far-reaching goals and objectives” (169). Throughout the twentieth century, the planning profession often justified the theory and practice of its planning processes along comprehensive lines.

Rational comprehensive planning had substantial roots in utopian comprehensiveness as well as modern scientism. The utopian heritage can be seen in the described characteristics of planners and social scientists, since both groups helped to shape the debate on rational comprehensive planning. Faludi (1973b) makes two observations on the subject: “First, what distinguishes planners and their critics in these days of growing sophistication ... is less their intellectual calibre and more their temperament. Planners are optimistic whilst social scientists are reared on scepticism” (113). The second observation that Faludi makes is that comprehensive planning opponents “see society as pluralistic” comprised of “a collection of individuals and groups” while its proponents view “society as an organic whole” (113). The debate revolves around rational comprehensive planning’s postulation of the objective neutrality of its processes. The latter may be seen as stemming from rational comprehensive planning’s adoption of the scientific method in its planning processes, as well as its drive to accommodate economic efficiency methods on behalf of the ‘public interest.’

Campbell and Fainstein (2003b) provide us with a succinct explanation of rational

comprehensive planning “as the attempt to coordinate the multiple development and regulatory initiatives undertaken in a region or city” (9). Taylor (1998) points out that the post-war period in the west was characterized both by a general sense of euphoria, renewed hope and optimism, and intense urban development largely carried out by political agendas and economic interests.

This scientific management view of planning was later discredited (Campbell and Fainstein, 2003b), but not before subjecting the profession to both external and internal criticism of its processes and substantive theories. Criticism of urban development of the post-war period had a lasting impact on the profession. It ended the profession’s reliance on its core expertise of physical planning in favour of theory generation and extended the boundaries of the discipline to include the full spectrum of the social sciences. In effect, this shift diluted the capacity of planners to practice their core design skills and overburdened them with bureaucratic and administrative regulatory functions. This led to the planning profession’s inability to deal decisively and effectively with the socio-political and economic forces that were seeking to dominate its work (Campbell and Fainstein, 2003b).

After being the dominant approach of planning in the first half of the twentieth century, physical determinism was no longer holding sway in social planning and both value-laden judgments and citizen participation in planning were given their due. The profession entered a new period of reflection on its processes and its underlying theoretical assumptions, which widened the horizons of its practice and directed its theoretical energies into a new direction, that of comprehensive rationality. This system, along with the rational process view of planning, was

wedded to the modernist ideology of scientific management and its humanist assumptions about humanity's ability to conquer nature with the tools of science. Thus, rational comprehensive planning entered what Kuhn (1962) would have described as a period of "paradigm articulation" (33), marked by a resurgence of former beliefs in progress and the scientific agenda of eighteenth century European enlightenment. It was as if the two world wars had not only wiped out countless human lives, but also induced a lapse in collective memory — at least as far as planning practice was concerned.

Comprehensiveness, consensus, and value-rationality as opposed to instrumental-rationality, mixed scanning, incrementalism, and pluralism: these are some of the many faceted concepts and theories that planners had to explore and synthesize into coherency in the wake of comprehensive rationality.

Campbell and Fainstein (2003b) give a useful perspective on the evolution of planning approaches as "divergent responses to comprehensiveness" (169). The authors cite two reasons for the failure of comprehensiveness to accomplish its objectives. The first reason has to do with the immense amount of knowledge, analysis, and coordination that must be synthesized by the planner for a multitude of specializations and initiatives. The second reason is the effective abandonment of planning's public interest obligation to represent the needs of low-income citizens and the disadvantaged. The criticisms and debate on rational comprehensive planning, began in the mid-1960s with Altshuler (1966) and continued well into the 1980s and led not only to alternative approaches in planning, but also to a broader scope of planning that included socio-

political and economic considerations in forming policy. As such, it went beyond its earlier singular focus on land-use.

Friedmann's (1971) critique of rational comprehensive planning hinges on the premise that a tactical approach to planning concerns, such as his own procedural transactive planning paradigm, has validity and relevancy. This, he contends, is in contrast to the strategic approach, which rational comprehensive planning employs as a substantive measure to answer the concerns and objectives of the profession. Friedmann's critique was coupled with a prescription for a dramatic change in planning theory and practice. He advocated utilizing a bottom-up approach to planning that invokes public participation, rather than the historically dominant and centralized top-down approach of rational comprehensive planners whose long-range plans and empirical and systemic view of urbanity positioned the rational comprehensive planner as a technical expert at the helm of control.

Perhaps the greatest failing of the rational comprehensive approach is its inability, despite its modern scientific garb, to accomplish the three primary objectives of planning, namely, social justice, environmental protection, and economic effectiveness, without compromising reflective praxis for the sake of technical expertise (Campbell and Fainstein, 2003a). Planning responses to issues of individual values, context, moral judgment, resource conservation, equitable distribution, social equity, and justice were abdicated to special interest groups and powerful political and social entrepreneurs. Rational comprehensive planning did so by replacing value-

rationality with instrumental-rationality in emulation of the natural sciences and its cadre of copycat social sciences (Flyvbjerg, 2001).

As both Taylor (1998) and Friedmann (1971) point out, planning's mode of inquiry is multi-disciplinary and, as such, cannot be bounded or ordered through its paradigms alone. A reflective dialogue between its theory and practice is needed to inform the profession and maintain its flexibility and relevancy amidst a sea of competing values and influences. We are currently experiencing a resurgence of interest in comprehensive planning, which seems to derive less from a nostalgic appreciation of its technical and neutral view of urbanity and more from our evolved understanding of the urban context and the multitude of socio-economic, political, and environmental factors that shape it. This in turn, improves our response to these factors and enhances our interactions with each other.

The resurgence is also because of a renewed appreciation for the role of self-sufficiency, technical sufficiency, social guidance, and the impact of collaborations and partnerships in the urban context. All of which led to favourable outcomes, through public participation in traditional planning processes. Open-system planning, natural planning, and strategic planning have all emerged out of a reformulation of rational comprehensive planning practices in our current era.

3.3. Advocacy Planning, Transactive Planning, and Pluralism

Paul Davidoff's (1965) advocacy planning and John Friedmann's (1973) transactive planning are among the variety of planning approaches representative of a didactic culture, both of which share a participatory orientation with the Phronesis-based approach. Advocacy planning is the earlier of the two, while transactive planning employs a more refined participatory approach.

Davidoff (1965) summarizes advocacy planning and its pluralist attributes as follows:

City planning is a means for determining policy. Appropriate policy in a democracy is determined through political debate. The right course of action is always a matter of choice, never of fact. Planners should engage in the political process as advocates of the interests of government and other groups. Intelligent choice about public policy would be aided if different political, social, and economic interests produced city plans. Plural plans rather than a single agency plan should be presented to the public. Politicizing the planning process requires that the planning function be located in either or both the executive and legislative branches and the scope of planning be broadened to include all areas of interest to the public. (331)

Thus, advocacy planning remains a group response to group power politics in a pluralist society. In terms of citizen participation, the planner acts as an expert consultant to a group of citizens, providing guidance and political accessibility in order to further the values and aims of the group. The advocacy planner's response, while retaining its client-centered orientation, is nevertheless a political response to influence policy. His or her politics are those of collective action in the form of pluralist plans.

John Friedmann (1973) postulated in his theory of transactive planning that it is citizens, rather than planners, who should be leading planning processes. With the role of the planner confined

to that of a facilitator, citizens should utilize social knowledge to guide the development agenda of their society effectively. Friedmann also argued that the main assumption of transactive planning is inter-subjective, drawing its inspiration from Maoism and emphasizing mutual learning between the planner and the client. Thus, transactive planning's overriding objective, according to Hudson (1979), is to facilitate greater participation in decision-making for disadvantaged communities.

Friedmann's (1973) transactive planning approach follows up on his prior criticism of rational comprehensive planning. Friedmann mitigates its shortcomings with processes that were previously put in place by advocacy planners as they pursued a social agenda on behalf of what was defined, in structuralist terms, as disadvantaged and disenfranchised minorities.

Transactive planning is viewed by Friedmann (1973) as a decentralized, bottom-up approach not separate in its processes from social action and procedurally more pragmatic and more detailed in its emphasis on translating information into action than advocacy planning. Transactive planning sets a new role for values, as well as a defined role for the transactive planner as a mediator, rather than merely an advocate for the client.

Within the active society that Friedmann (1973) envisioned, personal dialogue between planners and their clients is vital for sufficient knowledge to address problems as they are being defined and as information is being exchanged. This in turn, as Friedmann reminds us, promotes an environment of mutual learning among the participants in a society that is able to transform

knowledge into consensus on community action. Hudson (1979) further explains that people's unique life experiences provide the focus needed for uncovering hidden complexities in policy issues, thus enabling transactive planning processes to address them effectively.

When set against the historical record of the social theories that were prominent in the early seventies, a different picture emerges than the one presented by proponents of transactive planning. Friedmann (1973) revealed the usefulness of transactive planning for its ability to allocate and innovate in bridging the gap between the planner and his client. He also posits that one of its most important components is the integration of diverse kinds of knowledge into a holistic spectrum.

Transactive planning shares with communicative action its redefinition of the relationship between the planner and the client as a reciprocal process of learning. However, its objectives and the inter-subjectivity of its premises differentiate it from another, later planning approach, namely, deliberative participatory planning, which emerged in the United States in the 1980s through Forester's (1980) interpretation of Habermas. Transactive planning and communicative action differ from a Phronesis-based approach on substantive, as well as procedural, grounds, while the deliberative participatory planning approach differs from a Phronesis-based approach primarily on procedural grounds.

A phronetic approach to citizen participation/engagement remains an individual endeavour, not subject to group politics or instrumentally rational processes and deliberations. The phronetic

approach is grounded in an understanding of democracy that is reflective and value-rational at the individual level, as well as strong in its insistence on the validity of direct participation of citizen practitioners in all aspects of social concerns.

By contrast, transactive planners translate information garnered from their clients into action, without addressing the assumptions and value ascriptions inherent in their translation. Forester's (1980) definition of the deliberative participatory planner disregards the question of how issues are to be framed. Additionally, Healey's (1997) description of planners' uncertainties about their roles opens the debate on the efficacy of transactive planning as an approach and also of communicative action theory's substantive contributions to planning practice or lack thereof.

Pluralism is another theory that is descriptive rather than prescriptive. Dahl (1961) used the term "pluralism" to describe a society with a decentralized government in which no group, no matter its affiliation, may dominate the political resources and access to power. Such access to resources must come, instead, from multiple power centers. The state in such a society uses its authority to arbitrate between competitive and fragmented interest groups.

The prominent difference between a phronetic approach and pluralism is at the individual level. Pluralism's emphasis is on representation of the spectrum of interests in any society for accessibility to resources and political power. It remains a static theory describing a society comprised of competitive but politically equal groups, rather than a society comprised of individuals and individual interests. In pluralism, there is no expression or emphasis on the role

of moral judgment, individual praxis, or context-dependent value rationality in the daily lives of individuals. These qualities characterize a Phronesis-based approach, which stands in stark contrast to the approaches of pluralism, Davidoff's (1965) advocacy planning, and Habermas's (1984) theory of communicative action (described below).

As we discussed earlier, of the three planning approaches advocacy planning remains a group response to group power politics in a pluralist society. The transactive planning approach, however, follows up on Friedmann's (1973) prior criticism of the shortcomings of rational comprehensive planning with mitigation processes previously put in place by advocacy planners. In contrast to the two previous dynamic approaches, pluralism remains a static theory, describing a society comprised of competitive but politically equal groups, rather than a society comprised of individuals and individual interests.

3.4. Communicative Action and the Deliberative Practitioner

Conventional literary sources abound in theories and approaches to enhancing and increasing collective solidarity, while harnessing individual voices to achieve it. Habermas (1984) is an advocate of a prominent approach, originally introduced in Europe and later adopted in the United States through the efforts of Forester (1980). In Habermas' (1984) conception, communicative action "serves to transmit and renew cultural knowledge, in a process of achieving mutual understandings [and] coordinates action towards social integration and

solidarity” (5). Habermas goes further to assert that beyond enhancing the objective of collective solidarity, “communicative action is the process through which people form their identities” (5).

Habermas (1998) also developed a set of theories of communicative rationality, which he employed to describe the processes of communicative action. Habermas maintains that communicative rationality is “oriented to achieving, sustaining and reviewing consensus - and indeed a consensus that rests on the intersubjective recognition of criticisable validity claims” (17). In this definition, this author asserts that rationality is essentially a social endeavour rather than an individual one. In this same vein, he also acknowledges that language itself is a social and rational phenomenon, rather than one that stems from individual initiative. Habermas’ communicative action could be viewed as a linguo-semiotic method, promoting the use of language for a special purpose. As such, it would be of special interest and benefit to a select and well-trained group of adherents who would have to follow its linguo-semiotic rules of communication to the letter in order to be effective.³³ It is of dubious usefulness, however, for communication between ordinary citizens and their elected representatives and professional experts. Nazarova (1996) emphasizes this point as she notes:

The moment someone deliberately chooses a variety of English for a special kind of human communication, he (or she) ceases to be functioning on the natural linguistic (historical-philological) level, but enters a new branch of activity which becomes the object of a different science – semiotics. The process is connected with the use of “rational communicative systems” the rationality of scientific communication, its optimal character. Language for specific purposes (LSP) has much to do with a semiotically repetitive, “disembodied” arbitrarily chosen text, “singular” (or “unique”) in the sense that it is there to be “transcribed, imitated, emulated” as closely as possible. (25)

³³ See Fowler 1996; Kristeva 1980.

This is one of the fundamental differences between communicative action and a Phronesis-based approach, which has a focus on individual praxis and value-rational moral judgment.

Additionally, Habermas (1998) ties morality to a social common will, rather than seeing it as stemming from each individual as expressed through their individual actions:

In the modern normative equation of individualization = more market autonomy less social solidarity, the many new, more individualized forms of citizenship appear (and must appear) as creating a problem of free riding threatening the exercise of ‘strong’ democracy in a normatively well-integrated state and civil society. This idea of common norms as the ‘glue’ of democracy still looms large in most participatory and deliberative approaches to citizenship. The worry is over the ongoing marketisation or individualization of people in civil society, which is said to undermine the pillars of virtuous citizenship, namely (1) that citizen activism expresses a collective enterprise for keeping the state accountable to the needs of civil society; (2) that citizen identity is essentially about the creation of strong, affective moral ties to the (national) social community, committing citizens to act normatively responsibly and in the name of the common will. I will challenge both of these presumptions. (20)

Observers, such as John B. Thompson (1991) (a professor of sociology at the University of Cambridge) have criticized Habermas’s (1962) revival of the notion of the public sphere and his insistence on its validity for an equitable political system as a context for his communicative action approach. Thompson refers to Habermas’s conceptualization of the public sphere as archaic and irrelevant in the age of mass-media communications. Additionally, Cohen and Arrato (1992), Jay (1984), Thompson (1995) and Thompson and Held (1982) give more substantive criticism of Habermas’s communicative action and notion of the public sphere.

John Forester's (1999) book, *The Deliberative Practitioner*, presents a vision of the deliberative practitioner as a model of practice for planners, urban designers, policy analysts, and theorists. This model for professionals bridges the gap between authority/expertise and local knowledge and enables the role of the citizen practitioner presented in this chapter as a model of practice for ordinary citizenry. In doing so, Forester posits "a value-explicit inquiry into how to do planning well in a messy, politicized world" (10). He bases his discussion on cases that draw from hundreds of interviews with planners on several continents, citing practitioner accounts of the challenges and difficulties of putting strategies to practice, as well as several years worth of recordings of planning staff meetings of a New York State local government.

Forester (1999) describes those years as a deliberative practice of processes and outcomes as well as values and choices. Throughout, Forester, established relevant and significantly descriptive character-building accounts in which he identified allies and opposing political interests. Forester sums up the scope and nature of deliberative planning practice by stating, "When planners can facilitate processes of multiparty inquiry and learning, trust and relationship building, public participation can produce not just noise but well crafted practical strategies that address real needs" (4).

Additionally, Forester's (1999) position on power is opposed to static determinism and espouses a politically flexible relationship that facilitates opportunities for positive action, rather than being structurally delimiting. As for ethics, Forester understands it as "pragmatic action always done well or poorly, always potentially assessable by standards, consequences and qualities of

action (virtues)” (6) paralleling in that sentiment prudence of action, the defining element of a Phronesis-based approach. The value judgment that precedes an individual’s singular prudent action (done well, by definition) is informed by a singularly acquired appropriate value, distilled from a life of experiences.

3.5. Reflective Practice, Social Learning, and Phronesis:

Insights from Work on Social Learning and Reflective Practice

Miller and Dollard’s (1941) earlier perspective on modeling human behavior is extended by the social learning theory of Bandura (1973). The author explains that both observation and modeling are preconditions for individuals to learn and retain instances of encountered behaviours by others and their accompanying emotional states. Bandura (1977) views human behaviour as the result of mutual interplay of behavioural, environmental, and cognitive factors. He states, “Learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous, if people had to rely solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them what to do. Fortunately, most human behaviour is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others one forms an idea of how new behaviours are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action.” (22) Social learning theory extends Miller and Dollard’s (1941) earlier perspective on modeling human behaviour.

Donald Schön (1983) introduced two types of reflection in practice: reflection in action, wherein,

while performing an action, the practitioner identifies an emerging problem and reflects on it during praxis. Reflection on action, on the other hand, involves retrospective reflection on an action that is past and examining the knowledge base that enabled the action through analysis and interpretive recall of the experience that frames the action. The practitioner considers alternative modes of action and acquires relevant knowledge that may constructively impact the experience.

The process of reflection encompasses an individual's life experience, both as action events that represent benchmarks in the knowledge field of the individual and as ethics of action wherein positive and negative experiences are codified through correct and incorrect actions performed in one's life. Schön (1983) advocated a juxtapositioning of the roles of technical and artistic knowledge in the pursuit of professional excellence.

Schön (1993) introduced the concept of a generative metaphor as an implicit figurative tool that individuals utilize to interpret and describe social events and generate solutions to perceived problems. Schön argues that instead of dealing with metaphor "as a species of figurative language which needs explaining, or explaining away," there is another application, "one which treats metaphor as central to the task of accounting for our perspective on the world." In this iteration, a metaphor becomes "a perspective or frame, a way of looking at things - and to a certain kind of process – a process by which new perspectives on the world come into existence" (137).

For a Phronesis-based approach, it is this understanding and usage of the metaphor as a uniquely derived and self-actuated perspective on the world that gives the citizen practitioner's self-narrative meaning and relevancy in the act of local knowledge exchange.

Schön and Rein (1994) wrote *Frame Reflection*, in which the previous concept of metaphor as frame was developed into shared reconstructed frames or descriptions as “learning systems” to solve social policy problems. The learning system process enables reconstructed interpretations of deliberative processes and dialogues between researchers and the researched, or between ordinary citizens and organizational representatives. Schön and Rein describe this process, which is relevant to the literature on deliberative practice, as a Phronesis-based approach, as follows:

Frame restructuring and the making of generative metaphor are closely related processes. In both kinds of processes, participants bring to a situation different and conflicting ways of seeing – different and conflicting descriptions. There is an impetus to map the descriptions onto one another, but the descriptions resist mapping. In the context of a particular concrete situation, the participants work at the restructuring of their initial descriptions – regrouping, recording, and renaming elements and relations; selecting new features and relations from their observations of the situation. As this work proceeds, they represent their experience of the situation through strategies which capture the “next – next – next” of temporal experience of events: and from such representations, of which storytelling is a prime example, they draw the restructured grouping and relations of elements which they are able to embed in a new, coordinated description. (159)

Rein and Schön's (1994) reconstructed interpretations of deliberative processes between researchers and the researched lead us to explore how such processes are grounded in situated knowledge through the ethnographic research practices of representation. The feminist geographer Cindy Katz (1992), who has a wealth of field experience in ethnography, gives a

concise critique of transparent reflexive positionality. This author describes the types and practices of representation in ethnographic research conducted in Sudan and New York City. Katz argues “that by interrogating the subject positions of ourselves as intellectuals as well as the objects of our inquiry we can excavate a ‘space of betweenness’ wherein the multiple determinations of a decentred world are connected. Appropriating this knowledge, we may develop enabling analyses of power and difference to find collective paths toward change” (495).

Katz (1992) emphasizes that ethnographers, and by extension most intellectuals, have been late to recognize the inherent biases in their positions as researchers and as privileged individuals. Katz maintains that researchers are “masking their own positions” when they ascribe roles to their objects of research and assimilating the transmitted knowledge from them will result in missing the connections “between the macrological structures of domination and the micrological practices of everyday life” (507). Gillian Rose (1997) explains that this scalar model of power, along with a distributional model of power, comprise the two main models used by feminist geographers to position reflexivity. Rose argues “that both these tactics work by turning extraordinarily complex power relations into a visible and clearly ordered space that can be surveyed by the researcher: Power becomes seen as a sort of landscape” (310).

Haraway (1988) explains that whatever process we use as intellectuals to help acknowledge our inherent biases and the positions of representation that we ascribe to the subjects of our inquiry, that same process should also modulate our own self-narrative towards an ethnography of “non-innocence” (151). For post-structural feminist geographers like Katz and Haraway, power

becomes the context within which the researcher navigates in the quest for transparent reflexivity at the micro level of locally produced knowledge and the macro level of economic-political power relations.

Overall, Katz (1992) agrees with Pratt's (1986) supposition that "as intellectuals we are both protagonists and narrators" (151). Katz also maintains that researchers can acquire and exchange knowledge with their subjects of inquiry in a transparent and non-dominant way. Katz emphasizes that "conscious awareness of the situatedness of our knowledge enables us not only to be accountable for the stories we tell, but to move strategically to the discursive, practical, and material borders between subject positions" (505).

This last pronouncement brings the ethnographic research findings Katz presented in 1992 into alignment with current citizen engagement literature, which shares a similar understanding of the situatedness of knowledge. Katz (1992) insisted that field findings must be fully contextualized, in "an analysis of position that if consciously appropriated can lead to, be part of, and inform collective oppositional practice" (505). Questioning this approach, Rose's (1997) own research conclusions negate the possibility of achieving a comprehensive and transparently reflexive positionality in favour of "other ways of situating the knowledge of the researcher" (314). This is accomplished by allowing gaps of knowledge and fallibility to be part of the research process as a natural consequence of knowledge production.

Rose (1997), comments on the transparent reflexive positionality methods of traditional feminist geographers and ethnographers by citing her own failed attempt at situating knowledge in her own research as a point of departure. The author explains, “I knew instead, from some of those same critiques, that I should situate myself and my interpretations of those interviews by reflexively examining my positionality” (305). The author’s work offers a review of the assumptions and strategies utilized by feminist geographers in their quest to achieve full transparent reflexivity, a position that Rose considers untenable. She argues, though, that through her own and other feminist geographers’ failures to achieve comprehensive transparent reflexivity, other forms of “radical strategies for situating feminist geographical knowledges” (306) are brought to light.

Despite her criticism of traditional feminist methods, Rose (1997) maintains that these methods should not be abandoned as they still have merit. Rose explains that they should be viewed with a mindset that allows fallibility and acknowledges that the production of knowledge is prone to alterations and interpretations that are too politically complicated to be captured by the researcher. Rose (1997) suggests that “how a research project is understood is not entirely a consequence of the relation between researcher and researched. To assume otherwise is, once again, to resist the proliferation of power/knowledges by asserting the unassailable authority of academic analysis” (319).

It is important to note here that in contrast to the feminist strategies for transparent reflexive positionality discussed above, for Rose the rich amount of information that emerges from direct

dialogues between the researcher and the researched is not an end in itself. It is, rather, the natural product of knowledge exchange and self-transformation for the researcher and the researched alike. The self-narrative of the citizen practitioner is situated knowledge only in the sense that the project-specific dialogue gives it form. The self-narrative of the citizen practitioner is only useful for the researcher through a similar process of self-narration and transformation, whose outcome is an interpretation framed by the researcher's own life experience/expertise. (An exploration of the citizen practitioner's self-narrative is covered in more detail in Chapter 5).

3.6. Synthesis

The chapter methodologically and historically reviewed strategies and approaches utilized by planning, architecture and urban design professionals, academicians, and researchers aiming at engaging citizens with their professional and elected advocates. The authors cited and the approaches selected were by no means exhaustive of such strategies in the fields of planning, architecture, and urban design. They merely represent the most historically relevant research for the purposes of this dissertation in terms of seeking effective and relevant citizen participation/engagement strategies in policy and, as such, can be viewed as a point of departure for a Phronesis-based approach advanced by this research.

The chapter also explores early attempts at describing the various levels of citizen participation, which may occur in a particular society given its particular system of government.

One such attempt is Arnstein's (1969) ladder of citizen participation, which is abstract in scope and focuses mostly on group initiated indirect citizen participation.

The first section covered other unique orientations and approaches towards framing types and stages of citizen participation. Some examples that were prominent in the review are Wiedemann and Femers' (1993) ladder, which was presented as an administrative and government-oriented mandate; Dorsey, Doney, and Rueggeberg's (1994) ladder, which framed citizen participation along the typical stages of planning processes; and Conner's (1988) ladder, which presented citizen participation as methods of dispute resolution of public policy processes.

Indeed, the diversity of approaches and conceptualizations mirror an equal diversity of the citizen participation literature, following complicated stakeholder typologies and models. Integrated frameworks and matrices that connect "public" frameworks to those of participation were developed by other researchers and are reviewed in this section to answer the "what," "when," and "why" they are to be utilized. The subsection presented an illustration of different approaches, revealing the inadequacy of available planning and urban design strategies in making citizen engagement in policy more effective and relevant while advancing a Phronesis-based approach as a viable alternative that can enhance and complement such strategies. This was done through an analysis of selected case studies of a dominant top-down planning approach in professional practice, namely, the rational comprehensive planning approach, in comparison to its polar opposite bottom-up approach, the transactive planning approach. We explored the processes of the two approaches as a representative sample of the multitude of planning and

urban design strategies and approaches that are available and, through the comparative analysis we were able to reveal three main obstacles to achieving better outcomes for citizen participation/engagement efforts.

In the subsequent sections (Rational Comprehensive Planning; Advocacy Planning, Transactive Planning and Pluralism; Communicative Action and the Deliberative Practitioner), we explored various dominant approaches and planning paradigms. Historically, these approaches and paradigms arose in two ways for the planning profession; either internally to answer an expressed need within the planning profession and to synthesize its most effective approaches into dominant operative processes or externally to formalize its methods and professional identity.

It is important to note a prominent feature that is relevant to this research. It characterizes policy and planning cultures in general, including Arnstein (1969), Habermas ([1962] 1989), and the pluralist theorists. This is the preoccupation of most of the reviewed literature with indirect citizen participation, its group-oriented processes, and its remedies for the challenges facing citizen participation.

An exception to the above is the deliberative planning practice approach, which parallels the Phronesis-based approach advanced by this research in its emphasis on praxis and prudence of action, but differs from a Phronesis-based approach in considerations of context, as well as an over emphasis on group-oriented initiatives rather than those focused on individuals. What also

emerged is that most of those approaches lack meaning because of their detachment from their value context, a condition that a Phronesis-based approach seeks to rectify through an emphasis on value-rationality, praxis, and context. However, the methodological review did cover some studies that observed the need for one or other component of a Phronesis-based approach, without naming them as such.

In the last section of this chapter, we initially explored the theory of social learning by Bandura (1973) and the process of reflection, which, as Schön (1983) pointed out, encompasses an individual's life experience, both as action events and "ethics of action." Schön's (1993) "generative metaphor" is equally important and decisively relevant to the life experience-based situated local place knowledge of lay citizen practitioners. Schön and Rein (1994) devised "learning systems," whose processes enable reconstructed interpretations of deliberative processes and dialogues between ordinary citizens and organizational representatives. It is this understanding and usage of the metaphor, as a uniquely derived and self-actuated perspective on the world that gives the citizen practitioner's self-narrative meaning and relevancy in the act of local place knowledge exchange.

We learned later in the section that post-structural feminist geographers such as Katz (1992) and Haraway (1988) viewed power as the context within which the reflective practitioner or researcher navigates in the quest for transparent reflexive positionality. This is to be done at the micro level of locally produced knowledge and the macro level of economic-political power relations.

We also cover Rose's (1997) research conclusions, which lead us to acknowledge that it is not possible or even desirable to achieve a comprehensive and transparently reflexive positionality. We may conclude that it is far better to allow gaps of knowledge and fallibility to be part of the research process or local place knowledge exchange as a natural consequence of knowledge production.

The chapter's exploration of dominant planning approaches highlighted three main obstacles to achieving better outcomes for citizen participation/engagement for planning, architectural, and urban design processes and policy. These challenges can be viewed as benchmarks, which planners can set towards realizing effective and relevant strategies and outcomes for their respective communities. The first challenge confronting planners is one of informing existing planning methods and processes to advance their communities' vision with lessons from practice. The second challenge is the socio-political climate of informal discrimination and segregation pervading society. The third challenge is that of existing economic methods of production that would benefit from globally coordinated and locally applied responsive methods of production.

Each of the planning approaches could have its own unique response to those challenges, which follow its own unique processes. Ultimately, to be effective and relevant, they need to be grounded in an understanding and appreciation of the components characterizing a Phronesis-based approach, namely, value-rationality, praxis, and context.

Chapters 2 and 3, comprising the integrative, methodological and historical literature review, explored the relationship between citizens in a community and their representatives or advocates by delineating the issues confronting citizen participation in municipal planning, architectural, and urban design processes and policy.

The majority of authors of studies in the literature examined consider current approaches to citizen participation/engagement in policy to be limited in terms of financial cost, required time, and predictability. None of the studies examined presented a comprehensive approach in getting this valuable input from citizens synthesized and transformed into effective policy and design parameters that lead to positive change. There is clearly a need for an effective and relevant participatory approach, which positions citizen participation/engagement in the correct context for constructive change in present and future planning, architecture, and urban design processes and policy.

Chapters 2 and 3 analyzed and reviewed the body of knowledge about citizen participation in policy. Chapter 3 also: continued the exploration of Phronesis and the manner in which theories of institutional planning account for the distinction between Phronesis and sophia; demonstrated the inadequacy of available strategies in making citizen engagement more effective through a comparative analysis of two polarized planning paradigms in case studies of citizen participation in the sustainable development of two cities; explored the processes of reflection related to an individual's life experience; and reviewed the learning systems that enable

deliberative processes and dialogues between ordinary citizens and organizational representatives. These integrative, methodological and historical reviews provided us with the necessary theories, ideas, and concepts to construct a conceptual framework for a Phronesis-based approach to citizen engagement in matters of policy. Chapter 4 initiates the construction process by exploring definitions of “Phronesis,” “citizen participation/engagement,” “citizen practitioner/praxis,” “expert activity,” “mindful engagement,” “self-narrative,” “phronetic planning research,” “phronetic research,” “scientific research,” “episteme,” “sophia,” and “techne,” and by examining the Dreyfus Model of Human Learning; it goes on to outline the historical evolution of theories leading to a Phronesis-based approach.

4. PHRONESIS AS A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The first sections of this chapter will show that attempts to define social science and theory on the basis of episteme and techne alone are often misguided and have set an unfortunate precedent for research in the social and applied sciences, which include the fields of planning, architecture, and urban design. Such research often ignores the relevance of its own methodological findings in favour of those developed by the natural sciences. Those are often grounded in epistemic theory and aim at producing predictions and explanations, which are the characteristic strengths of the natural sciences. This emulation of the natural sciences by social scientists often negates the social sciences rich heritage of “reflexive analysis and discussion of values and interests, which is the prerequisite for an enlightened political, economic, and cultural development in any society, and which is at the core of Phronesis” (Flyvbjerg 2001, 3).

A reinterpretation of the Aristotelian concept of Phronesis and an analysis of the work of more contemporary writers; such as Winch (2001), Moser, Mulder, and Trout (1998), and Flyvbjerg (2001); serve the general discussion of what contemporary social sciences are and should be and, more specifically, its effect on citizen participation/engagement research methods and practices. Such a reinterpretation requires that we also revisit the often-cited comparison between the natural and social sciences, which is solely, and unfairly, based on their epistemic qualities. This will be followed by a sub-section with an analysis of Winch’s (2001) *The Idea of a Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy* and a critique of its main chapter by utilizing phronetic insights that bear directly on this manuscript’s research question.

Work by Reynolds (1971) is examined in terms of its treatment of social phenomena, as well as Hedstrom and Swedberg's (1998) editorial work in *Social Mechanisms*, for insights on the dominant methodologies of qualitative researchers. In addition to the above works, an analysis of *The Theory of Knowledge* (Moser, Mulder, and Trout 1998) is put forth to describe fundamental components of epistemology that share historical roots with the Aristotelian concept of Phronesis.

Bourdieu (1990) is discussed with particular attention to the implications of his key concepts of "habitus," "field," and "capital." Their impact will be examined on the issues of inequity, citizen engagement processes, and the acquisition and distribution of situated knowledge for ordinary citizenry and their affect on social stratification that hinders those engagement processes. We also explore three prominent paradigms, informed by Bourdieu's work, that bear on the process of school reform. This process highlights the mechanisms of power distribution in citizen engagement processes, including the Phronesis-based approach that is advanced by this dissertation.

A summary of a Phronesis-based approach, with examples of Phronesis in action in various fields and disciplines, is presented with specific reference to phronetic approaches to case study methods. With a focus on redefining the case study method along phronetic lines, other methods, such as social mechanisms, are given due consideration, followed by a discussion of the shortcomings of certain components of epistemology in relation to the three fundamental

elements of phronetic research. In effect, we treat “the case study method” as its own case study by examining the strengths and weaknesses of the case study method in its current state within qualitative methodology.

We also examine the work of Brent Flyvbjerg (2001) and Robert Yin (2003) and other contemporary writers who have utilized some of the dominant methodologies in both quantitative and qualitative research. Through an analysis of their work, we examine the central position that the Dreyfus Model of Human Learning (Dreyfus and Dreyfus, 1986) occupies in such a redefinition of the case study method. In order to reinvigorate its traditional processes with insights based on three fundamental elements of the concept of Phronesis, namely, context, value-rationality, and practical knowledge or praxis.

Flyvbjerg’s (2001) seminal book on phronetic social science, *Making Social Science Matter*, is examined to describe the phronetic elements that bear strongly on the case study method. The section then applies this phronetic framework to Yin’s (2003) comprehensive presentation of the case study method in *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* in order to generate a methodological framework that may elucidate the usefulness of a Phronesis-based approach to case study research and practices in social science. The section concludes with a discussion of some of the implications and limitations of the proposed approach and its impact on social science’s need for rehabilitation in its present context.

The development of citizen participation/engagement processes is examined in their historical contexts, and the two forms of participation and the various factors mediating such processes are described. The section also explores the issues facing effective and meaningful engagement and strategies that may achieve a more meaningful dialogue between ordinary citizenry and professionals. A broader engagement critique is offered in this section, wherein engagement is placed in its rightful context: within the engagement debate between the “agents” of authority/expertise and those who possess local knowledge among ordinary citizenry. The chapter concludes with a brief synthesis representing the operationalization for the study of citizen practitioners.

4.1. Phronesis as a Unifying Concept

The Aristotelian concept of Phronesis, often translated as “practical wisdom or prudence” gives the social sciences insight into the human condition, which is far superior to that offered by episteme and techne. In Aristotle’s ([384 BC] 1976) own words, Phronesis is a “true state, reasoned, and capable of action with regard to things that are good or bad for man” (1140).

Phronesis involves practical knowledge and context-dependent judgment that reaches far beyond scientific knowledge (episteme) and technical knowledge (techne), both of which emphasize instrumental rationality and the quest for universal principles. Instrumental rationality, in particular, dominates the research in fields whose ultimate output is often the production of material products.

Flyvbjerg (2001) explains that our modern era does not possess a word describing the intellectual virtue, *Phronesis*. Aristotle ([384 BC] 1976) valued it above all other intellectual virtues for its significance to social and political inquiry. The reason for this, in Flyvbjerg's opinion, is the conceptual dominance of the natural sciences over the social sciences, which resulted in the elimination of the concept of *Phronesis* from modern discourse.

Flyvbjerg (2001) also cautions us that adhering to the teachings of Socrates and Plato, out of which the hypothetical-deductive scientific model has its origins, can only preoccupy us with deductions and general principles applied to large samples. Flyvbjerg emphasizes, "Going into depth with an individual case is seen as unproductive. The question, however, is where a singular focus on deduction and general principles leads. I will argue that in social science such a focus leads to a dead end" (70).

The seventeenth century philosopher, Vico (1968, 1990, 1993) posited that truth can only be arrived at through invention or creation. This was in contrast to Descartes [1650] in (Charles and Tannery, 1976) who held that it was only through observation that one arrives at the truth. Vico proved to be equally influential on modern scholarship, where his ideas are often compared to Hegelian idealism. In the course of our discussion of the "science wars" it is worthwhile noting that Vico (1993) also argued that modern education is too preoccupied with the natural sciences at the expense of the art of topics. He regarded the latter to be essential in achieving a "poetic wisdom" of the mind. Vico's (1990) ideas on learning embraced a humanistic "*prudencia*" in which the artistic or poetic training of the human mind (the use of imagination and memory in

disciplining speech into poetic persuasion) one can achieve a “poetic wisdom.” It is an understanding of practical wisdom that differs from Aristotelian “Prudence,” with its context-dependent praxis and value-judgment. Although his work and ideas are inspiring, their focus diverges from the phronetically driven experiential narrative of the citizen practitioner, which is the concern of this research.

My application of the Aristotelian concept of Phronesis is embedded within the context of democratic values and ethics, in order to highlight the need for an equitable and prudent urban design, architecture, planning, and policy approach. Such prudence may steer future policy-makers into shaping policy rooted in context, through value-rational dialogue and allowing individual policy-makers to utilize their own life experiences in the process of shaping such policy. Today, more than ever, there is a need for such a dialogue to discuss and answer our society’s most pressing needs, from social policy challenges to socio-political and environmental inequity. Value-rationality, in context, utilizing practical knowledge and individual initiative, can inform social policy and enable effective citizen engagement, while stemming the tide of destructive impulses in our society, towards ourselves and towards our environment at large.

Although at its core, Phronesis remains an individual endeavour, Flyvbjerg (2001) informs us that phronetic researchers seek input to questions regarding the construction and consequences of structural elements affecting individual actions. This is my intention in this chapter as well, to delineate the phronetic structure of social discourse in order to produce input from individual citizens that contributes to the current social dialogue. Rather than seek to dominate it with a

single voice, we must seek instead to be, as Flyvbjerg states, “included in, polyphony of voices, with no one voice, including that of the researcher, claiming final authority” (139). Citizen practitioners acquire their expertise through the application of their individual life experiences to engagement through daily interaction with their immediate environments and as a result of exercising prudent value-rationality.

4.1.1. Philosophical Implications of the Phronesis-Based Approach

In addition to applying the three fundamental elements that constitute phronetic research to Yin’s (2003) book, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, this section extends that treatment to some other influential works. The intention is to align their assumptions regarding rationality, in its two faces, context and practical knowledge, to the chapter’s Phronesis-based approach.

Several epistemological preoccupations are the focus of this analytical framework and bear directly on the three fundamental elements that constitute phronetic research: context, sources of knowledge, rationality, the nature of meaningful behaviour, social mechanisms, social phenomena, and theory construction.

With respect to context, it is important to consider Moser, Mulder, and Trout’s (1998) *The Theory of Knowledge*. The authors discuss the pros and cons of adopting the deontological construal of justification. We find the issue of context (cultural context in this instance) delineating the difference between epistemically justified belief and excusable belief. The authors even give a hierarchal value to them, with the former possessing a higher value than the

latter. The authors seem to acknowledge that available evidence is of a relative nature and further state that the exact conditions for adequate epistemic support are disputable. This exercise in disputable justification is, nevertheless, a symptom of classical epistemology's inability to deal with the changing nature of human knowledge propositions, which are dependent on variables, time, and context, and which are relative to the user and the user's methodology.

Every aspect of our empirical knowledge of the world today has come to us on the ruins of past knowledge. What we deem to be apparent knowledge today was genuine knowledge to our ancestors. The annals of genuine knowledge that we prescribe to today are continually being stripped down, one item at a time, by newer observations, more genuine theory models, and newer perceptions. What becomes clear is that despite the authors' zest for distinguishing "counterfeits from the real article" knowledge marches on oblivious to their protestations. The authors' central failing, though, is their "genuine" disregard for context and its nature, which is built on change.

The same line of reasoning that is expressed above extends to the authors' treatment of "a correct way, as opposed to an incorrect way, to explain what knowledge is, owing to the actual characteristics of knowledge" (Moser, Mulder, and Trout 1998, 27). When one adds a time scale and a healthy regard for changing context to the latter statement, the above defensible statement becomes less objectionable in our pursuit for what constitutes genuine knowledge at this time.

Moser, Mulder, and Trout's (1998) provide an exemplary account of the history of epistemology, its branches (with their various manifestations), and its equally numerous concepts of justification. The central theme of the historical overview is that the ongoing debate on the nature of knowledge, which began at the dawn of history by the intellectual ancestors of Aristotle in Mesopotamia, reaches us today still embroiled in the intricacies of that historical argument. The authors' reminders about the value of epistemology, as an evaluative discipline that can both bind and transcend other disciplines, are clear and to the point. What the authors' propositions also reveal is that epistemology, in addition to being a study of the constituents of knowledge, is also about the processes of cognition and all of the human pursuits that lead to them.

The proposition of social dependence, advanced by Moser, Mulder, and Trout (1998) in Chapter 6 of *The Theory of Knowledge*, treats an individual's testimony in knowledge as nothing more than an epistemic agent contributing to a collective social pursuit of knowledge. Such an approach disregards the central role that individual initiative plays in the acquisition of knowledge in so far as increasing the collective body of knowledge. Leaps of individual prowess in the progression of knowledge, and their examples, abound in the recorded history of human progress. They are the norm rather than the exception.

It is self-reliant individuals, rather than epistemic agents of the social collective acting outside of the social collective of knowledge and quite often in opposition to its tenets, that have accelerated and given momentum to the acquisition of knowledge. In their quest for knowledge, such individuals often take their premises and points of departure from outside of their

contemporary social collective of accepted “genuine” knowledge and may reach for them in other cultures or in the far past.

This is not to say that the collective social pursuit of knowledge has no value as a methodology. In reaching the twofold aims of knowing significant truths and avoiding error it does have value, but viewed in a hierarchy of efficient methodologies for acquiring knowledge it occupies the lesser position.

As Bourdieu (1977) points out, this is so for two reasons, both of which have to do with the inherent instability of social systems and their fragmented inflexible structures. The first is that although societies are quite effective at recording acquired knowledge, they are equally effective at institutionalizing them. This causes knowledge to become fossilized and quickly reverts to dogma, which stifles further innovation and keeps the pursuit of knowledge at a stand still. The second reason has to do with the political and social struggle for hierarchal dominance that exists in any society. Knowledge cannot exist without being fragmented in such a context. A society that undergoes political or social upheaval does not only take itself apart, but it also takes apart its collective body of knowledge. Individuals, however, are superior to societies in those two regards, but inferior to it in the preservation of knowledge and in passing it along to posterity.

Moser, Mulder, and Trout (1998) touch upon the issue of feminist epistemology and identify it as an intellectual movement, failing to note that an intellectual collective based on the gender that makes up half of humanity cannot be viewed as a mere movement. It represents a significant

contribution to the body of knowledge, as well as an exposure of some of its inherent weaknesses. Feminist epistemologists correctly identified the fallacy permeating the history of knowledge as the tendency of researchers to assume that their observations are conducted from an objective stance outside of social interaction with communities and nature.

Another valid observation made by feminist epistemologists concerns the ascription of ascendancy given to the control over natural phenomena, rather than to the cooperation with nature and its processes. The explanations advanced by feminist epistemologists for such lapses in the quest for knowledge went beyond their gender ascriptions and exposed a much wider weakness with far more devastating consequences to the body of knowledge. This weakness is the inherent subjectivity of any human observation and its subsequent effect on the account of the phenomena observed.

With respect to rationality, Moser, Mulder, and Trout (1998) inform us in Chapter 7 of *The Theory of Knowledge* that “it is no surprise to find theories of rational decision and judgment rife with normative notions, attributions of good reasoning, sound judgment, etc.” (124). Indeed, one finds their own prose rife with such normative notions as “genuine” belief and “apparent” knowledge, among others. However, throughout the text, one rarely finds an admission of fallibility or even the appearance of doubt in their ability to formulate general definitions on such profound notions as truth and knowledge, among others. One such rare occasion occurs, also in Chapter 7, on the subject of a general definition of rationality. The authors concur that “Even so,

the factors that contribute to rational decision in any particular case can have such diverse sources that it is difficult to offer a general definition of rationality” (128).

One area in which to commend the authors is in their presentation of research literature that bears on human decision-making and judgement made under uncertain and risky conditions. Their survey and explanation of the base-rate fallacy, availability bias, and the violation of Bayes’s theorem are all exemplary.

Their failing, however, is in their inability to separate their methodology from their object of study, which, in this case, happens to be rationality. This inability mars the authors’ arguments and subsequent conclusions. They admit to “substantial difficulties in formulating a general account of rationality” (Moser, Mulder, and Trout 1998, 128), but they nevertheless advance a thematic conclusion based on their literature survey to the effect that “rationality-bearing factors” can be a viable integrative contribution toward the formulation of a general account of rationality. They go on to recommend “a research strategy that unifies perceptual, cognitive, and social factors in human rationality” (128). Although the authors adopt a research strategy that is exclusive in its methodology and tends to return a fragmentary picture of rationality, they compound their error by qualifying such a flawed approach with a recommendation toward unification of a wider array of factors in human rationality without adopting such an approach themselves.

The authors, however, do admit to the relativity of rationality only in a certain context and under conditions “analogous to our earlier questions about the relativity of truth” (Moser, Mulder, and Trout 1998, 128). The authors’ inability to discover and assess the flaws in their methodology, despite the numerous conflicting results that their strategy had acquired, points to more general culpability in human reasoning. It is the inherent subjectivity of human observation and its interpretation of observable phenomena that raises serious doubts on the spirit of objective inquiry and the ability to define, and identify, objective truth.

With respect to the nature of meaningful knowledge, Peter Winch (2001), in Chapter 2 of *The Idea of Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy* states that “principles, precepts, definitions, formulae—all derive their sense from the context of human social activity in which they are applied” (57). The author’s expressed view of philosophy leads him to an exploration of its impact on the nature of human activity. This exploration lacks, however, the realization that it is the individual nature of human activity that merits attention, rather than the collective contextual assumptions of social activity.

The author’s argument also suffers from a general tendency to reach conclusions in one section that do not follow from precepts introduced in a previous section. In section 2, the author states, “Now according to the argument of the last chapter, this is possible only where the act in question has a relation to a social context: this must be true even of the most private acts, if, that is, they are meaningful” (Winch 2001, 41). The author’s argument in the last chapter concerned the importance of context in assessing social relations. There was no specific mention of private

acts or any treatment involving individual forms of expression, for that matter. There certainly was no correlation to the conclusion alluded to by the author as following anything previously stated in Chapter 1. In all fairness to the author, in his preface he admits that this error occurs in several sections of this chapter.

In outlining one of the main features of Wittgenstein's analysis of the application of rules to human behaviour, Winch (2001) treats the relevance of the notion of rule in an oblique, distorted fashion. This occurs in his discussion of human behaviour in this chapter, as well as in his treatment of language in previous chapters. In section 4, the author points out, "It matters that the pupil should react to his teacher's example in one way rather than another." He goes on to say, "He has to learn not merely to do things in the same way as his teacher, but also what counts as the same way" (59). In his emphasis on the ability to apply a criterion, the author neglects to mention an even more pressing requirement for the student. This consists of the ability to trace the item to be learned to its original conception. This point of origin stands independent of both the student and his teacher.

The application of a criterion in the context of learning has to exemplify the original concept if it is to be understood intelligibly. This notion has to do with the force of the concept of reality as belonging to the realm of philosophy, which the author mentions briefly in the last chapter without exploring it further. It is about acquiring knowledge through an understanding of the concept exemplifying that knowledge and not merely by understanding the "right" or "wrong" way of applying a particular methodology.

With respect to social mechanisms, Taylor Cowen (1998) gives us an interpretative definition of “social mechanisms.” The author interprets “social mechanisms as rational-choice accounts of how a specified combination of preferences and constraints can give rise to more complex social outcomes” (125). He also argues, “The generation of mechanisms through economic science is a result of human action, even though it is not always the product of direct human design” (125). Here, Cowen examines how economics can be interpreted as a science of social mechanisms and concludes, “Despite the pre-eminence of mechanisms in economics, the status of mechanisms in economics is inherently fragile” (125). The author, nevertheless, assigns high marks to both economics and rational-choice sociology for their success in uncovering and analyzing social mechanisms. He bases his evaluation on his belief in economics’ “ability to contribute to our final understanding of the world” (143-144). This evaluation, in addition to being whimsical, is also highly subjective.

The social sciences would do well to be cautious of adopting the social mechanism methodology, considering that its success record as a tool for enhancing explanation and prediction of social phenomena is dubious at best, even within the field of economics. This is an important consideration in light of the fact that in sociology, as Cowen (1998) correctly points out, “the study of social mechanisms serves as a methodological competitor to both more atheoretical approaches and to grand theory building” (125). One may also conclude that those attempts to advance and promote the cause of social-mechanism methodology in the social sciences are done, on the one hand, in the hope of increasing the latter’s contribution to scientific knowledge.

On the other hand lies the assumption that doing so would bridge the gap between the natural and social sciences and end the “Science Wars.”

With respect to social phenomena and theory construction, Paul Reynolds (1971), in *A Primer in Theory Construction*, considers whether a scientific body of knowledge related to social phenomena can be developed. Reynolds asserts, “There are five problems inherent in dealing with social and human phenomena that increase the difficulty of developing an empirically based body of scientific knowledge” (41). Reynolds outlines these problems as follows:

(1) the large number of subtle and interrelated processes, (2) the problems of achieving intersubjective measurement of abstract concepts, (3) the change in many social and individual phenomena under observation and the tendency for lay individuals to resist the interpretations and explanations of social scientists, (4) the difficulty of achieving complete objectivity in dealing with social phenomena, particularly when related to sensitive issues, and (5) ethical considerations that prevent the use of certain types of research procedures or require more expensive alternatives. (160-163)

The social mechanism-based approach is itself afflicted with these problems in addition to what Reynolds (1971) surmises as “the character of social scientists themselves-problems within the social scientists, not within the phenomena. Two major deficiencies are the lack of clarity in theoretical writings and ignorance about what scientific knowledge should look like and how it is created” (164). Although the social mechanism-based approach, having been incubated by economics, comes closest of all currently available social science methodologies to the notion of an empirical scientific approach, it is, nevertheless, a flawed approach. Perhaps what

recommends it best to posterity is the explanatory resilience of its action and precision principles.

4.1.2. Theory of Practice: Bourdieu

The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1990) developed his theory of practice in response to a pressing issue in contemporary sociological theory and its classical counterpart. This is the issue of social ontology, its constituents, its causes and effects, and the debate over determinants of human behaviour between proponents of the primacy of social structure and those of agency.

The proponents of the primacy of social structure formed a position within the theoretical systems of structuralism, functionalism and some forms of Marxism. An opposing position was formed within methodological individualism, social phenomenology, interactionism, and ethnomethodology theoretical systems.

In his theory of practice, Bourdieu (1990) postulated a middle-ground position that seeks to balance structure and agency's relation to each other in their effect on human behaviour.

Bourdieu argued that while social structures impact human behaviour, people can in turn affect the social structures they exist in. Structure and agency are, thus, presented as having complementary, rather than antagonistic, roles on human behaviour. This view is also shared by structuration, another dominant perspective in social ontology (Eldred, 2008).

“Habitus” was a central concept that Bourdieu (1977) presented in *An Outline of the Theory of Practice*. He followed it with the concepts of “field” and “capital” in his subsequent development of the theory of practice. Bourdieu’s view of “habitus” is as follows:

The agent is “socialized in a “field” (an evolving set of roles and relationships in a social domain, where various forms of “capital” such as prestige or financial resources are at stake). As the agent accommodates to his or her roles and relationships in the context of his or her position in the field, the agent internalizes relationships and expectations for operating in that domain. These internalized relationships and habitual expectations and relationships form, over time, the habitus. (488)

Bourdieu’s (1977) concepts of “habitus,” “field,” and “capital” have important implications for the propositions of a Phronesis-based approach advanced by this research, especially where it involves citizen engagement processes. The notion of praxis within the social context of that individual, which emerges from value-rational life experiences and guides an individual’s actions, is analogous to Bourdieu’s postulation on social agents and structure. Specifically, Bourdieu’s explanation that agents act implicitly according to a practical logic evolving out of “bodily dispositions” and practices from interaction with the social world. Such interaction must, by necessity, involve the acquisition of knowledge and other forms of “cultural capital” that assist the “agent” in forming “habitus” in the context or “field” of citizen engagement. This becomes doubly problematic when engagement is occurring in elite networks, where “experts” dominate the “field” to the exclusion of ordinary citizens.

As Martinez-Cosio (2006) points out “the structure of civic participation is cloaked in democratic principles that are presented as just ‘sensible’ and historically-based and thus difficult

for the excluded to challenge. For the purpose of applying cultural resource theory to participation, it is thus important to problematize cultural capital, as a resource that affects engagement in elite networks” (132).

A vital mechanism in the power dynamics of citizen engagement processes involves the ascription of value to “cultural capital.” Bourdieu (1977) defines “cultural capital” as “instruments of appropriation of symbolic wealth socially designated as worthy of being sought and possessed” (54). In a social network, the “field” affects “cultural capital” along with other factors to determine its actual value; as Bourdieu (1990) states:

Because native membership in a field implies a feel for the game in the sense of a capacity for practical anticipation of the ‘upcoming’ future contained in the present, everything that takes place in it seems sensible: full of sense and objectively directed in a judicious direction. Indeed, one only has to suspend the commitment to the game . . . and the actions performed in it, to absurdity, and to bring up questions about the meaning of the world and existence which people never ask when they are caught up in the game.

(54)

Bourdieu opposed the view of social agents espoused by the Intellectualist tradition, as well as that presented by rational choice theory. As such, Bourdieu’s position is in accord with a Phronesis-based approach’s redefinitions of expertise, situated knowledge, and mechanisms for direct individual citizen engagement. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) opposed the Intellectualist tradition on procedural grounds; he found its “mechanisms of social domination and reproduction were primarily focused on bodily know-how and competent practices in the social world” (119). He opposed rational choice theory, however, for more substantive reasons, because

he viewed it as a misrepresentation and distortion of how social agents act in a field. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) stressed that social agents do not necessarily operate on an explicitly rational or economical criteria, but rather apply their own subjective “habitus” to the field.

Bourdieu (1990), also, dispelled the myth that modern societies that operate on a representational democratic system of government ensure the path to equal opportunity and high social status through formal education. He pointed out that the ruling and intellectual classes monopolize and pass on their social privileges to their progeny across generations at the expense of the underprivileged classes. According to Bourdieu, through a “hidden curriculum,” the education system acts as an enabler for such monopolized social privileges on behalf of the privileged classes (54). Much of Bourdieu work, throughout his life, was focused on the analysis and resolution of inequities created by mechanisms of power distribution in the social world.

Structural-functionalism, social conflict theory, and critical theory are prominent paradigms whose influence on post-industrial societies was entrenched through the vehicle of formal education systems. Their impact on social stratification has only become known through recent school reform efforts and the work of pioneering sociologists like Bourdieu. In the next sub-section, we will examine the impact of those paradigms on social stratification and inequity through the lens of the school reform debate.

4.1.3. Structural-Functionalism/Social Conflict Theory/Critical Theory

The issues surrounding the debate on school reform are often viewed from a variety of theoretical lenses, whose overriding paradigms guide the descriptive and prescriptive conclusions and outcomes adopted by increasingly polarized camps of opponents and proponents. The debate on school reform is both highly political and highly contentious; as the value ascriptions and methodologies advanced by each camp often clash with each other and sometimes within the seemingly unified camps themselves. It is the concern of this sub-section to examine and present an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of those three dominant paradigms, whose configurations and key assumptions helped to shape the debate on school reform and frame its major arguments.

The first part of the sub-section examines a top-down analytical approach of society by exploring the structural-functionalism view on the socializing role of public schools as an agency in an organic social system of integral parts. This paradigm was initially termed functionalism by Emile Durkheim (1997). The term was later expanded to structural-functionalism by Davis and Moore (1945) and others.

The second part of the sub-section will examine social conflict theory, which is the polar opposite of structural-functionalism in that it presents a bottom-up approach to social enquiry. It begins at the level of the individual and builds up to the level of society, through an analysis of the role of conflict in a class struggle for equity. The strengths and weaknesses of conflict theory are examined, as originally posited by Karl Marx (1848) and its later treatment by Bowles and Gintis (1976). The third part of the sub-section will examine Horkheimer (1985) and his critical

theory, as it transcends previous critiques by Marx and Freud regarding the role of the state in advanced capitalism and its implications for public policies on education and school reform. The sub-section then concludes with a review of school reform examples advanced by a perspective view of each of the three paradigms, their strengths and weaknesses, and their implications for present and future school reform.

Structural-functional theories, as conceived by Durkheim (1997) posit a model in which three principles are paramount: structure, culture (which, combined, form the basic foundation of society), and agency (which acts as the actuator of control for the smooth operation of such a society). Durkheim presents his idea of “social solidarity” in the main hypothesis of his book, *The Division of Labor in Society*, by explaining that “divisions of labor normally function to provide the ‘order, harmony, and social solidarity’ that society needs” (63). The main thesis of structural-functionalism is that it views society as a cohesive organism, in which the survival of the whole organism is accomplished by its interdependent parts and the importance of the well-being of the whole of society outweighs that of any individual within it. Such a society is composed of both structure and function. Structures, such as education, actuate stability for such a society in which differentiated functions through the “division of labor” provide it with “smooth operation” (63). Structures, like public schools, have an important stabilizing function for society at large, in that they promote social norms and socialize students to perform and accept their role within the “division of labor” in society.

Davis and Moore (1945) expand the structural-functionism thesis through the relationship between stratification and the social order on which Durkheim's "division of labor" is based. The authors explain this functional requirement by outlining that "as a functioning mechanism a society must somehow distribute its members in social positions and induce them to perform the duties of these positions." The authors argue that their explanation of stratification as a functional aspect of society rests on the premise of its being an inquiry of the "system of positions" rather than of the particular individuals who fill these positions. They explain "it is one thing to ask why different positions carry different degrees of prestige and quite another to ask how certain individuals get into those positions" (39).

Davis and Moore (1945) also expound on social inequality and the reasons for its presence in all societies. They link the phenomena to their view of stratification and present an explanation of the tools needed to control it, stating, "social inequality is thus an unconsciously evolved device by which societies insure that the most important positions are conscientiously filled by the most qualified persons" (40).

This explanation ties in with the functional agency role of public schools in structural functionalism. In liberal democracies, public schools actuate the social integration of students to form a national identity through a meritocratic process of social allocation. In such a process, each student is free to reach full potential as a contributing member of society and to fill an assigned role within society through the student's own effort or merit. In a system that rewards students who exhibit the appropriate behaviours expected of them by their teachers, students who

acquire the behaviours and skills most needed in society are awarded the highest honours that society can bestow on its members.

The various mechanisms of control and regulation that ensure the stability of society also serve to weed out the non-conforming members of society either through punishment or marginalization. At the same time, they confirm the status and reward positions for those members who conform and excel. Schools allocate students to jobs within the hierarchy defined by the “division of labor” in society by sorting them based on achievement. This is done through a graduated scale of performance administered by objective measures of performance, like tests, grades, degrees, and merit awards. At the heart of Foucault’s (1986) critique of utopian and authoritarian systems is the notion that a multitude of practical unsanctified spaces must, by necessity, exist within any society. Within this multitude of ephemeral spaces or heterotopias, some would define differences and deviation from the norms of society, while others are for an escape from its repressive structures and rituals.³⁴

Structural-functionalists describe this method of sorting as an ideology of achievement by merit, in which social mobility is actuated by the agencies like public schools that make it possible for students to improve their performance through additional effort and, likewise, for workers who desire to improve their social standing in society.

4.1.3.1. Social Conflict Theory

³⁴ See Foucault’s (1986) *Of Other Spaces*, based on a lecture given in 1967, for a thorough explanation of his heterotopia concept. See Lefebvre (1991) on the history of spatial thought, in turn influencing urban geographers Soja (2010) and Harvey (1990).

Conflict lies at the heart of social conflict theory and it is blamed for all social change and strife by its early advocate Marx ([1848] 1992) and its later theorists Bowles and Gintis (1976). As was noted earlier, structural functionalists blame the non-conformist individual for harming the stability of society and the non-conformist is also viewed as a failure for not striving for improvement in performance. Conflict theorists, by contrast, blame societal structures and hierarchy for harming the well-being of individuals and for causing conflict between the haves and have-nots through dominance, discrimination, and the inequitable division of resources and opportunities. Conflict theorists are also extremely sceptical of the system of meritocracy and value ascription to patriotism for society's well being advocated by structural functionalists.

Marx ([1848] 1992) would explain that those controlling the resources of society would never voluntarily share these resources or share control with the rest of society. Instead, they promote the illusion of shared control to the masses through "mechanisms of control." Later, authors like Bowles and Gintis (1976) explore those "mechanisms of control" further and ask the following question: "Under what conditions will individuals accept the pattern of social relationships that frame their lives?" They conclude that the most effective way for the powerful to instil the belief in these "mechanism of control" in the powerless is to institute them throughout society at a very young age, in the form of "explicit mechanisms constituted to maintain and extend the dominant patterns of power and privilege. We call the sum total of these mechanisms and their actions the reproduction process" (127).

According to Bowles and Gintis (1976), these mechanisms are inherently linked and instituted in society by various agencies, like public schools, to reproduce consciousness in the powerless masses. Public schools maintain the status quo for the powerful by instituting a system of education based on conformity and unquestionable adherence to rules and obedience to authority. Bowles and Gintis explain this role by pointing out that “education works primarily through the institutional relations to which students are subjected. Thus schooling fosters and rewards the development of certain capacities and the expression of certain needs, while thwarting and penalizing others.” The authors link this system of education to value ascriptions at the level of the individual and to the “division of labor” for society. They conclude, “through these institutional relationships, the educational system tailors the self-concepts, aspirations, and social class identification of individuals to the requirements of the social division of labor” (129).

4.1.3.2. Critical Theory

The term critical theory is attributed to the German philosopher Horkheimer (1985) of the Frankfurt School of Social Theory. His work built on, and was inspired by, previous critiques of Marx and Freud. Marx (1975) defined critical theory as “the self-clarification of the struggles and wishes of the age” (209). Horkheimer, in turn, extended the previous definition of critical theory to offer what Steven Dandaneau (2001) explains as “a self-conscious and generalized approach to social theory that would transcend its particular origins in Marx, Freud and others” (231).

As we can see from the above, critical theory's scope extends beyond that of social conflict theory; it also seeks to give a vital role to "values" in its analysis of the achievement ideology promoted by structural-functionalists. It does so by positing a historical analysis of value ascriptions in education through various eras of US history. It also analyzes conflict as an ideological struggle not merely between classes, but as a result of the state's adoption of the dominant ideology of that era and its economic, political, and social mechanisms of intervention to secure the outcome for that ideology.

This treatment is brought to bear on the role of the state in public education as it exerts its control by dominating the school reform debate and controlling the framework. It dictates what constitutes legitimate values while advancing its own measures of school performance and accountability, all within the context of late capitalism. The role of public officials as agents of state intervention is illustrated by the various mandates on school reform that characterize election campaign promises of elected officials, like that of ex-president George W. Bush in the United States. It also explains the dominance of technological fixes for what is essentially a value-laden educational system, which requires a debate on what constitutes relevant values in a pluralistic society. Thus, we often see that the competition between schools is driven by the lure of technological endowments to "deserving" schools rather than on the basis of effective knowledge transmission and meaningful discourse on relevant value ascriptions.

Dandaneau (2001) summarizes the scope of critical theorists as he says "in agreement with Marx, critical theorists view capitalism as an irrational, contradictory, oppressive, albeit dynamic

and productive, economic system” (227). Dandaneau points out the contradictory nature of capitalism, as comprehended by critical theorists, in that it is dehumanizing and the source of social crisis, while also being the source of progress, materially and technologically. He goes on to say that because of this characteristic of late capitalism, critical theorists needed to advance their analysis “beyond Marx’s primary analytical focus on the internal dynamics of the capitalist economic system, *per se*, to include analyses of the political and cultural processes increasingly essential in the sustained and legitimate reproduction of 20th-century capitalist society” (228).

Structural-functionalism, conflict theory, and critical theory can be viewed as occupying different positions on a theoretical scale that has the humanist tradition at one polar end and the systemic/elitist tradition at the other pole. Within this view, both conflict theory and critical theory can be judged as humanist perspectives of society because they are substantively concerned with equity and the individual. In the case of critical theory, this concern is expressed procedurally as well, with its emphasis on value transmission and the importance of historical context. Critical theory, however, may occupy a farther position from the humanist pole as compared to conflict theory because its method of inquiry is inherently analytical, which subjects its conclusions to generalizations. Structural-functionalism occupies a prominent position within the systemic/elitist perspective because both its methods of inquiry and its substantive theory are inherently hierarchal.

While structural-functionalists place the blame for the failure of minority students on the students’ own lack of effort and initiative, conflict theorist would place the blame on the schools

and their teachers and administrators as perpetuating a system of inequality and conformity through mechanisms of control. Critical theorists would go further to explain how, throughout the history of education, value transmission and its utility have been used by the elite to keep the masses subjugated. Structural-functionalists often promote their methods of education as equitable and colour-blind and cite programs, ranging from language to the arts and music, as level playing fields for all students. Conflict theorist would expose such programs as biased from inception to favour native English speakers at the expense of immigrant populations. They would also argue that quantifiable measures of performance also favour the normative values of the elite over those of the working class and the disadvantaged.

Performance and accountability are the terms most often used by politicians and policy-makers to gauge and control educational policy agendas. They do little, however, to identify and eliminate degenerate policies that institute racism in the school system and divide the constituents and their school-age children into “categories of deservedness” (Newton 2005). These social constructions, which are often posited as societal norms by elite policy analysts and policy-makers, reflect a politically powerful majority stance that substantively deepen the level of inequity within the school system.

Such policies on education reform often embody, within their core assumptions, values and constructions of deservedness that are borrowed from immigration policies, such as the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. Newton (2005) explains, “in addition to reflecting the prevailing values of politicians and their constituents, these debates

produce recognizable, recurrent depictions of groups-depictions that politicians manipulated and juxtaposed to support the final design of the IIRAIRA” (164). Such values are often consolidated at the level of policy design and are distilled from key assumptions of such dominant theoretical paradigms, as is the case of the three discussed in this sub-section. They are often presented as the product of consensus, while in reality they are the result of conflict and dominance of one paradigm over the others. It is often a paradigm whose proponents have consolidated political power and framed the debate to reflect the issues from their particular perspective; such is the state of the debate on school reform in its present manifestation.

4.2. Examples of Phronesis-Based Approaches in Other Domains

In the last decade, interest and research on Phronesis has increased exponentially compared to past decades. Examples of the use of Phronesis in case studies are still few and far between, however, the debate and discussions focusing on Phronesis are not in short supply and they are spread over a wide range of fields and disciplines.

- In philosophy and the history of ideas, the work of Michel Foucault, in particular *Discipline and Punish* (1995) and the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* (1990); as well as the work of Mitchell Dean (2009); Jan Goldstein (2005); Baert Patrick, Sokratis Koniordos, Giovanna Procacci, and Carlo Ruzza (2010); Arpad Szakolczai (2009); Joseph Rouse (2008); and Ian Hacking’s (1995) *Rewriting the Soul*.
- In sociology, the work of Pierre Bourdieu; in particular *Acts of Resistance: Against the Tyranny of the Market* (1999), *On Television* (1998), *The Logic of Practice* (1990), and

Outline of a Theory of Practice (1977); Bruno Latour, in particular, *Aramis, or the Love of Technology and Science in Action* (1996); as well as Robert Bellah's (1996) *Habits of the Heart*.

- In political science, Wendy Brown's (1995) *States of Injury*; Barbara Cruikshank's (1999) *The Will to Empower*; Eric Darier's (1999) *Discourse of the Environment*; and Francois Ewald's (1986) *L'Etat Providence*; as well as Barry Hindess' (1996) *Discourses of Power: From Hobbes to Foucault*; Mitchell Dean and Barry Hindess' (1998) *Governing Australia: Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government*; and Robert Putnam, Leonardi, and Nanetti's (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*.
- In gender studies, Martin Duberman's (1994) *Stonewall*; Sandra Bartky's (1992) *Femininity and Domination*; Judith Butler's (2010) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*; and Nancy Fraser's (1998) *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*; as well as Naomi Wolf's (1998) *Promiscuities: The Secret Struggle for Womanhood*.
- In anthropology, the work of Paul Rabinow: *French DNA: Trouble in Purgatory* (1999) and *Making PCR: A Story of Biotechnology* (1996) are particularly of note.
- In management and accounting, the work of Peter Miller (2008) is particularly relevant, as is Mennicken and Miller (2012).
- In geography, the work of Ed Soja (2010); and in development studies, the work of James Ferguson (2010).

- In urban studies and planning, the work of Jonathan Crush (Crush, Frayne, and Pendleton 2012); Margo Huxley (2011); Ole Jensen (2011); Tim Richardson (Hrelja, Isaksson, and Richardson 2012); and Oren Yiftachel (2009).

Bent Flyvbjerg's (2001) work, *Making Social Science Matter*, is central to this chapter's research. It also provides, in the Aalborg Project, a solid example of the positive influence that a researcher utilizing praxis can exert in guiding municipal planning along phronetic sensibilities. The book also informs the examples of Phronesis listed here. Flyvbjerg has targeted his critique of the case study method to social science disciplines in general; he is concerned, in particular, with its usage in political science and public policy. His conclusions on its applicability for phronetic research rests on the premise that within the framework of power politics, collective group behaviour may be generalizable based on exemplary context-dependent case study conclusions. That premise may well be defensible; however, this dissertation's suppositions diverge from Flyvbjerg's premise and his critique of the case study method in two significant ways:

First, a Phronesis-based approach is applied to the role of individuals within the context of expertise and the interplay between authority and local place knowledge. This is in contrast to Flyvbjerg's (2001) phronetic research context of group dynamics in power politics. While Flyvbjerg's phronetic social science offers prescriptive recommendations for "making social science work," this dissertation treats its Phronesis-based approach as a self-help guide for

citizen practitioners, ordinary and professional alike, to enhance and complement existing practices rather than replace them.

Second, for this dissertation, the goal of redefining of the case study method as a method of learning in direct engagement is to operationalize the experiential narrative exchange of citizen practitioners as a form of citizen praxis. This is within the context of local place knowledge for neighbourhood projects. Its premise is based on direct, rather than indirect, citizen engagement and on individual lay citizen praxis resulting in prudent singular outcomes, rather than on collective civic action geared towards increasing social capital and political representation.

A more recent contribution is the work of urban planner, Beth Moore Milroy (2009). In *Thinking, Planning and Urbanism*, this author offers a reconstruction of the planning processes in a case study of Yonge and Dundas urban core area of the city of Toronto, Canada. The author uses an approach that is decidedly phronetic both in its focus on the immediate context and the author's own immersion in its rich details, although the author does not name it as such. The author investigates the dichotomy between two proposals for the site presented by the planning department of the city of Toronto.

The proposals represented competing theories of space conceptualization: technical aesthetic and socioeconomic conceptions of the urban core area under study. The author also raises valid questions on the effectiveness and relevancy “of the theories planners use to inform their work on a planned intervention such as this” (Milroy 2009, 1). The author argues that prominent

theories of planning do not provide an adequate support for practicing planners seeking relevant and creative solutions to post-industrial conditions of modern urbanity. The author concludes that there is a present need for the planning profession to adopt a broader understanding of such conditions in a new form of urbanism and “for a reciprocal readjustment between the form of urban tissue and the forms of engaging with each other” (2).³⁵

Another study of note is conducted by Yli-Pelkonen and Kohl (2005). The authors explain the findings from a comprehensive study of the role of local ecological knowledge as follows:

This paper is a study of the role of local ecological knowledge (LEK) as lay-expert knowledge in the urban land use planning process in Finland ... Considering LEK in urban planning is important because it complements scientific ecological data and indicates places important to locals. Some of the challenges of using LEK include collecting it through participatory planning processes, distinguishing it from other information, valuing subjective knowledge, and empowering planning officials to use LEK. To enhance communication between stakeholders, social scientists should be integrated in the planning process.³⁶ (x)

4.3. Applying a Phronesis-Based Approach for Case Study Research

³⁵ For a rigorous example of the value of Phronesis in the fields of Strategic Management and Catastrophe Preparedness, see Matt Statler, Johan Roos, and Bart Victor’s (2006) “Illustrating the Need for Practical Wisdom” published in the *International Journal of Management Concepts and Philosophy* 2(1). The case study explores catastrophe preparedness post-September 11, 2001 and documents the staff activities of *The Center for Catastrophe Preparedness and Response* as they carry out their duties.

³⁶ For an example demonstrating the positive effect of integrating local environmental knowledge of local citizens into municipal planning and social policy processes, see Vesa Yli-Pelkonen and Johanna Kohl’s (2005) paper, “The role of local ecological knowledge in sustainable urban planning: Perspectives from Finland” published in *Sustainability: Science, Practice, and Policy* 1(1). The authors demonstrate the positive role that lay-expertise plays in advancing responsive and relevant plans and policies for local municipalities in Finland with its strong tradition of architecture/planning and a deep concern for its nature.

Contemporary case study research is complicated by its controversial standing as an effective methodology. A multitude of misconceptions surround the nature of the case study as a research method where its viability as a scientific method has been questioned. Bent Flyvbjerg (2001) explores these misunderstandings in his book *Making Social Science Matter*. The author explains that adhering to the teachings of Socrates and Plato, out of which the hypothetical-deductive scientific model has its origins, can only preoccupy us with deductions and general principles, applied to large samples. Flyvbjerg emphasizes, “Going into depth with an individual case is seen as unproductive. The question, however, is where a singular focus on deduction and general principles leads. I will argue that in social science such a focus leads to a dead end” (71).

Flyvbjerg (2001) summarizes the general antagonism against case study research into five misunderstandings, which are generally viewed as weaknesses of the case study approach. They are as follows:

1. “General theoretical (context-independent) knowledge is more valuable than concrete, practical (context-dependent) knowledge.” (66)
2. “One cannot generalize on the basis of an individual case; therefore, the case study cannot contribute to scientific development.” (66)
3. “The case study is most useful for generating hypotheses; that is, in the first stage of a total research process, while other methods are more suitable for hypothesis testing and theory building.” (66-67)

4. “The case study contains a bias toward verification, that is, a tendency to confirm the researcher’s preconceived notions.” (67)
5. “It is often difficult to develop general propositions and theories on the basis of specific case studies.” (67)

These misunderstandings have important implications for any treatment of the case study approach in social theory and in its research and practices. Behind the lack of transparency presented by these misunderstandings lies a truer picture of the case study’s strengths, vitality, and potential for leading the social sciences out of its current difficulties. These misunderstandings do in fact present a major obstacle to the method’s adoption and validation by the scientific community. Flyvbjerg (2001) explains, “These five misunderstandings indicate that it is theory, reliability, and validity which are at issue” (66). He goes on to explain that “the single most important explanation for the persistence of the five misunderstandings about the case study method is that it contradicts Plato’s teachings and tradition, and that this tradition is at the core of modern social science” (66-67).

Plato followed his teacher Socrates’ quest for the existence of general principles of knowledge. While Socrates’ quest for such universals proved fruitless, the answers he postulated pointed to concrete case studies instead. Socrates’ refusals to accept those postulations lead him to nihilistic conclusions. Plato, by contrast, rejected Socrates’ nihilistic conclusions while adopting his teacher’s quest for universals. Plato became, as Flyvbjerg (2001) reminds us, “one of the authentic founders of Western philosophy and of theoretical science” (71).

Plato's student, Aristotle, who is considered the founder of empirical science, had disagreed with his teacher's conclusions that a focus on universals has any bearing on the study of human activity. Aristotle pointed out that while universals may describe patterns discernable in inanimate objects, This does not have any bearing on living things. He, therefore, advocated the study of living things on a case-by-case basis.

Western science, consequently, adopted Plato's conclusions in its conventions while ignoring, or perhaps forgetting, Aristotle's reassessment of those conclusions. Flyvbjerg informs us "Galileo, two thousand years later, showed that Plato's ideas work well for the study of nature and set the natural sciences on their revolutionary trajectory. A similar development has not taken place for the social sciences." Flyvbjerg explains, "the social sciences have not made a breakthrough as epistemic sciences, and there is nothing which indicates that this will occur. Reinforced by the success of the natural sciences, Plato's thinking continues to thrive, as does the natural-science ideal in the study of humans and society" (Flyvbjerg 2001, 71).

The social sciences' present predicament is tied directly to its futile quest for predictive theory. The social sciences' lack of hard theory is compensated for by its richness in concrete, context-dependent knowledge gleaned from case study methodology. Researchers are slowly reconsidering their once rigid preconceptions about the case study method and are beginning to use it in new and creative ways. Donald Campbell (1975), D. T. Campbell and M. H. Bickhard (2003), Hans Eysenck (1995), Charles Ragin and Howard Becker (1992), among others, are

examples of researchers who were once opponents of case study research and have subsequently become some of its greatest proponents.

The five weaknesses or misunderstandings about the case study method, as summarized by Flyvbjerg (2001), can be restated as its greatest strengths, they are as follows:

1. "Predictive theories and universals cannot be found in the study of human affairs. Concrete, context-dependent knowledge is therefore more valuable than the vain search for predictive theories and universals." (73)
2. "One can often generalize on the basis of a single case, and the case study may be central to scientific development via generalization as supplement or alternative to other methods. But formal generalization is overvalued as a source of scientific development, whereas 'the power of the good example' is underestimated." (77)
3. "The case study is useful for both generating and testing of hypotheses but is not limited to these research activities alone." (77)
4. "The case study contains no greater bias toward verification of the researcher's preconceived notions than other methods of inquiry. On the contrary, experience indicates that the case study contains a greater bias toward falsification of preconceived notions than toward verification." (84)
5. "It is correct that summarizing case studies is often difficult, especially as concerns process. It is less correct as regards outcomes. The problems in summarizing case studies, however, are due more often to the properties of the

reality studied than to the case study as a research method. Often it is not desirable to summarize and generalize case studies. Good studies should be read in their entirety.” (86)

In conclusion, it should be noted that, at present, the balance between research that focuses on large random samples or on entire populations and that which focuses on case studies is biased toward the former in social science. This bias is evident in most disciplines and has resulted in impeding the role of case studies in advancing those disciplines.

Aristotle’s ([384 BC] 1976) insight, that case knowledge is crucial to the practice of Phronesis, helped to determine its hierarchal importance within this chapter’s conceptual framework, as well as its role in linking both sides of the research equation, qualitatively and quantitatively. Although, the concept of Phronesis could well be applied to other social science methods other than the case study method, its special emphasis and historical ties with the case study method makes it ideally suited for it. Other methods can accommodate the concept of Phronesis with varying degrees of success depending on the prevalence of universal assumptions and degree of empirical control that any particular method requires of its findings.

Aristotle ([384 BC] 1976) assigned a leading role for case studies and context in understanding human behaviour. The Dreyfus (1986) model, Flyvbjerg’s (2001) proposal of a phronetic social science, and Bourdieu’s (1977) theory of practice reinforce Aristotle’s vision in its emphasis on experience and the particular. While quantitative methods are often viewed as possessing

discipline and rigor, the same charity of view is not usually extended to case study methods. The observation that case study methods possess their own rigor, which differs from that of quantitative methods, is without question. Campbell (1975) explains, “in a case study done by an alert social scientist who has thorough local acquaintance, the theory he uses to explain the focal difference also generates prediction or expectations on a dozen of other aspects of the culture, and he does not retain the theory unless most of these are also confirmed . . . Experiences of social scientists confirm this” (182). From what Campbell has alluded to, it is obvious that what characterizes the case study approach is falsification rather than verification. Campbell goes on to say, “Even in a single qualitative case study, the conscientious social scientist finds no explanation that seems satisfactory. Such an outcome would be impossible if the caricature of the single case study as presented . . . was correct - there would instead be a surfeit of subjectively compelling explanations” (183).

In the above passage, Campbell (1975) characterizes the social scientist as a conscientious scientist, a quality that guides his research conduct. This conscientiousness is the hallmark of *Phronesis* and it finds its greatest application in the case study method. Flyvbjerg (2001) also addresses arbitrary subjectivism in a quantitative or structural investigation, where bias is significant in the choice of categories and variables. He gives an example of a structured questionnaire to be used across a large sample of cases and notes that the probability is high “(1) that this subjectivism survives without being thoroughly corrected during the study and (2) that it may affect the results, quite simply because the quantitative/structural researcher does not get as close to those under study as does the case study researcher” (Flyvbjerg 2001, 83).

Additionally, case study researchers practicing *Phronesis* do not dominate the case narrative but rather allow the richness and variety of evidence to make different interpretations possible and lead to diverse conclusions. Flyvbjerg (2001) relays Andrew Abbott's observation that "a social science expressed in terms of typical case narratives would provide far better access for policy intervention than present social science of variables" (86). Flyvbjerg correctly surmises, "A focus on concrete cases does not exclude the attempts at empirical generalizations typical of much social and political science. Such generalizations are perfectly compatible with cases and with narrative. Cases exist in context. What has been called the 'primacy of context' follows from the empirical fact that in the history of science, human action has shown itself to be irreducible to predefined elements and rules unconnected to interpretation" (136).

Where it concerns *praxis*, however, context-dependent judgment rather than first principles or theories are applicable. Flyvbjerg (2001) tells us that "the minutiae, practices, and concrete cases which lie at the heart of *phronetic* research are seen in their proper contexts; both the small, local context, which gives phenomena their immediate meaning, and the larger, international and global context in which phenomena can be appreciated for their general and conceptual significance" (136).

Despite the stereotypical portrayal of the case study method in social sciences as a weak

research method,³⁷ it has been and continues to be, extensively used in a multitude of disciplines and fields. Its continued relevance suggests that the stereotype is wrong and that social scientists have often misunderstood its strengths and weaknesses. In this sub-section of the chapter, a clarification of the status and uses of case studies in social science as well as its strengths and weaknesses will follow, along with an explanation of how the concept of Phronesis can impact the case study's distinguishing features. According to Yin (2003), these features are problem definition, design, data collection, data analysis, and composition and reporting (xiv).

One of the core difficulties that faces any researcher utilizing Phronesis in realigning the work of quantitative and quasi-experimental case study approaches, like that of Robert Yin, is that one must challenge it on its own grounds by casting doubt on its theory, validity, and reliability. In essence, one must break down its claims to having achieved those hallmarks of conformity to science's goals and methods in order to rebuild it again with a phronetic conceptual framework. Donald Campbell, in his forward to Yin's book, explains, "the case study approach as presented here, and quasi-experimentation more generally, is more similar to the experimental isolation paradigm than to the randomized-assignment-to-treatment model in that each rival hypothesis must be specific and specifically controlled for" (Yin 2003: x).

Campbell considers Yin's approach as pushing the boundary of scientifically controlled methods in its reach for "a humanistic validity-seeking case study methodology that, although making no use of qualification or tests of significance, would still work on the same questions and share the

³⁷ See Chima 2005, Fenno 1986, Lamnek 2005, Sheppard and Greene 2003, Stake 1995, Thomas 2001, and Wieviorka 1992.

same goals of knowledge” (Yin, 2003: ix-x) Additionally, Campbell views Yin’s term “a humanistic validity-seeking case study” as a goal both desired and unreachable for quantitative researchers, in that the very methodologies they use to achieve it invalidate the data they seek to generalize and replicate. This represents the very antithesis of Phronesis, which seeks to balance instrumental-rationality with value-rationality and whose case study approach is grounded in context laden practical knowledge.

Yin’s (2003) technical definition of the case study illustrates his ideological emulation of the natural sciences. This, presumably, is an influence of his education and training in experimental psychology, where he states “A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomena and context are not clearly evident” (13). The author contends that issues of context should be integral to the empirical investigation conducted, but he fails to see that this qualification assumes that issues of context can be isolated from the phenomena studied and can be assigned a quantitatively measurable factor in the analysis. Both of these assumptions fail where theory, validity, and reliability are concerned, as was shown earlier, through the discussion of the five weaknesses or misunderstandings about case study methodology, as summarized by Flyvbjerg (2001).

Yin (2003) goes further in his operational definition by allowing for the difficulty in isolating the phenomena from the context. He does this, by adding a new set of technical characteristics that

he claims will enable the researcher to set clearer boundaries between the two in his final analysis. Yin states:

The case study inquiry copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variable of interest than data points, and as one result relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and as another result benefits from the development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. (14)

Yin's technical additions to his operational definition do not explicate the researcher from the dilemma of separating phenomena from context on objective rather than subjective grounds. This definition remains a futile exercise in emulation of the scientific method at the expense of social science's richest resource, context-laden reflexive analysis. Sadly, Yin's emulation of the natural sciences follows the mainstream practice in the social sciences. Plato's and Socrates' views of the case study approach have become the hallmark of western science, which has embraced the viewpoint of Socrates and Plato and ignored Aristotle's conclusions on the significance of context-based case studies in comprehending human behaviour.

Flyvbjerg (2001) contends that the phenomenology of human learning and its five-step process is useful in elucidating two important points, either one of which can refute Plato's and Socrates' views of the case study approach. The first point, according to Flyvbjerg, is that "the case study produces precisely the type of context-dependent knowledge which makes it possible to move from the lower to the higher levels in the learning process" (70). The Dreyfus model of human learning, Flyvbjerg tells us "emphasizes the importance of gaining concrete experience as a precondition for the qualitative leap from the rule-governed analytical rationality of the first

three levels to the intuitive, holistic, and synchronous performance of tacit skills of the last two levels” (70).

For the researcher practicing *Phronesis*, that leap is an important hierarchical transition from rule governed context-independent knowledge to context-dependent practical knowledge where value rationality governs. This process also melds the application of the case study method in research and in teaching into one cohesive whole. By doing so, it reverses the conventional hierarchy that dominates social science research in which the qualitative approach takes the leading role in case study research as a learning method.

In the second point, Flyvbjerg (2001) states, “In the study of human affairs, there exists only context-dependent knowledge, which thus presently rules out the possibility of epistemic theoretical construction” (71).

Empirical researchers, like Yin (2003), choose to follow the conventional hierarchy instead, but not without yearning for an alternative strategy that goes beyond his formulaic approach to case study research. In the conclusion of his book Yin confesses, “In all of case study research, one of the most challenging tasks is to define an exemplary case study. Although no direct evidence is available, some speculation seems an appropriate way of concluding this book.” (160) Yin outlines five general characteristics of an exemplary case study as follows: “The case study must be significant, the case study must be complete, the case study must consider alternative

perspectives, the case study must display sufficient evidence and the case study must be composed in an engaging manner.” (163-164)

These five characteristics, while seeming to leave room for a phronetic perspective, in actuality negate that possibility through Yin’s (2003) insistence that they must be applied empirically to all cases and without sensitivity to context. Yin then muddies the issue further by concluding, “even if you, as a case study investigator, have followed most of the basic techniques—using a case study protocol, maintaining a chain of evidence, establishing a case study database, and so on—you still may not have produced an exemplary case study.” Yin goes on to say, “the mastering of these techniques makes you a good technician but not necessarily an esteemed scientist” (161).

Yin (2003) continues, “To take but one analogy, consider the difference between a chronicler and a historian: The former is technically correct but does not produce the insights into human or social processes provided by the latter” (161). Interestingly, Yin seems to indicate that “mastering techniques” on its own, would not allow a researcher to leap from the level of a technician to that of an “esteemed scientist.” Yin’s position, here, is akin to the Dreyfus method of human learning, in which the necessary leap to expertise can only be achieved qualitatively through personal experience.

Yin, additionally, makes the claim that his book, *Case Study Research: Design and*

Methods, is “a comprehensive presentation of the case study method.” In other words Yin’s book is a formulaic presentation of empirical case study doctrine that leaves no room for discussion or for opposing points of view on the process and application of the case study method. By Yin’s own admission “this book can be (and apparently has been) used as a complete “cookbook” on case studies” (Yin 2003, xiv).

Yin (2003) also delineates the case study method into separate research and teaching applications, claiming a fundamental difference between the two instances, in the manner and manipulation of the collected data. Yin informs us “the criteria for developing good cases for teaching-usually of the single and not multiple-case variety-are far different from those for doing case study research. Teaching case studies need not be concerned with the rigorous and fair presentation of empirical data; research case studies need to do exactly that” (2).

This view is the antithesis of expert activity, which holds that context-dependent knowledge and experience meld research and teaching into a cohesive method of learning. Flyvbjerg (2001) explains that in order to move beyond the third level of learning to the fourth and fifth levels one must accumulate case experience. Adherence to rote learning of rules and context-independent knowledge will keep learning at the first level.

This limitation of analytical rationality has disturbing implications on the adequacy of researchers and educators trained in context-independent methodology in advancing the state of

knowledge. This is not to say that facts and rule-based knowledge do not have their place in research, what is disputable is their leadership role in such research.

As for the case study approach, Flyvbjerg (2001) also points out that it is important in two respects: “First, in order to acquire a richly-articulated perspective of reality, theories and rule-dominated actions stemming from the first level of learning can not explain human behaviour.” As for the second, Flyvbjerg says, “cases are important for researchers’ own learning process in developing the skills needed to do good research. If researchers wish to develop their own skills to a high level, then concrete, context-dependent experience is just as central for them as to professionals learning any other specific skills” (72). Case studies, which are undertaken in depth, at close range, and via feedback from the subject of study, are an effective methodology for advanced research.

Yin’s empirical sensibilities dominate his views on the design and selection of case studies. Yin informs us “Individual case studies are to be selected as a laboratory investigator selects the topic of a new experiment. Multiple cases, in this sense, should be considered like multiple experiments.” Yin, then, elaborates on the role of generalization of empirical evidence gathered in the case study and the researcher’s subsequent claims to replication of those results by stating, “Under these circumstances, the mode of generalization is ‘analytical generalization’, in which a previously developed theory is used as a template with which to compare the empirical results of the case study. If two or more cases are shown to support the same theory, replication may be claimed” (Yin 2003, 32).

Yin's (2003) convictions on the relevance and importance of epistemic theoretical construction to the case study method are abundantly clear. Yin states, "The use of theory, in doing case studies, is not only an immense aid in defining the appropriate research design and data collection but also becomes the main vehicle for generalizing the results of the case study" (33). It is clear that Yin's views on the applicability of epistemic theoretical construction run counter to the three fundamental elements of Phronesis, namely, context, value-rationality, and practical knowledge. Each of those elements runs counter to instrumental rationality and its premise of context-independent knowledge of the variety that Yin advocates.

Claims regarding the generalization of the results of case study research in the social sciences have two fallacies in their core assumptions about the nature of human behaviour, they are as follows:

The first fallacy is that the study of human beings and human societies are comparable to the object of study in the natural sciences (which is the study of inanimate objects that are assumed to be in stasis). This fallacy leads to the core assumption of quantitative and empirical researchers, which is that the empirical methods and theoretical construction developed by natural scientists are valid and relevant to the social sciences as well. Yin's (2003) application of these empirical principles in the design and methods of case study research is an example of his adoption of this assumption.

The second fallacy is that the researcher can remain independent of the object/subject of his study and its context, and that research experience can only come from rote learning and repeated exposure to rule governed behaviour. This fallacy stems from the assumption that researcher objectivity is a fundamental requirement of empirical research given its emphasis on theory, validity, and reliability rather than researchers practical experience. This assumption runs counter to phronetic sensibilities and to the reality of the daily application of research practice.

In summary, one can redefine the case study method in the following manner: The case study as a method of learning undertaken in depth, at close range, and via a two-way situated knowledge exchange with the subject of study is an effective methodology for social science research and for planning, architecture, urban design, and policy design. As such, it is characterized by three fundamentals of phronetic research: context, value-rationality, and praxis.

This recommendation culminates in a redefinition of the case study methodology along phronetic lines. It is hoped that case study research, when utilized by participatory researchers, architects, planners, and policy-makers, is reinvigorated as an indispensable tool in their practices, wherein ordinary citizens can participate integrally as citizen practitioners. However, it must be noted that this approach must be viewed as only one attempt among many that will require further methodological and conceptual refinement.

The social sciences are currently facing difficulties that require reorientation of both their methodologies and their purpose. I contend that adopting a case study approach that is guided by

phronetic sensibility in conducting higher-level research would advance the state of research in social science. It may well prove to be the precise response to social science's need for rehabilitation in its present context.

4.4. A Phronesis-Based Approach to Citizen Participation and Engagement

The challenges and issues facing citizen participation/engagement are a pressing area of concern for planners, architects, urban designers, policy-makers, public officials, and non-profit organizations, as well as for community-based participatory researchers. Citizens engaging in issues and decisions that have an impact on their lives have mandated special attention and deliberation from their societies both in contemporary times and in ancient antiquity.

Altshuler and Luberoff (2003) expound on the activism of that era in North America, as they explain, “the 1960s were a decade of citizen activism combined with a spreading awareness of the disruption associated with urban mega-projects. This activism found many outlets but three are of particular significance in the present context: the movement for civil rights, citizen participation and (toward the end of the decade), environmental protection” (22).

Altshuler and Luberoff (2003) describe citizen participation efforts as having arisen out of a growing sense of individual frustration, compounded by disfranchisement and a desire for personal and political empowerment by ordinary citizens at a grassroots level of society. Such issues are at the heart of the phronetic discourse, which addresses them at both the individual level and at the level of society. This individual sense of frustration culminated in a nation-wide

movement described by the authors as, “the movement for citizen participation was organized, above all, around the premise that citizens had a right to be consulted in timely fashion and with access to all pertinent evidence, about government deliberations that might profoundly affect them” (Altshuler and Luberoff 2003, 22).

The other two factors, namely, the civil rights movement and the environmental movement are expounded upon by Chong (1991), who uncovers the underlying social factors shaping the indirect form of citizen participation that culminated in these two movements. The author explains, “Successful past collective action proves that a considerable number of people are willing to participate in collective action. Social pressure presumes that people are linked by membership in the same community and therefore share common bases of information” (121).

The brief history of the two forms of citizen participation described above highlights a key observation for this section, in that citizen participation as a social phenomenon has undergone what can only be described as an evolutionary process of development. In the first half of the last century, citizen participation emerged in its indirect form, which was more attuned to, and as a consequence more malleable to, the influence of conservative and institutional forces that reigned at the time. The latter half of the century saw the emergence of a direct form of participation because of greater awareness of its benefits highlighted by accumulating research in the behavioural science and psychology fields. There was, as well, growing disillusion and dissatisfaction with the outcomes of the previous half century of citizen activism.

Alan Altshuler and David Luberoff (2003) describe this shift in societal norms for the period leading to the present by explaining that “by the end of the 1970s mega-program reversals were occurring universally. A satisfactory explanation of these program reversals must, we judge, be organized around two themes: the general and to date unique surge in citizen activism that occurred during the 1960s, and social learning” (252). The authors also point out that the nature of the dynamics of that period, which brought about mega-program reversals, also represented an end to an era of strong command-control policies.

Such an ideological shift moves the debate to a political level in which ordinary citizens must have an active voice. The role of citizens in effectively mitigating the effects of such a conflict is made more difficult by two limitations inherent to the socio-political realities of living in a liberal industrial society. The first of these limitations concerns the lack of effective representation of the voice of individual working-class citizens in the social policy arena. Sherry and Charles Cable (1995) remark on this limitation as they ask, “The essential question inherent in grassroots environmental conflict, and a question which you as a citizen of the world must eventually resolve for yourself, is this: Who should make the decisions that may result in dangerous environmental consequences? Corporate and governmental officials? The public at large? The citizens whose environments, and personal health, will be directly affected?” (117).

These questions point to the need for an internal dialogue, on the individual level, something akin to the values and personal experiences that enrich an individual’s locally situated knowledge of the issues that surround the daily existence of that individual. This dialogue, which

must occur on a personal level, may lead to self-empowerment that, in itself, may instigate social change. Such self-empowerment may lead an individual to seek a role in mitigating social change through some form of participation, whether indirectly through a grassroots organization or through direct citizen participation/engagement. Cable and Cable (1995) remark, “Environmental activism is a strongly politicizing experience, and the grassroots organization becomes a vehicle for self empowerment” (120). Such self-empowerment, and the internal debate and reflective discourse that precede it, are inherently phronetic processes that culminate in a meaningful role for that individual in society.

The second limitation facing citizens concerns the hegemony of institutionally recognized experts and their monopoly over the access to “legitimate knowledge,” which in turn monopolizes the process leading to decision-making authority. By contrast, Phronesis invests expertise at the individual level beyond the reach of institutions by recognizing that “meaningful knowledge” or praxis is the highest form of acquired knowledge, and that expertise is its ultimate form (Cables and Cable 1995, 118).

Alastair Iles (2004) writes, “People living and working in the neighbourhoods that surround chemical facilities are using local knowledge both to gain entrance to decision-making inside plants and to challenge the industry’s hegemony over defining what counts as expert knowledge.” The author also argues, “As a result, the meaning of expertise can potentially change away from specialized skills and knowledge to a more general criterion of being prepared to participate in decision-making inside and outside plants on both local and global scales” (286).

While the phronetic notion of expertise is able to invest an individual citizen with a meaningful role as a citizen practitioner, it is inherently not scalable to the levels that political systems require. Iles' (2004) observation on the malleability of the notion of expertise to serve political ends does not have a parallel in Phronesis. Although contemporary writers like Flyvbjerg (2001) have, through his definition of phronetic research, attempted to invest the concept of Phronesis with political connotations, in reality such links to power do not exist in the classical definition of Phronesis as articulated by Aristotle ([384 BC] 1976). Phronesis is practiced at the individual level, in context, and by an individual exercising value-rationality while drawing insights from a personal trough of life experiences. Praxis, as such, cannot be melded to fit political agendas or advance the standards of political movements. It remains an individual endeavour shaped by personal experience and guided by prudence of action. However, a society comprised of such prudent individuals could be viewed as possessing the level of equity, participation, and values that are the hallmarks of a truly principled democracy.

Foremost in the debate over citizen participation/engagement is the realization that our predominant tools and research methods to achieve effective and relevant citizen participation/engagement are inadequate for such purposes. The debate has changed direction as well, from one where socio-political issues determined outcomes that were legislated into laws to one where economic and political considerations sit at the forefront of the debate, acting as strangleholds that are increasingly mired in controversy.

This dissertation advances concepts that are central to citizen participation in both its forms (direct and indirect participation) and for both levels of intensity (participation and engagement). Value-rationality is paramount among these concepts, in that the values codified by any society are the sum of the individual values of each of its members, a bottom-up process, rather than a top-down imposition of group values on its individual members. Values emerge from the expressed actions of individual citizens as they conduct their daily lives. Society in turn codifies these values in a process of social coercion and cohesion forming social groups in the process. The process, as Bourdieu (1997) pointed out, is two-way: as individuals interact with their social context and acquire its codified values from it, they in turn transform those values and transmit them back to society through their unique individual praxis. Individuals, however, do suffer a loss of personal values when they ascribe to the values of a group.

Group activism, by its very nature, tends to erode individual initiative and personal modes of expression by limiting them to group parameters and channelling group efforts through established avenues and methodologies, rather than through creative or newly initiated paths. The process by which social groups consolidate and achieve group power and group identity is by applying social coercion to its members in order to achieve the appearance of social cohesion. Institutions and their mechanisms of bureaucratic hierarchy and control parallel a macrocosm of this process.

In summation, group activism compromises and subordinates individual praxis and value-rationality, which are subsumed in a group's homogeneous attributes and group consensus.

Citizen participation/engagement could then be viewed as having been institutionally compromised, where value rationality (a main component of Phronesis) is substituted with instrumental-rationality, which belongs to the group as a whole.

When considering outcomes that require collective decision-making, as is common to policy decisions in general, the value of Phronesis is in its ability to enrich the debate by increasing the awareness of the participants to the issues of context, value-rationality, and ethics, while investing the participants with meaningful knowledge distilled from their own individual praxis.

4.5. Synthesis: Operationalization for the Study of Citizen Practitioners

The chapter applied the Aristotelian concept of Phronesis and its three fundamental components through an analysis that explored various strategies for citizen participation/engagement. The chapter also explored the role of the individual in a community as a citizen practitioner whose life experiences and practical knowledge shape the community and the policy strategies and outcomes for that community. This chapter began with a specific definition of Phronesis, which was adopted for the purposes of this research, and then went on to explore a variety of concepts and theories that are either congruent with or opposed to the concept of Phronesis.

The phronetic approach was then applied to the case study method to reinvigorate its processes and render them more effective in documenting citizen participation/engagement strategies and

to imbue them with meaning and relevancy. We also concluded that in order to increase the effectiveness and relevance of citizen participation/engagement practices, we also needed to improve citizen participation/engagement research methods as well. We followed the historical development of these processes leading to a re-positioning of those processes within the historical context with a broader engagement critique. In summation, a Phronesis-based approach calls for integrating the research and practices of planning, urban design, and social policies with input from citizens very early in the design and formulation of such processes. The emphasis, in practice, would be on the role of citizens as individual “experts,” whose life experiences and practical knowledge of their respective dwellings and their land defines their knowledge base and describes their participation in their community’s development.

Such a community of grassroots citizen practitioners can have a positive impact in guiding their city towards a more enlightened planning, urban design, and policy design. It would serve to empower their voices and their effective impact not only on their respective communities, but also regionally and throughout the nation. Such an influence may find its way into scholarly research circles, where a Phronesis-based approach can enhance existing research approaches in planning, urban design, and social policy. A Phronesis-based approach also positions citizenship participation/engagement in the correct context for constructive change: in present and future planning, urban design, and social policy processes.

Therefore, a phronetic approach that imbues citizen participation/engagement with value-rationality and context through the exercise of Praxis would have a double purpose:

- It serves to educate individual citizens about their role as “experts” through initiating and achieving sustainable local policy strategies and by advancing responsive planning, urban design, and policy initiatives that positively affect their local environments.
- It provides guidance for public officials, planners, and urban designers in local municipalities, along with other stakeholders to achieve relevant and satisfactory citizen participation/engagement efforts that directly involve individual residents in decision-making.

In Chapter 4, I completed construction of the conceptual framework and built a theoretical argument for advancing a Phronesis-based approach. In Chapter 5, I will demonstrate the implications and viability of the proposed approach through several means: firstly, by exploring the role the citizen practitioner can play in planning, architecture, and urban design engagement processes and policy formation using a Phronesis-based approach; secondly, by comparing this role with that of expert citizens and everyday makers; thirdly, by analyzing selected material from interviews conducted with second-home owners in central Ontario in which citizen practitioner narrative exchanges demonstrate the efficacy and relevance of the self-narrative of the citizen practitioner as a means of transmitting local place knowledge.

5. RECOGNIZING CITIZEN PRACTITIONER EXPERTISE AS A FORM OF PRAXIS

“Although logos is common to all, most people live as if they had a wisdom of their own.”

(Diels-Kranz “Heraclitus” 22b2)

This chapter explores the role of the individual in a community, as a citizen practitioner whose life experiences and practical knowledge shapes the community and the policy strategies and outcomes for that community. The first section of the chapter presents an explanation of the notion of a lay citizen practitioner and its influences as a form of legitimate expertise through praxis (which is covered in its first sub-section). It also enables the mutual exchange of local ecological and cultural knowledge between lay citizens and professional experts (as relayed in its third sub-section).

The second sub-section, however, explores the implications of a phronetic approach to local knowledge expertise (lay-expertise) by contrasting the polarizing roles of citizen practitioners with those of project-driven expert-citizens and everyday makers in citizen engagement strategies. The second section explores the notion of a citizen practitioner through the lens of self-narrative praxis and its role in facilitating direct communication and exchange of life experience narratives between ordinary citizens and professionals. This is followed by a brief synthesis of the discussion and its relevant implications.

5.1 What is in a Name? The Notion of a Citizen Practitioner

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the notions of “citizen practitioner” and “citizen praxis” further as new terms advanced by this research. It is, therefore, worthwhile to reiterate what was previously mentioned in Chapter 1: the specific definition of Phronesis adopted by this research is one of the root influences for defining the terms and exploring their role in citizen engagement for urban design and planning policy. This contemporary understanding and application of Phronesis, as both process and an end in itself, has its focus on the individual. The individual’s narrative story (his or her life experience) is woven and expressed as the ever-evolving dialogue between the self and other individuals in society. Its purpose is to resolve the tension and re-tension of narratives between the self and others or, as Wall (2005) aptly defines it, as transformations of “moral tensions” into “moral meaning” (317).

The argument presented in this dissertation stipulates that the existence of this self-narrative (concerning local ecological and cultural knowledge) is a manifestation of Phronesis as process. Its concurrent re-shaping by the public official/planner/urban designer/architect through the mutual self-narrative exchange with the citizen/client demonstrates Phronesis not only as process, but also as an end in itself. Its common denominator is the moral ethos and poetics of the individual whose narrative is a collaborative endeavour with the “other” individuals sharing a community of resources, activities, values, and a common objective stemming from a common “culture.”

As shown previously in Chapter 2, Bourdieu’s (1977) concepts of “field” and agent” are

particularly useful for describing the context within which this exchange takes place and its actors. The “field” in which this exchange takes place is embodied by the social, cultural, and ecological context of the collaborative project undertaken at a relevant scale to the local knowledge exchanged. Its “agents,” on the one hand, are citizen practitioners (who possess meaningful and relevant local knowledge of their home landscapes and surrounding neighbourhood, but lack the authority and creditability to affect change). On the other hand, its “agents” also are city officials, planners, urban designers, and other professionals (who lack such relevant and detailed knowledge, but possess the authority to direct change in such neighbourhoods).

It must be noted, that such “agents” may be characterized as experts, for their authoritative role and technical knowledge and that as individuals residing in their own respective properties and outside of their assumed authoritative roles (both professional and “expert-citizen” roles) they are also citizen practitioners. As such, they exercise their citizen praxis and possess local cultural and ecological knowledge relevant to a different locale. A later sub-section of this chapter will further explore the possible conflict arising from such “expert-citizens” utilizing their technical expertise and possession of a network of professional resources in the pursuit of privately exercised agendas. The desired scenario here is one where an ordinary citizen with local knowledge would share it, in the form of a life experience narrative, with a professional citizen, whose own narrative would facilitate and encapsulate this knowledge exchange. This collaborative effort to achieve desired outcomes for projects affecting the relevant neighbourhood is at the heart of this research.

5.1.1. An Identity Forged Through Praxis

And the wisdom of age? Had they deceived us,
 Or deceived themselves, the quiet-voiced elders,
 Bequeathing us merely a receipt for deceit?
 The serenity only a deliberate hebetude,
 The wisdom only the knowledge of dead secrets
 Useless in the darkness into which they peered
 Or from which they turned their eyes. There is, it seems to us,
 At best, only a limited value
 In the knowledge derived from experience.
 The knowledge inposes a pattern, and falsifies,
 For the pattern is new in every moment
 And every moment is a new and shocking
 Valuation of all we have been. We are only undeceived
 Of that which, deceiving, could no longer harm.

(Eliot, 1940, ii: lines 25-38)

The notion of expertise and the debate on authoritative knowledge can, as previously discussed in Chapter 2, take many forms and meanings depending on the definition one uses to explain the motivation and goals behind participatory actions. The nature of expertise is multi-faceted and encompasses both formal and informal knowledge acquisition. When everyday knowledge, which has a bearing on lay-expertise as well as formal-expertise, is considered, the definition of what constitutes an expert is further muddled.

As we noted in Chapter 2, Collins and Evans (2002) have explained that there are three types of expertise that take precedent: contributory expertise, no-expertise, and interactional expertise. The import of which is to add credibility to individual perspectives that originate outside of the

group of contributory experts. This is distinct from phenomenological theories of expertise, which identify embodied contributory expertise but not interactional expertise.

Interactional expertise can enhance the local cultural and ecological knowledge derived from a particular locale by a citizen practitioner through self-narrative praxis when exercised within the context of a verbal dialogue with experts. In such a dialogue, mutual self-narrative exchange takes place for a particular project at a particular locale.

Another root influence on the notion of a citizen practitioner comes from postulations and critiques advanced by various political theorists concerning the intellectually unsound structuralist assumptions that form the basis of the fields of policy analysis and policy science, producing a legacy of elitist politics in a top-down mass-consumption society. Foucault (1973) revealed the knowledge/power control mechanisms inherent in professional expertise and within the methodology of fields comprising the social sciences rendering them into tools of social control rather than those of objective social inquiry. Post-positivist theorists,³⁸ building on the work of Foucault, have also challenged the conventional precepts of the expert/citizen relationship and advocated a participatory expert/citizen relationship to supplant scientific rationality and its conventional methodologies and assumptions on professional expertise with the alternative framework of practical reason and deliberative processes (Fischer 1990). Post-positivists, however, offered little beyond articulating the need for the expert/citizen relationship to be participatory without describing the form such a relationship should follow.

³⁸ See Bernstein 1976; Hawksworth 1988; and Schön 1983.

It is the contention of this research that the articulation of such a form is necessary to the processes of deliberation, which are called for by the advocates of a strong participatory democracy, post-positivist proponents, and citizen engagement strategists. To that end, this research uses the term “citizen praxis” to define the exchange of self-narratives through praxis within the context of a particular project and for a particular locale.

Within the field of policy design and analysis, the work of Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) bares particular relevance to citizen praxis. As was discussed earlier in Chapter 2, the application of a phronetic approach to citizen participation assumes that policy-making in a democracy would desire to contain values and meaningful knowledge in the process of development. To make this possible, Lindblom and Woodhouse argue against analytical policy-making by stating, “it cannot wholly resolve conflicts of value and interests” (22). The citizen practitioner notion is a viable means of mitigating this negative aspect of the political debate and is viewed as a minimum requirement for an “intelligent” political process.

In commenting on the political process, Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) state that all political participants “do not share a dominant common purpose; instead, each pursues some combination of private purposes and his or her own vision of the public interest” (24). This is an important observation to keep in mind for the discussion in the following section.

The individual experience (praxis) of the citizen practitioner could be described in a similar manner in light of the political process, that is, as a provider of meaningful knowledge. In other

words, for an “intelligent” political process to function and acquire relevant local knowledge along the lines delineated by Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) necessitates, at minimum, the active engagement of lay citizen practitioners, demonstrating local knowledge in praxis, to provide relevant local ecological and cultural knowledge. Real communication among stakeholders requires informal individual dialogue in which life experiences are exchanged bearing on local place knowledge and the particular project under discussion.

5.1.2. A Citizen Practitioner Versus an Expert-Citizen

The last couple of decades in North America have witnessed direct citizen participation giving rise to a variety of new forms, the most dominant of which is citizen activism. The discussion in Chapter 2 extended the work of a number of writers, noting that the phenomenon of citizen activism is exercised in its most elitist and socially destructive form by expert-citizens.³⁹

Foremost among those writers, Bang (2004) emphasizes that this form of citizen-expertise, with its indistinguishable ethic of pluralism, is far from harmless (162). It represents a top-down invasion of civil society by politicized individuals in partnership with NGOs to further political group objectives and private individual agendas.

Far from celebrating the proliferation of NGOs as the ascendance of the voice of ordinary citizenry in moderating political processes, it should be viewed, instead, as a new form of elitist political authority exploiting the undifferentiated ethic of pluralism inherent to expert-citizenry for effective top-down governance. The cooperative relationships NGOs form with expert-

³⁹ See Bang 2004; Bang and Dyhrberg 2000, 2003; Etzioni-Halevy 1993; McIntosh et al. 2004; and Zadek 2001.

citizens and their strategic communications exclude ordinary citizens from everyday political experience by replacing the conventional values and processes of democracy with those of political expediency, affluence, and power.

This research advances another form of citizen expertise that denotes lay-expertise or ordinary citizenship, rather than activism. The terms coined for this purpose, “citizen practitioners” and “citizen praxis,” define the level of participation by everyday citizens, not expert-citizens or everyday makers (both of whom exemplify project-driven politically networked atomized citizenship). The lay-expertise of the citizen practitioners is legitimized by their life experiences, or praxis, and their local ecological and cultural knowledge of their immediate neighbourhoods. Their engagement is confined to the context of their land and to issues affecting their domiciles. Other writers have postulated a politically networked part-time engaged atomized form of ordinary citizenry similar in meaning to the term “citizen practitioner,” namely, the “everyday maker” to express the legitimacy of practical experience as a source of authentic knowledge. The everyday maker, though, lacks the “citizen practitioner” ties to the phronetic components of context, value-rationality, and praxis and to its roots in local ecological and cultural knowledge.⁴⁰

Bang (2004) describes the everyday maker as the part-time project-driven politically networked ordinary side of a mirror that holds the full-time professional version of the expert-citizen on its other side. Citizen engagement in policy can also be described as a graduated spectrum, with the

⁴⁰ See Bang and Sorenson 1997, 1999, 2001; Benhabib 1996; Easton 1947; and Etzioni-Halevy 1993.

atomized and project-driven professionally engaged expert-citizen at the end closest to the governance networks. Further towards the middle of the spectrum, we can find the amateur part-time engaged everyday maker closest to the consumer level of engagement. While the other end of the spectrum contains the phronetically-driven politically benign individual we know as the citizen practitioner, anchored in engagement to the processes of governance and policy-making by value-rationality, praxis, and the context of his living environment.

The phenomenon of political individualization that has taken place in developed and some developing nations a few decades hence has given rise to alternative forms of political agency of which expert-citizens, everyday makers, and citizen practitioner are current examples. This phenomenon emerged in response to the accelerating weakness and disintegration of traditional forms, processes, and membership of political group organizations and diluted citizen engagement practices.

Both current and conventional civic and political participation literature is rife with tales of atomized citizenship emerging out of the social capital debate in which new and alternative forms of individual political engagement happen within or outside of the state's political apparatus. This holds true with a majority of current deliberative and engagement approaches that present the notion of the "virtuous citizen" as the protagonist who defends social norms against the onslaught of market forces on civil society, but who is overcome by them and atomized to pursue a personal agenda through an exploitation of the state.

There are two underlying presumptions here that Bang (2004b) makes clear, “(1) citizen participation is about collective actions influencing strategic decision and action of rational actors in the state (politicians, administrators, interest groups, etc.); (2) citizen identity is essentially about the creation of strong, affective moral ties, committing citizens to act normatively responsibly and in the name of the common good” (3). These presumptions, as Bang succinctly points out, holds sway over a sizeable proportion of participation literature, from its social capital analysis (Putnam (1993, 2002) included) to cause-oriented critical citizens (Norris 2003, 2007) and micro-personal political activity (Pattie, Seyd, and Whiteley 2004).

The question that occupies this research is not with the problem that atomized citizenship represents for democracy but rather with its outcomes. Many political scientists and thinkers, including Bang (2004b), have posited causes and prescriptions designed to allow a strong democracy to take hold amidst the disenchantment of its members or despite their given mistrust of its institutions and apathy for its values and mores.

The concern that I raise here is at the fundamental level of communication occurring between individuals in a democracy regardless of any other form of social, political, or networked communication, or otherwise. It is the essentially and fundamentally human level of direct individual communication and exchange of ideas, thoughts, and life experiences that has occurred in every human society since time immemorial. Our current reality of atomized citizenship is not only an outcome of a beleaguered democracy, but is fundamentally a problem of basic human communication in its most direct and personal form. Putnam’s (1993) view of a

“Great Decline” of social and political norms and commitment to the exchange of shared concerns is not one for society at large, but is endemic to each of its members.

As Bang (2009) notes, conventional participation studies were not able to foresee this decline that led to ineffective governments that are less responsive to their citizens and the remediation of crises. Bang points out, “this focus on, and imagining of, a two-way, non-hierarchical and mutually conditioning authority relationship simply has no resonance for mainstream participatory models, all of which take it for granted that political authority always involves a command-obedience relationship between a hierarchical state and people in civil society” (4).

At the root of this miscomprehension is a model that has become a doctrine for mainstream participation studies, originally proposed by Almond and Verba (1963) in *The Civic Culture*. The work is a comparative cross-national survey of civic values and attitudes of five nations in which the authors identify three types of political culture: the participatory culture, the parochial culture, and the subject culture. The expectation of such a model is that ordinary citizens must position themselves in relation to their governments either actively as “virtuous citizens” or passively as compliant subjects.

At the heart of all derivative models since Almond and Verba (1963) is the ingrained supposition that political capital cannot be built from the bottom up since it is externally received through economic and social capitals that, “in the shape of facilities, legitimacy, and trust,” (4) ultimately shape a government’s ability to be effective and responsive to its citizens. As was discussed

earlier, the literature cites two forms of atomized citizenship, the expert citizen and the everyday maker, which figure prominently in current literature on project-politics.

Bang (2004a) explains that both expert-citizens and everyday makers have broken away from conventional forms of citizen participation whether legitimizing or oppositional, passive or active, and whose networked participation is neither state-driven nor socially driven.

Bang (2004b) delineates the differences between their common activity of constructing and running decision-making networks and reflexive political communities as full-time professional engagement activity (expert-citizens) and part-time ordinary activity (everyday makers). Bang (2004b) also notes that the distinctive engagement profiles of expert-citizens and everyday makers point to the need to revise Putnam's (1993) definition of citizen engagement as "vibrant networks and norms of civic engagement" (15) that exhibit "forms of organized but voluntary social solidarity" (140).

5.1.3. Local Knowledge Expertise

This brings us to the distinguishing characteristics that mark the identity of the citizen practitioner in terms of local knowledge expertise and how they contrast with that of the other politicised ordinary citizen, the everyday maker, who can equally lay claim to lay-expertise based on practice alone or in cooperation with a professional counterpart, the expert-citizen. A citizen practitioner can be distinguished by reflective and personal commitment to engaging with his/her locale. An important characteristic of a citizen practitioner is the trough of life

experiences rooted in context to domicile and land, which maybe expressed in a phronetic form as value-rationality and praxis. Another characteristic of a citizen practitioner is the non-aligned and non-strategic nature of his/her directly engaged citizenship, which is driven by phronetic sensibilities rather than by state, socially, environmentally, economically, or project driven political expediency.

The exchange of self-narratives takes place in the context of a local environment with an attitude of mutual trust and respect for the gift of life experience exchange, as two individuals whose common interest is their shared humanity. As we have noted earlier in the section, these characteristics contrast sharply with those of everyday makers and expert-citizens. What really distinguishes their political engagement activities is their ability to usurp the role, and even the identity of, ordinary citizens to serve their own ends and effectively exclude the voice and input of ordinary people and citizen practitioners. Bang and Sorensen (2001) explain, “ECs, EMs can see, engage in strategic communication, using all the wonderful words of the democratic traditions—freedom, equality, deliberation, dialogue, undistorted communication, etc.—but utilising them all in a systematic quest for democratic effectiveness. Voluntary organizations are developing elite attitudes and EMs respond to this challenge by inventing a variety of ‘small’ everyday tactics and narratives about how one can make a political difference as an ‘ordinary’ political citizen” (5).

What is clear here is that the concept of the “ordinary citizen” as well as that of “local expertise” is being usurped by everyday makers, enabled as they are with expert-citizens strategic

communication networks that systematically articulate multi-cultural and project-driven political narratives. Narratives that redefine, for elitist ends, universal conceptions, such as the “state,” “democratic publics,” and the “ordinary citizen” effectively isolate and negate narratives emerging from individuals ordinary citizens, such as that of the citizen practitioner, and leave them vulnerable to misrepresentation and predation.

It is reasonable to assume then that as more expert-citizens get entrenched in governance comprised of “elite networks of knowledge and power” (Bang 2004b, 8) and as the outlook of national governments and organized entities becomes more global, these expert-citizens become increasingly uncoupled from the daily concerns of ordinary lay citizens. Bang also points out that a crucial difference exists in the nature of everyday makers’ political activity from that of expert-citizens. Bang (2004a) explains, “EMs’ lay-activities are self-referential, but at the same time much more fluid, opaque, non-planned and impulsive than are the strategic communication of ECs. EMs do not separate knowledge and practice which is why they insist on deciding themselves where to ‘hit’ and when to ‘run’, when they feel the need or the desire to do so, whether alone or in cooperation with others” (8).

From all appearances, everyday makers act as consumers would, consuming political capital at will and choosing between political institutions as one would choose between competing brands of products. Additionally, everyday makers do not view themselves as moral beings; instead, they construe their political identity as one of political expediency in which they align themselves and their interests to whatever institution that would increase their sense of

empowerment and affirm their convictions of entitlement. As such, Bang (2004b) views everyday makers as both a threat to expert-citizens' political and social identity and as a political capital with which to form balanced alliances between representatives and individual citizens, such as citizen practitioners.

The participatory activity of those two polarized and project oriented forms of atomized citizenship necessitates the emergence of a relevant participatory model that explains and allows for new forms of democratic processes and communication methods that take into account individual rather than group differences in values and aspirations. It would allow the voice and input of the individual citizen practitioner to be legitimized and made part of the decision-making processes of governance and policy-making without the need for politicizing the narrative exchange into project-driven, state, or socially driven networks. Planners may view this emphasis on the individual in collective and generally large-scale planning and policy-making processes as impractical and as better suited for urban design and architectural scales. However, if planners do not try to accommodate individual input they run the very real risk of having expert-citizens and everyday makers bypass planners and deal with policy-makers directly, advancing personal agendas that are at odds with planning recommendations.

5.2. Exploring the Notion of a Citizen Practitioner: Self-Narrative as Praxis

The moments of happiness—not the sense of well-being,
Fruition, fulfilment, security or affection,

Or even a very good dinner, but the sudden illumination—
 We had the experience but missed the meaning,
 And approach to the meaning restores the experience
 In a different form, beyond any meaning
 We can assign to happiness. I have said before
 That the past experience revived in the meaning
 Is not the experience of one life only
 But of many generations

(Eliot, 1941, ii: lines 42-51)

The differences between “content” experts’ and lay-experts’ knowledge hinges on the role that value ascription plays in the perspective each group of experts holds and in the manner in which knowledge is exchanged. What is clear, however, is that such an exchange would be mutually beneficial to both groups, making public policy processes both relevant and inclusive. To that end, it would be worthwhile to re-visit the discourse on self-narrative as a process of reflection, both in action and on action, of professionals (as content experts) and citizen practitioners (as lay-experts).

As was discussed in previous chapters, Donald Schön (1983) introduced two types of reflection in practice: reflection in action, wherein the practitioner identifies an emerging problem, while performing an action, and reflects on it during praxis. Reflection on action, on the other hand, involves an action and the experience that frames the action, in retrospect, while reflecting on its knowledge base through analysis and interpretive recall. The process of reflection also involves an individual’s life experiences that represent benchmarks in the individual knowledge field and are codified as correct and incorrect actions. Schön (1993) also informs us that individuals utilize metaphors as an implicit figurative tool to generate a world perspective and to interpret and

describe social events and generate solutions to perceived problems. It is this understanding and usage of the metaphor that gives the citizen practitioner's self-narrative meaning and relevancy in the act of local knowledge exchange.

The learning system process developed by Schön and Rein (1994) is enabled by individually reconstructed interpretations of deliberative processes and dialogues between researchers and the researched, or between ordinary citizens and organizational representatives. Schön and Rein describe this process as relevant to processes of self-narrative formation. In such a narrative exchange, citizen practitioners represent their life experience as storylines embedding values in a coordinated description of the experienced events. Such representational narrative devices enable an individual to relay a linear progression of temporal events as life experience narratives.

The exchange of local knowledge between citizen practitioners and their professional representatives is nuanced by feminist critiques of transparent reflexive positionality, as was discussed in earlier chapters. To that end, Gillian Rose (1997) cited her own failed attempt at situating knowledge in her own research, as a point of departure. Rose's own research conclusions negate the possibility of achieving a comprehensive and transparently reflexive positionality using conventional research methods, in favour of "other ways of situating the knowledge of the researcher" (314). Rose accomplished this by allowing gaps of knowledge and fallibility to be part of the research process as a natural consequence of knowledge production.

As noted earlier in Chapter 3, section 3.5, the rich amount of information that emerges from

direct dialogues between the researcher and the researched is the natural product of knowledge exchange and self-transformation for ordinary citizens and their professional representatives. It is a learning process which recalls to mind the Dreyfus method of human learning, discussed in earlier chapters, in which expertise is achieved through reliance on life experience rather than on rote learning. The researcher and the researched alike may achieve their desired ends through self-reflection on the topic at hand, guided by life experience and the mutual learning process that takes place when they exchange their respective self-narratives.

5.3. Demonstrations of Phronesis in Respondent Narratives

Positional narrative on research evolution: Studies and approaches based on Aristotelian Phronesis are a nascent area of research in the field of architecture; however, it is not such a common research filter in the fields of planning and urban design. The coupling of Phronesis with citizen participation in this dissertation is a novel conceptualization for the three fields. Allowing this conceptualization to extend to policy research required a new level of understanding to emerge, and also opened the possibility of forming new concepts and theories. This process was far from straight forward, since my goal was to enable policy-oriented participatory research for architecture and urban design: a novel attempt in itself. I therefore needed explanatory level research and a theoretical foundation to back up this goal.

What I started with is a descriptive process of analysis and data generation in which I conducted

a quantitative meta-research analysis of existing studies, which in turn helped me to identify the issues challenging citizen participation, enabling me to frame the research problem with a phronetic lens. The identification of the problem through the literature reviews helped me generate the research question and narrowed the focus towards what had essentially coalesced into explanatory level research. The latter provided me with the theoretical foundations needed to inform an enabling approach for policy-oriented participatory research in the classical sense.

However, the existing problem of pseudo and partial user participation in architecture and urban design made the goal of achieving such research untenable, and more importantly, undesirable. Considering the challenged state of citizen participation in classical planning policy-oriented research, emulating those processes in architecture would be taking a step backwards. I needed a new approach to provide a shift in perspective, which could potentially transform participatory practices in all three fields for the better. I therefore focused my efforts on individual level learning systems informed by phronetic research. This focus led me eventually to the identification of a phenomenon: life-experience self-narratives generated by ordinary people, in everyday interactions. Findings from the meta-research analysis pointed to certain enabling characteristics that can address the challenges facing citizen participation in policy.

The analysis also uncovered issues of political uncoupling and atomized citizenship. At this point in the research, new terms were needed to differentiate between agenda-less ordinary citizens with local place knowledge and the two atomized forms of citizenship identified in the literature. The phronesis-based approach was starting to take shape and its protagonists were given names

(citizen practitioners). What remained to be done was to identify the characteristics of citizen practitioners to differentiate them from the other two varieties. I turned to thematic analysis of second-hand interviews to isolate those characteristics and identify which conditions were favourable for eliciting self-narratives in local place knowledge exchanges between agenda-less ordinary citizens and researchers.

5.3.1. Second-Homeowners in Central Ontario

This sub-section presents a thematic analysis of selected interview material with second-homeowners in central Ontario within the context of its cottage industry, in which the respondents connect with their land for a variety of reasons that will be explored. Section 5.3.1.2., describes, later, two undifferentiated categories of ordinary citizenry: Non-Citizen Practitioners, or casual respondents, and Citizen Practitioners. Selected narrative excerpts are provided to highlight, along phronetic key themes, essential, identifying characteristics of Citizen Practitioners that differentiate them from casual respondents within the three case study areas. What follows next, is a thematic analysis of interview transcripts, which will help to identify within the transcript dialogues, the existence of a life-experience based self-narrative exchange phenomenon, as well as, the essential characteristics of respondents' engagement in that exchange, identifying them as Citizen Practitioners.

Thematic Analysis:

According to Guest (2012) thematic analysis, "is the most common form of analysis in qualitative research." (11) "It emphasizes pinpointing, examining, and recording patterns (or

"themes") within data." (Braun and Clarke, 2006: 83) It involves both inductive reasoning to create themes and deductive reasoning to verify them. Daly, Kellehear and Gliksman (1997) inform us that, "themes are patterns across data sets that are important to the description of a phenomenon and are associated to a specific research question." (611)

This is done by systematically identifying topics through de-contextualizing and re-contextualizing topics and integrating themes into progressively higher order. Since a number of themes can be cross-referenced by individual codes, this leads to a discursive interpretation focused on meaning in representing a view of reality. In the thematic analysis of interview transcripts of Second-Homeowners in Central Ontario, the units of analysis were the identified themes. The theme description was sought to be in the middle range between conceptual and practical, to enhance usefulness in the analysis. A series of data-driven questions were considered through all the phases of coding and data analysis. These questions were based on recommendations by Saldana (2009), they are:

- What are respondents trying to accomplish?
- How exactly do respondents accomplish this?
- What specific means or strategies do respondents use?
- How do respondent household members talk about and understand what is going on?
- What assumptions are respondents making?
- What major issues are embedded in the text of the transcripts?
- What did I learn from annotating the re-read text in the micro-analysis?
- Why did I include this information during open coding?

Thematic analysis was selected because it was deemed to be the most appropriate method to the research question, and it was driven by both theoretical assumptions of the phronetic research components; context, value-rationality and praxis, and the research questions: What is the theory that explains the process of life-experience based self-narrative exchange (the central phenomenon) for respondents at the three case study areas, and what characteristics define the respondents in this exchange?

Preparation of the data for analysis:

The original investigator, Luka (2006), had transcribed and stripped the original primary data recordings of all identifiable respondent information, before transferring them to me. I reformatted the transcripts in order to have usable margins for cross referencing line number identifiers, for the unitizing stage of analysis.

The data set comprised of 44 respondent transcripts, in total, consisting of 21 males and 23 females who were almost equally divided among the three case study areas. The transcripts included 28 respondent households with children, which were also almost equally divided among the three case study areas.

In accordance with the process of coding for thematic analysis, as explained by Braun and Clarke (2006), coding was conducted in six phases, as follows:

Phase 1: Familiarization with Data

Since the interviews were already transcribed and in order to become familiar with what the data entails, I thoroughly read and re-read the transcripts, while looking for emerging patterns in the text. The first stage of the analysis involved cleaning-up the text for transcript text preparation. Each transcript was examined and all ‘dross’ in the text was removed. Dross is a term used by Field and Morse (1985) to describe material that occurs in transcripts and is repetitious, peripheral or does not relate directly to the topic at hand. Therefore, to be on the safe side, only text which did not contribute to understanding the respondent’s point of view was omitted. Preliminary codes and detailed notes were taken in this phase.

Phase 2: Generating Initial Codes

Data reduction was conducted initially to identify and label discrete units in the text in order to create categories. This was followed by data complication, in which meaning was inferred from the text by de-contextualizing any remaining pieces of information within the original material.

Phase 3: Searching For Themes

Each transcript was carefully examined and all its text was divided into meaning units. According to Mostyn (1985), “a meaning unit is a discrete phrase, sentence or series of sentences which conveys one idea or one related set of perceptions.” (117) Meaning units were sometimes lightly related to preceding or following units. Several repetitions were necessary before discrete meaning units were isolated into an exhaustive category system. Codes were combined into simple themes that accurately described the transcript text, and were flexible enough to be re-

ordered at a later phase.

Phase 4: Reviewing Themes

Theme descriptions were further reviewed to be certain that they reflect the text and the theoretical perspective. Also, all missing elements in the analysis were accounted for. Initial names and general definitions were given to the simple themes. The number of categories was restricted to nine categories, with a couple of additional sub-categories. This was done in order to achieve a balanced number of discrete categories for the text to be sufficiently analysed and contain a robust number of examples of each category. All discrete categories describing the transcripts' meaning units were then ascribed an alphabetical letter each. The latter procedure was necessary to evaluate any deficiencies in categorizing the units. This procedure was repeated until all unclassified passages of text, as well as miscellaneous categories, were accounted for and the text was fully categorized.

Phase 5: Defining and naming themes

A second review of the transcripts or axial coding was conducted, in which all text was re-contextualized in terms of the developed categories. This was done for each theme separately to insure that no contradictory text existed or was unaccounted for within a theme. It was followed by a detailed written analysis of each theme, and its meaningful significance in answering the research questions. At the end of this phase, each theme had an accurate definition and an explanation. After the final review of themes, more meaningful themes were noted for later refinement into final themes, at which point I began writing the final report.

Phase 6: Producing the Report

One of the ways of checking the validity of a thematic analysis is through member checking, in which the researcher returns to the respondents and shows them the analysis and asks if the interpretation and meaning of the categories are accurate depictions of each respondent's original intent. Since this was not possible for this research's anonymized transcripts, I went back instead to the original investigator, Luka (2006), who had previously conducted the interviews. The method of categorisation was talked through (along with emergent citizen practitioner characteristics). The interviewer's opinions were sought regarding the interpretive validity, descriptive validity, theoretical validity, and evaluative validity of the categories' accuracy in depicting the respondents' original intentions. I considered the interviewer's view, along with my own immersion experience with the transcripts, in order to re-examine the categories and make a final adjustment reflecting a clearer and truer representation of the topics discussed in the interview transcripts. After validity checks were run on the categorized meaning units, the total number of transcripts was ordered in an alphabetical list. This enabled additional verification of the suitability of assigned units of meaning, to their respective category. This was done to each analysed transcript, through a second round of re-contextualization, after which the report was finalized.

In order to expand the theoretical implications of the analysis findings beyond the confines of the analysis report, I have presented the supporting dialogues connected with each theme in two stages, as follows:

The first stage presents short examples of supporting dialogue excerpts, after each category in the category set of the analysis report. The goal of the first stage is to present the points of the analysis in support of the research questions. It is also to increase the dependability of themes within the text in their relevance to the transcripts, through a thick description of the findings. According to Geertz (1973), “a thick description of a human behavior is one that explains not just the behavior, but its context as well, such that the behavior becomes meaningful to an outsider.” (5-6)

The second stage (5.3.1.2. Analysis of Key Themes in Respondent Narratives) comes later in the chapter, and presents exemplary excerpts of supporting dialogues under phronetic research component theme headings. The goal of the second stage is to present exemplary dialogue excerpts to support the over-arching theoretical argument of the dissertation, and to contrast citizen practitioner respondent characteristics with those of a non-citizen practitioner respondent.

Final Thematic Analysis Report

Set of Categories:

1) Theme Proactive engagement with context: this pattern or theme displays the respondents’ practical knowledge and context-dependent judgment, when relating the reasons for choosing certain locations over others in the three case study areas. And when an ordinary citizen exhibits personal commitment and engagement with locale or residence; this theme is divided into the following linked categories:

Category A.

Definition: It is expressed as uniqueness of context in terms of individual residence or neighbourhood or local community.

Example: Well, Thunder Beach is very unique in that the bay itself just speaks volumes for the whole thing. So you know, you've got Silver Birch to West Shore, and the church is almost central; tennis courts are you know a very important part of our life, and the Friendly Store is appropriately named; and then our little compound ... what speaks out in this picture is the water, obviously, the proximity to the water. Lots of nature; even though it's somewhat of a really busy community, you know you're really close to the nature setting ...

(Male teacher in his 40s, seasonal cottage owner-occupier at Thunder Bay and owner-occupier of a dwelling in central Toronto)

(Luka 2006, 246)

Category B.

Definition: it is expressed as a physical or emotional attachment to “place,” this was especially true of respondents with shorter histories of residency, and is a uniquely individual response to a “sense of place” or a “sense of community” for the social, physical, cultural, and experiential interaction with one’s own cottage, residence, or locale.

Example: ... I guess the possibility being someplace similar to this—similar but not the same—would be more, ah, for us, possibly more of a grief than a delight. Assuming that something happened and we weren't able to keep this, I don't think I would want to go somewhere else and be reminded of that, and the anger [it would evoke].

(Man in his 60s, life-long year-round cottage owner-occupier on the Severn and owner-occupier of a dwelling in a Toronto suburb)

(Luka 2006, 250)

Category C.

Definition: it is expressed as a sense of family continuity in “place.” For respondents with longer histories of residency in the case study areas, this “sense of place” was also accompanied by strong historical knowledge of and ties with their local cottages and its community.

Example: When I was a baby they built their place and I spent most of my time there, my first 19 years (summers). ... you see, my father bought a large piece, and there's six—he had six children, and he gave us each a lot. My husband and I built on our lot, and my son has that now, and then my daughter inherited my parents' place, and my other daughter is here ... I've been here every year of my life, at some point.

(Woman in her 80s, life-long seasonal cottage owner-occupier on the Severn and owner-occupier of a dwelling in a Toronto suburb)

(Luka 2006, 228)

2) Theme Demonstration of value-rationality in narrative form: this theme demonstrated a translation of personal values into value judgments concerning one's own residence. Under circumstances of local change, the respondent possesses the capacity to articulate and be willing to share, as circumstances require, a narrative of local place knowledge. This theme is divided into the following linked categories:

Category A.

Definition: It is present when emerging from experiential knowledge of past decisions or impressions. This, in turn, stems from the positive or negative impact on the respondent's cottage residence by developments or environmental degradation or crime.

Example: Back-lot development, where it would be behind us, you hear rumours, of course—I guess regardless of where you are living, it could even be in the US or whatnot—you'll hear things about well you know someone's planning on building a subdivision; they're going to be on that side of the road, but where do they gain access? So, that means, more impact on the lake, and the turbidity of the lake, the activity on the

lake, the impact of runoff and whatnot, septic drainage, and things of that nature, even though they'd have to comply to regulations.

You do get concerned with that type of thing. There is one development, it's been in for years in the far end of the lake, and it's that kind of thing, it's a subdivision ...

(Luka interview C01)

Category B.

Definition: It is expressed as continuity of family values in terms of historical ties to an individual residence or neighbourhood or local community.

Example: *Basically we try to keep the exterior as much to the original as we can, and if we do any exterior renovations we will try to keep them within the pattern of the existing building. ... the building probably looks about the same as it did when it was built....*

(Man in his 60s, life-long seasonal cottage owner-occupier on the Severn and owner-occupier of a dwelling near Blue Mountain)

(Luka 2006, 251)

Category C.

Definition: It is expressed as a physical or emotional attachment to “place”; this was especially true of respondents with shorter histories of occupation.

Example: *This is not that shabbily built that you'd want to tear it down. ... My son-in-law asked me, would you buy a lot and build again? Ah, yeah, I'd like to do that, but I don't know—there are so many slivers in my hands from this place, you know, you've given a lot of yourself, so to lose this place ... you'd have to be careful that you don't lost what's really valuable to you, not in the money sense, but in terms of feelings.*

(Man in his 60s, seasonal cottage owner-occupier at Crystal Lake and owner-occupier of a dwelling in a GTA suburb)

(Luka 2006, 250)

Sub Category C1.

Definition: It is expressed as a uniquely individual response to a “sense of place,” or a “sense of community” for the social, physical, cultural, and experiential interaction with

one's own cottage, residence, or locale.

Example: [Husband] *The cottage was built by me [in 1953].... I was going to be a bachelor, so I was going to build a bachelor cabin, so that's what I did, number one. And then that didn't work out, and so after growing up and with a limited space, I came across, down at the Big Chute, a log house, that belonged to one of the workers down there...*

[Wife] *We have buildings all over the place.... When [my husband] and his dad built the original cabin, they started it out by making it out of stone that they found right on the property, and they got a whole basement done ... they then said it was so difficult they switched to wood!*

(A professional consultant couple in their 60s, life-long seasonal cottage owner-occupiers on the Severn and owner-occupiers of a dwelling in Orillia)

(Luka 2006, 250)

3) Theme Demonstration of praxis: the willingness of an ordinary resident to put one's own place knowledge experience into decisions affecting one's locale. This includes sharing and exchanging such knowledge with similarly committed neighbourhood residents and with professionals/representatives pursuing projects affecting such neighbourhoods. this theme demonstrated the application of one's life experience to choices, actions, and perspectives. This theme is divided into the following linked categories:

Category A.

Definition: It is expressed in actual choices that exemplified the willingness of an ordinary resident to integrate experiential place knowledge into decisions affecting one's locale.

Example: *probably, going way back, at the time when we were living in the city; it might be a slightly different thinking on it because the cottage at the time when we were coming up on weekends and things we had problems with break-ins, and that's why a group was got together, with a former reeve, myself, and a group of us, ___ being one, got involved with forming a neighbourhood watch. I think that's helped (see Appendix for full text)*

(Luka interview C01)

Category B.

Definition: It is expressed in actual choices and decisions made by respondents regarding their residence and locale. Their interaction with planning officials and other professionals is expressed vividly in their narrative.

Example: *[H] As regulations tighten up, and as I did with the renovation project, you soon learn to keep your mouth shut, and don't ask questions, because you know that the answer is going to be no; and so Georgian Bay Township have a word for that now, and they say—it's called a 'creeping cottage'—people start off and say the Township will let me build a 15'x20' and I wanted to have a 15'x30', so they build the 15'x20' and in a couple of years' time they take an end wall out and extend it out a couple of feet, and then a couple of feet more, just a bit at a time, so it doesn't look like they've done anything. [L] ... (see Appendix for full text)*

(Luka interview S08)

Category C.

Definition: It is expressed in choices related to a “sense of community” where respondents are engaged in forming an extended care system for their children.

Example: *[In the city], my next-door neighbour, my house could blow up, and he probably wouldn't say anything, or call the fire department. I think that people are less aware of their surroundings, whereas up here, the neighbours know; they watch our kids. I had an incident way back on Centre Beach years ago when the kids were little, ... and I had to go run back for a pair a boots, so I thought, it'll take forever to get to the store if I don't let them keep walking. Well, one mum watched these three kids walk by and she kept watching until I walked by. She was aware of the fact that three kids were walking that maybe shouldn't be there by themselves. That's when I realised that people really watch what goes on, which is why I think the kids are a bit safer; because I think people are aware.*

(Woman in her 40s, seasonal cottage owner-occupier at Thunder Bay and owner-occupier of a dwelling in a GTA suburb)

(Luka 2006, 251)

Sub Category C1.

Definition: It is expressed as an open exchange of experiential local place knowledge with the interviewer on the effect of broader patterns of metropolitan development expansion on local change in the Crystal Lake area.

Example: [Wife] *They're all good changes.... One good thing is that a lot of people I think now that are buying cottages, and if they buy older places, or something like that, in their mind, they are [already] planning to tear them down...*

[Husband] *... Not too many people buy an average cottage and leave it, because it costs so much to buy a cottage ...*

[Wife's brother] *I would take a different perspective on that; I see that as the urbanisation of the lake. I like more basic stuff. I like a nice cottage ... But if I had the lake surrounded by places like [theirs], all around the lake, to me that's not a lake; it's a waterfront community.*

[Interviewer] *It sounds to me that what [wife's brother] is saying is that it's nice to see a mix; you don't want to see all the old cottages replaced.*

[Wife's brother] *Exactly: whenever you see the old cottage with the screened porch wraparound, ah! I love that, because that's what cottages really are—*

(Couple in their 40s and man in his 40s, seasonal cottage owner-occupiers at Crystal Lake and owner-occupiers of dwellings in GTA suburbs)

(Luka 2006, 259-260)

Essential Characteristics of Citizen Practitioners:

1. Proactive engagement with context: Beyond self-interest and more than simple protectionism, an ordinary citizen exhibits personal commitment and engagement with locale or residence; this characteristic is not defined through length of time at such residence, but through the willingness to take action to represent and defend it, describe

its merits and vulnerabilities, and collaborate on improving it.

2. Demonstration of value-rationality in narrative form: Under circumstances of local change, this is the capacity of an ordinary citizen to articulate and be willing to share, when circumstances require, a narrative of local place knowledge demonstrating a translation of personal values into value judgments concerning one's own residence.
3. Demonstration of praxis: The willingness of an ordinary resident to put one's own place knowledge experience into decisions affecting one's locale. This includes sharing and exchanging such knowledge with similarly committed neighbourhood residents and with professionals/representatives pursuing projects affecting such neighbourhoods.

Setup of Interviews:

All interviews took place in respondents' homes. The interviews were neither designed nor conducted to engage or identify respondents who would qualify as citizen practitioners; rather the evidence of citizen practitioner characteristics appears in the respondents' narrative discourse. Both Thunder Bay and Severn are cases whose protagonists share a strong propensity to be attached to "place" and to engage in stewardship of "place." Respondents with shorter histories of residency expressed a physical or emotional attachment to "place." For respondents with longer histories of residency in the case study areas, this was also accompanied by strong historical knowledge of and ties with their local cottages and its community.

Respondent Background and Demographics:

The total sample of 44 respondents consisting of 21 males and 23 females were almost equally

divided among the three case study areas. There were 28 respondent households with children, which were also almost equally divided among the three case study areas. The average age of a respondent was approximately 57 years and the average number of years spent by individual respondents in their current property was 22 years. The average of years spent in the case study setting, however, was 30 years.

The most elaborate narratives displaying one or more characteristics of a citizen practitioner came from the Severn and Thunder Bay Beach case study areas and were almost equally divided between them, although there were several from the Crystal Lake area as well. In the theme of context, there were eight representative narratives demonstrating the engagement with context characteristic of a citizen practitioner. In the theme of value-rationality, there were four representative narratives demonstrating the value-rationality in narrative form characteristic a citizen practitioner. Finally, in the theme of praxis, there were eight representative narratives demonstrating the praxis in actual choice characteristic of a citizen practitioner. As was mentioned previously, although a representative narrative most often displayed a dominant characteristic of a citizen practitioner, there were sometimes hints of the other two characteristics embedded within the respondent narrative as well.

The occupations of respondents whose narrative was selected as representative of a theme were varied and included the following: consultant; salesperson; EMS/fire/police officer; administrator; entrepreneur; executive; teacher or professor; MD, DD, or RN; banker; lender; writer or journalist; homemaker; civil servant; engineer; librarian; technician or technologist; and

buyer or broker. Across the three case study areas, the richest and most relevant narratives in terms of identifying citizen practitioners among the respondents came from service, teaching, consulting, and writing occupations and, to a lesser degree, from the civil service and medical occupations.

Citizen Practitioner Identification in Respondent Samples:

It must be noted that it is in the nature of citizen practitioners to be self-selective in their engagement over matters that mainly affect their daily lives and their locale. Identifying them is not a matter of statistical compilation of harvested lists but requires immersion in the local context in which they live and engagement in the transmission and sharing of local place knowledge. For the purposes of this dissertation, the author has attempted to identify citizen practitioners among casual respondents through a thematic analysis of representative narratives from the three case study areas. As such, 20 representative narratives demonstrating citizen practitioner characteristics have been identified from a total sample of 44 respondents. Across the three case study areas, the respondent occupations most relevant were in the service, teaching, consulting, and writing occupations and to a lesser degree in the civil service and medical occupations.

Hypothesis:

Judging from the distribution of representative narratives demonstrating citizen practitioner characteristics across the three case study areas and the range of respondent occupations, a hypothesis is formed that would require further research outside of the confines of this

dissertation. It is postulated that the emergence of phronetic patterns or themes from the interview transcripts is dependent on several factors:

- The interviewer's willingness to be immersed in the respondents' local context, delve deeper into the subject matter at hand, and go beyond the confines of the structured questionnaire to allow an open unrestricted dialogue to take place between himself and the respondent that may facilitate an atmosphere of mutual trust and learning.
- The respondents' experiential knowledge of the subject of the interview and their personal commitment and engagement with the locale or residence.
- The respondents' capacity to articulate and be willing to share a narrative of local place knowledge, demonstrating a translation of personal values into value judgments concerning one's own residence or locale. This capacity to articulate seems to be influenced to some degree by a respondent's occupation. The ability to speak freely and honestly concerning personal matters and issues that affect the respondent's daily life seems to be enhanced by the practice of occupations that require communication, public service, education, or caretaker skills or through an increased exposure to a variety of people during the course of a respondent's career. Examples from the case study sample of respondent occupations, which fall under this description, are consultant; salesperson; EMS/fire/police officer; teacher or professor; MD, DD, or RN; writer or journalist; and civil servant.

Thematic Analysis Report Summary:

A combination of a *a priori* framework and "elements of grounded theory," as explained by

Strauss and Corbin (1998), were used for the final analysis. This was accomplished by initially identifying, within the transcript responses, the life-experience based self-narrative exchange phenomenon and several characteristics of respondent engagement that were specific to this exchange. Descriptions were later developed for categories that made meaningful contributions in answering the research questions of the thematic analysis: What is the theory that explains the process of life-experience based self-narrative exchange (the central phenomenon) for respondents at the three case study areas and what characteristics define the respondents in this exchange? Category descriptions were then further refined into final themes, in a final set of categories, along with a list of respondent citizen practitioner characteristics. The analysis also revealed the need to test the postulates of a newly formed hypothesis, which require further research outside of the confines of this dissertation.

The thematic analysis revealed, both, the existence of the phenomenon of life-experience self-narrative exchange, and the characteristics of a citizen practitioner respondent. Category-based themes revealed by data coding, done in six phases for the analysis, identified several reasons for citizen practitioner respondent engagement. While those reasons varied, themes or patterns running through the respondents' narratives revealed that those reasons were built on a foundation of components, which are at the heart of a Phronesis-based approach. Those themes also demonstrated the effectiveness and relevance of the life-experience self-narrative exchange method, and the Phronesis-based approach as an explanatory theory. This theory is what gives meaning to the processes of the central phenomenon (life-experience based self-narrative exchange) for respondents at the three case study areas, and defines the characteristics of the

respondents (citizen practitioners) in this exchange.

5.3.1.1. Citizen Engagement, Citizen Practitioners, and Local Place Knowledge

The analysis of selected interview material with second-homeowners in central Ontario demonstrates key assumptions and components of the Phronesis-based approach as themes or patterns running through the respondents' narratives whenever the interviewer allowed the semi-formal interviews to veer from the stated questions. As can be seen in the next section, this allowed the respondents to articulate their own narratives, thereby revealing the efficacy and relevancy of the self-narrative of the citizen practitioner as a means of transmitting local place knowledge. It also exhibited its main role of facilitating direct communication and exchange of life experience narratives, between ordinary citizens and professionals.

As mentioned in previous chapters, the stated goal of this self-narrative exchange is to establish a common ground for a dialogue between ordinary citizens and professionals with the ultimate aim of improving outcomes for citizen engagement in urban design and planning policy. The task becomes one of levelling the platform for knowledge exchange between the agents of authority and those of local knowledge; in the case of the cottage industry of central Ontario, this involves planners, developers, and researchers, on the one hand, and second-home owners as lay citizen practitioners, on the other.

As shown previously in Chapter 2, Bourdieu's (1977) concepts of "field" and agent" are particularly useful for describing both the actors and the context of the cottage industry of central

Ontario within which this exchange takes place. The social “field” in which this exchange takes place is embodied by the context of the three geographical locations selected for semi-formal interviews undertaken at a relevant scale to the local knowledge exchanged. Its “agents,” on the one hand, are second-home owners as citizen practitioners (who possess meaningful and relevant local knowledge of their home landscapes and surrounding environment, but lack the authority and creditability to affect change). On the other hand, its agents are researchers/interviewers, city officials, planners, urban designers, developers, and other professionals who lack such relevant and detailed knowledge, but possess the authority to direct change in such environments.

While living in cottage country may be viewed as a life style choice in the central Ontario cottage country, the reality is that it is a permanent choice of a home for many second-home owners in central Ontario to whom its landscapes, in addition to their aesthetic appeal, hold special meaning that is deeply rooted in their history and culture. Some of these people have made it their only home year round, while others’ investment in a particular second home ran for generations. Throughout the nineteenth century, these environs remained virtually untouched. The advent of the early years of the millennium, however, brought rapid change in the form of alternative housing. Timeshare cottage-condominiums and townhouses have crowded the once serene and tranquil waterfronts. Established residents and those whose investment in those environments runs for generations are understandably concerned about the scale and kind of development change taking place. Such development often occurred with little or no input solicited from local residents, who perceive themselves to be powerless in the face of such change.

The main resource for this section is Nik Luka's (2006) dissertation, *Placing the 'Natural' Edges of a Metropolitan Region Through Multiple Residency: Landscape and Urban Form in Toronto's 'Cottage Country.'* The study is an analysis of the social construction of nature and the social and cultural meanings of multiple residencies, focusing on the vital intersection between behaviour and the environment that gives character to a cultural landscape inhabited by central Ontario second-home owners, their perceptions, and the meaning they derive from their engagement with their land. The positionality of Luka (2006) in regards to this research must be emphasized here, in that his approach to the study was not as an expert planner or designer, but rather as a researcher in human geography, with an interest in the manner in which people utilize space and in their reasons for doing so. Luka (2006) utilizes a "bottom-up" approach in situating, through first-hand accounts, the perceptions of second-home owners of their engagement with their land to the wider cottage country literature, its theories, and models. Luka (2006) explains that his research constitutes "a conceptual dialogue between markets and meaning, for its aim has been to explore certain dynamics of urban form, structure, and growth in major metropolitan regions while at the same time revealing how 'cottaging' demonstrates important aspects of how people think about space, place, [and] landscape." (1) In essence, this research captures lay citizens' perception of their locale, or their "sense of place," and expanding its coverage to an entire region.

Luka (2006) asserts that population and development pressures have led to making waterfront second-homes in central Ontario an extension of the greater Toronto area or "metapolis." Luka

also raises the question of whether it represents another kind of “sprawl” with its accompaniment of negative ecological impacts. Its historical precedence was the early twentieth century exodus of the elite from polluted central cities to the agrarian hinterland to isolate themselves with a buffer of “nature” from the poor, minorities, and the disadvantaged, who had no such means of escape.

Under Canadian norms of equity and equal access to resources, this flight to develop cottage country at market prices goes against the grain of its social and political sensibilities, hinting as it does of “gentrification” and “suburbanization” belts for major urban areas. It would be ironic, as Luka (2006) noted, if this “intensification” would end up killing the very essence of tranquil nature that attracted people to cottage country in the first place. Bourdieu (1977) defines “cultural capital” as “instruments of appropriation of symbolic wealth socially designated as worthy of being sought and possessed.” (54) As such, the ascription of value to “cultural capital” becomes a vital mechanism in the power dynamics of citizen engagement processes.

For the communities that comprise the cottage country, the cultural capital represented by their settlement patterns and its physical structures do not determine their true value, as market forces would like to have it. Its actual value is determined by the “field,” which affects “cultural capital” along with other factors. Some of those values reside in the perceptions and meaning derived from local environments, as well as the relationships built on long-term engagement of the second-home owners with their land.

However, most of the important human geography issues highlighted above are beyond the scope of this research. The study's relevance to this dissertation is that it provides a ready canvas upon which is drawn the multiple convergences between market and municipal forces. Those forces provide a ready rationale for development expediency, while downplaying ordinary residents' environmental perceptions and living space engagement with their cottage country environment. This is presented in the form of semi-formal interview transcripts for the 200 respondents, representing the working population of cottage-country residents within the three geographical areas described by the study.

The study shows unequivocally that second-home owners in central Ontario possess both a visual acuity to the aesthetic of their local environments, as well as a dedication to its upkeep that far outstrips those of denser metropolitan areas. This is especially true of the Toronto Metropolitan Area, from whose population are drawn the vast majority of second-home owners in central Ontario. This study demonstrates that, in terms of the exchange of self-narratives for local place knowledge between citizen practitioners and their professional representatives, mutual learning can occur to the benefit of all parties. Luka (2006) explains, "There is an opportunity for users to learn about the 'living landscapes' of cottage country and to integrate this with their apparently well-developed sense of the landscape aesthetics of water-oriented second-home settings." (247) This could be achieved through the processes of citizen engagement, as Luka (2006) argues, "A substantive endeavour would involve exploring how to link the visual acuity of cottagers into ecological processes, for which a common concern already seems well-developed. Certainly given the strong commitment to place on the part of users, as

observed in other second-home contexts, there is potential for fostering an improved ethic and practice of stewardship.” (248)

As this dissertation seeks to show, a Phronesis-based approach to citizen engagement, when applied through the self-narrative exchange of local place knowledge, is an example of such enhanced citizen engagement processes. It would benefit planners and planning practices in fostering stewardship among citizen practitioners, as well as, the acquisition of a rich source of local place knowledge, without resorting to coercive measures to govern cottage country.

Luka (2006) gives us a brief background of the social capital present within the context of the study areas from which the respondent transcripts were gathered; he states:

Cottage settings appear to be deeply meaningful in place-specific and generic ways for a great many users. Aspects of the social-spatial practice of multiple residency were examined and preliminary generalisations made based on the results. It was demonstrated that the cultural landscapes of cottage country appear to be important and perhaps even intrinsic to their users’ psychological well-being. Associations with various aspects of identity, both individual and collective, were also explored. Questions concerning widespread change (both real and perceived) were addressed, raising the spectre of a significant net loss in social capital if current transformations are allowed to proceed unchecked. (221)

Luka also gives us an account of the usage and meaning of the three selected case study areas exhibiting differences in local change patterns, as seen “through the eyes of users.” The author explains, “while similarities unite the three areas examined, it is also apparent that place matters—in other words, that both historical patterns and contemporary changes now occurring

across central Ontario cottage country play out differently in local areas.” (Luka 2006, 221)

Luka provides us with a brief description of the geographical context of the three areas, beginning with the Severn River area stretching from Sparrow Lake to Gloucester Pool. Luka (2006) describes it as, “located in strict geographic terms within 130km of central Toronto but about 150km by road—mostly multilane expressway—the Severn River is nearest to the city of the three case study areas, and it also has the longest history as a cottaging destination. It is traversed by the two major rail lines that historically defined the strong northerly axis of central Ontario cottage country.” (186)

The second case study area is Thunder Bay Beach, which Luka (2006) describes as follows:

Thunder Bay is found at the south end of Georgian Bay on the peninsula separating Severn Sound and Nottawasaga Bay (Map 7.6). It is about 150km from central Toronto by road, the first 100km of which are on a multi-lane expressway (Highway 400). Although much of the Georgian Bay shoreline in the area is strewn with boulders and small rocks, the focal point for this case study area is a wide ribbon of sand, called Centre Beach or simply Thunder Beach, which has had cottages on it since the mid-1920s. This case study area is typical of many beachfront cottage settings at the western extremes of central Ontario, especially those on Nottawasaga Bay, and it is not unlike most of Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching. It is squarely part of the southern Georgian Bay area shown by Dahms (1996) to be the residential mobility destination of choice for many older in-migrants from the Greater Toronto Area beginning in the late 1980s. (196)

The third and last case study area is Crystal Lake, which Luka (2006) describes as follows:

On the eastern second-home axis relative to the Greater Toronto Area, Crystal Lake is a

cottage country setting on the fringe of central Ontario's settled area. Geographically the furthest of the three case study areas from central Toronto, roughly 150km away as the crow flies (some 200km by road), its only transportation link is by automobile via the two-lane Highway 121 north from the small town of Bobcaygeon (population 2,800). Its closest functional ties are to Kinmount (population 800), located 15km to the northwest. Historically part of Peterborough County to the southeast, Crystal Lake is now found in the rather paradoxically-named City of Kawartha Lakes, formed in 2001 by the provincially-forced amalgamation of Victoria County with Lindsay, a city of 17,000. This 'city' is a sparsely-settled territory of 3,000km² with a total population of only 69,000.

(171)

5.3.1.2. Analysis of Key Themes in Respondent Narratives

Having outlined briefly the physical, social, and ecological issues surrounding the cottage country context and its three case study areas, we now move to excerpts from respondent transcripts outlining apparent phronetic patterns or themes. As has been shown through the thematic analysis, these themes emerged most notably during the interview at time when respondent and interviewer shared a feeling of mutual respect and trust and whenever the response was allowed to veer from the structured questions posed by the interviewer.

The interviewer's willingness to delve deeper into the subject matter at hand (and in doing so, to go beyond the confines of the structured questionnaire and allow an open unrestricted dialogue to take place between himself and the respondent) contributed greatly to fostering an atmosphere of trust, respect, and mutual learning between them. Additionally, the interviewer relied on his own interpersonal skills more than his training when conducting the interviews, recalling his own childhood memories of time spent in cottage country in order to get immersed in the immediate

context of the interviews.

While this is far from the mutual exchange of self-narratives that a Phronesis-based approach requires (whereby there is a mutual learning experience from both parties), it is still significant. It emerged spontaneously from the interviews, in large part due to the ability of the interviewer to foster a feeling of mutual trust and respect in his respondents.

The pattern or themes that emerge from the rich unhindered narrative of some of the respondents in the study display the respondents' practical knowledge and context-dependent judgment when relating the reasons for choosing certain locations over others in the three case study areas. It is also present when narrating the respondent's value-laden views of other second-home owners as neighbours, parents, or children that are either culturally similar or diverse from them, and the meaning they attach to their local place. Taking into account the inherent subjectivity of human observation and its interpretation of observable phenomena, this "sense of place" is what the respondents carry in their memories of, and in their engagement with, their cottages and its environment.

These are all manifestations of Phronesis as both a process and an end in itself. A Phronesis-based approach embodies all three phronetic components working synergistically, namely: knowledge of context, value-rationality (judgement), and praxis in actual choices. The choices made are dependent on the context within which each individual lives and on the reified meaning that events imbues each individual's life experience.

For the purposes of this analysis, the socio-demographic profile sample of the respondents given below consists of two undifferentiated categories of ordinary citizenry: Non-Citizen Practitioners, or casual respondents, and Citizen Practitioners. Luka (2006) explains that the respondents in the three case study areas tend to be older, much less ethnically diverse than found in metropolitan areas, and to some extent of limited higher-level education, as follows:

The number of individual respondents totals 44 in 30 households. Socio-demographic characteristics for the sample are summarised by area on Table 8.1 and by residential status on Table 8.2. As suggested by their average and median ages, this sample is very much an older one—dominated by Baby Boomers—although Crystal Lake respondents are slightly younger overall. About three in four persons are active on the labour market, but almost half of the individuals at Crystal Lake (seven of the 15) are inactive—in most instances because they are already retired. No difference is seen between the ‘seasonal’ and ‘permanent’ cottagers in this regard. Most respondents have at least one adult child; about one in three has younger children. Across the three areas, the mean number of years spent by respondents at the current property varies considerably, although the time spent in each area is similar for the Severn and Thunder Bay Beach groups. Crystal Lake respondents have only been in their area for roughly half as many years relative to the other two groups, and they seem much less apt to have switched specific locations than their counterparts to the west. By residential status (Table 8.2), ‘seasonal’ residents are more likely to have young children. They have also spent longer on average at their current property than ‘permanent cottagers’ whereas the latter group has typically spent more time in the area. Year-round residency may thus be associable with moving from one property to another within a given setting. (218-219)

The previous sections explored the phenomenon of politicised individualism within contemporary liberal democracies and the differences between citizen practitioners (as protagonists) and expert-citizens/everyday makers (antagonists, as described by Bang (2004a)) in practical experience as a source of authentic knowledge. While such comparisons are based

solely on the role of practical experience in meaningful knowledge production, they do not involve the role of narrative exchange in the production of local place knowledge. In order to do so, it was necessary to identify the characteristics that define ordinary citizens as citizen practitioners, through a thematic analysis of interview transcripts, as presented earlier in section 5.3.2., and to differentiate their narrative form from those of casual or non-citizen practitioners, as will be shown in the excerpts that follow. To that purpose, a representative narrative excerpt of a non-citizen practitioner respondent will be presented next, followed by representative narrative excerpts of citizen practitioner respondents.

The following narrative belongs to a professional (51-60 age bracket) from the Severn case study area that worked in the health sciences and raced watercraft professionally for 30 years. The narrative displays opinions and characteristics more fitting of an expert-citizen/everyday maker. The respondent has a long family history in the locale with a history of litigation over property lines and land-use issues. The respondent has also experienced personal and tragic loss of two of his children in accidents connected to water activities close to his property.

The respondent views, which are markedly pro-development and regulatory controls, go beyond his concern for his own land; it also extends to his desire to impose them on his neighbours and other residents in the area as well. In more than one occasion in the narrative while describing water rights, the respondent hints at having used his professional connections and influence to get favourable regulatory controls passed for his area. This characteristic of expert-citizens/everyday makers differentiates them from citizen practitioners. While it is not the

intention of this section, or this dissertation, to explore such differences, the following narrative is included as an interesting anecdotal comparison to the narratives of citizen practitioners, which is to follow later. The respondent's narrative is as follows:

We were for example able to purchase our shore allowance, which originally was a so-called road allowance all through the area, the townships owned the 60' from the high-water mark on your property; we were able to purchase that for a very reasonable amount, I guess again prior to my taking ownership of the property, which enabled you then to control things right down to the waterfront, whereas previously people could actually use the front 60' of waterfront, so at least in our area, that's gone. There's a tremendous number of things that need to be controlled: building of docks, boathouses, that sort of thing, that's certainly a major problem, to make sure that things are done properly and that they're not overdone; ... (see Appendix for full text)

(Luka interview S07)

The following selected narrative excerpts are presented along phronetic key themes that highlight essential (non-thematic) identifying characteristics of Citizen Practitioners within the three case study areas.

5.3.1.2.1. Context

The first emerging theme from respondents' narratives is knowledge of context, whether cultural, historical, or stemming from daily interaction with a local environment. This theme permeated respondent narrative from the three case study areas in a variety of ways all of which were manifestations of the respondents' knowledge of the context of their cottages and locales. It was sometimes expressed as uniqueness of context in terms of individual residence or neighbourhood or local community. At other times, it was expressed as a physical or emotional attachment to

“place,” this was especially true of respondents with shorter histories of residency, and is a uniquely individual response to a “sense of place” or a “sense of community” for the social, physical, cultural, and experiential interaction with one’s own cottage, residence, or locale.

For respondents with longer histories of residency in the case study areas, this “sense of place” was also accompanied by strong historical knowledge of and ties with their local cottages and its community. In this case, it was expressed as a sense of family continuity in “place.” Although there are hints of the other two citizen practitioner characteristics embedded within the respondent narratives, proactive engagement with context emerged as the most dominant citizen practitioner characteristic within this theme. Luka (2006), relates that “personal histories in the immediate vicinity average almost 40 years overall, and are strikingly affirmed by childhood experiences of cottage-life-in-place. Eight of the ten respondent households have members who grew up spending time on the Severn; only one individual had a childhood cottage experience that was exclusively elsewhere.” (223)

In this theme, all of the following selected narrative excerpts demonstrate that its respondents possess proactive engagement with context as a dominant citizen practitioner characteristic. The excerpts below identify the role of knowledge of context for the respondents as a life-long experience of place encompassing childhood to adulthood:

I grew up on the Severn below the Big Chute, just on the Georgian Bay side, between Port Severn and Gloucester Pool; I could see Gloucester Pool out our cottage window. ... That whole group of islands, one of those islands was my parents’. [My husband and I] had never met—we met on a blind date!—and what we discovered was that we both grew

up on the Severn, only he grew up on one part of the Severn and I grew up on another. But in those days, nobody had big boats, you know, a four-horsepower motor was a big deal.

(Female professional consultant in her 60s, life-long seasonal cottage owner-occupier on the Severn and owner-occupier of a dwelling in Orillia)

(Luka 2006, 223)

I've been coming up virtually every year of my life, so 60 years. This property we've had since about '63, and it was bought when my sister had four kids in five years, and up to that point we had the place across the river, and my parents figured it was time to have another place for the kids.... [This cottage] was on the market, and the timing was right; ... that side of the river is water access only, you see, so it made it easier, too, for parking here, going across there, and so on.... When my great-grandfather died, his property was divided up amongst his six kids, and so when it was first divided, there would have been six different places, but [several parcels were] sold out of the family over time. I've got still three cousins on the original property, and I've got two other cousins that have property also on the Severn, fairly close. So, five properties in total, among four cousins; I also have a brother-in-law with a place.

(Male teacher in his 60s, life-long year-round cottage owner-occupier on the Severn and owner-occupier of a dwelling in a Hamilton suburb)

(Luka 2006, 228)

When I was a baby they built their place and I spent most of my time there, my first 19 years (summers).... you see, my father bought a large piece, and there's six—he had six children, and he gave us each a lot. My husband and I built on our lot, and my son has that now, and then my daughter inherited my parents' place, and my other daughter is here ... I've been here every year of my life, at some point.

(Woman in her 80s, life-long seasonal cottage owner-occupier on the Severn and owner-occupier of a dwelling in a Toronto suburb)

(Luka 2006, 228)

By contrast, the excerpt below identifies the role of knowledge of context as a memory of “a sense of place,” that influenced the respondent as an adult:

[Interviewer] And in your childhood, were there experiences in cottage settings in Ontario?

I think there was just that one opportunity, I remember my mother rented a place around Wasaga Beach, and that was quite exciting; I was a very young kid at the time, and I think we spent just a week, and that sort of got me exposed, but I was just a little guy; and then it was years after that, I was an adult when I'd rent—when I was working, I would rent a place.

(Man in his 60s, 'permanent cottage' owner-occupier at Crystal Lake, previously also tenant in a dwelling in central Toronto)

(Luka 2006, 224)

The following narrative excerpts exemplify respondents' proactive engagement with context as "a sense of community" or of connectivity within the three case study areas. The first respondent narrative exemplifies a family's commitment to establishing contact with other families as a necessary part of their contextual knowledge of "a sense of community." This narrative demonstrates one family's proactive engagement with their context, despite geographical barriers along the Severn River and on Sparrow Lake and Gloucester Pool that make interconnectivity among community members difficult. Luka (2006) explains:

A couple with two children under the age of 10 once happened to run into another young family.

[Husband] You tend to know your neighbours on either side [of your own cottage property], but it's very difficult to get to know people across the lake ...

[Wife] We're actually finding that any family that we do bump into at the marina wants to get to know us. It's a definite—where as soon as you see a child, and the mother comes over: 'How old are your children? Let's get together, which is your cottage?'—and they boat over right away. So there's definitely that desire and unfortunately ... you really have to go out of your way to meet people ... You can sit all by yourself here; the lake is so big that there's no reason to know anybody on the lake unless you want to. You have to go out of your way.

(Couple in their 40s, seasonal cottage owner-occupiers on Gloucester Pool and owner-occupiers of a dwelling in a GTA suburb)

(Luka 2006, 244- 245)

Luka (2006) argues, “Thunder Bay, in contrast, appears to be a very well-defined place that is also well interconnected through networks of social activity, while also limited enough in size and population that respondents are able to grasp it as a cohesive whole of which their cottage property is only part.” (245) Physical, geographical, and landmark features (such as churches, tennis courts, bicycle paths, and shorelines) exemplify the following respondent’s proactive engagement with his context as described in this narrative excerpt:

Well, Thunder Beach is very unique in that the bay itself just speaks volumes for the whole thing. So you know, you’ve got Silver Birch to West Shore, and the church is almost central; tennis courts are you know a very important part of our life, and the Friendly Store is appropriately named; and then our little compound ... what speaks out in this picture is the water, obviously, the proximity to the water. Lots of nature; even though it’s somewhat of a really busy community, you know you’re really close to the nature setting—I think a lot of people think that they’ve got to drive off to this secluded place to be by yourselves to find, but it’s all right amongst us here. The bicycles: you know, we love to park the vehicle and not use it. Bicycles and walking are first and foremost, and everybody owns a little piece of the major focus, which is the water.

[Interviewer] Now, by ‘everybody owns a piece of it’ do you mean everyone owns a piece and has a right to it, or everyone owns it together as a collective of sorts?

I think your first statement is more accurate; everyone has a right to it, and that remains very political ... [but] everyone has a right to this water.

(Male teacher in his 40s, seasonal cottage owner-occupier at Thunder Bay and owner-occupier of a dwelling in central Toronto)

(Luka 2006, 246)

In the Severn case study area, the narrative excerpt that follows exemplifies one respondent's proactive engagement with context, expressed as uniqueness of context, in terms of individual residence or neighbourhood or local community. Luka (2006) explains that in order "to test the apparent uniqueness and irreplaceability of the case study areas, respondents were asked if they would seek a similar setting were they for some reason beyond their control effectively shut out of their cottage area." (249) The respondent narrates the following:

Possibly, but I'm more inclined to think that we would likely go somewhere different. I guess the possibility being someplace similar to this—similar but not the same—would be more, ah, for us, possibly more of a grief than a delight. Assuming that something happened and we weren't able to keep this, I don't think I would want to go somewhere else and be reminded of that, and the anger [it would evoke].

(Man in his 60s, life-long year-round cottage owner-occupier on the Severn and owner-occupier of a dwelling in a Toronto suburb)

(Luka 2006, 250)

The following narrative comes from a Canadian professor with a college degree (61-70 age bracket) and a long family history in the Severn River case study area that dates back to the beginning of the twentieth century. The respondent's father made major improvements and additions to the original cottage, and he in turn, continued those renovations when he acquired ownership of it. The respondent was also proactive in researching the cultural and socio-economical history of his locale. In the processes of doing so, the respondent engaged in extensive narratives with friends and neighbours in his locale to ascertain facts and verify relationships connected to historical progression of living conditions and land uses for his locale.

It seems clear from the respondents answers to the more structured questions put to him by the interviewer that he is aware of contemporary regional and local changes that he regards as detrimental to his locale. The following narrative exemplifies the respondent's proactive engagement with context going beyond his self-interest and more than simple protectionism. His narrative exhibits personal commitment and engagement with locale or residence and the willingness to take action to represent and defend it, describe its merits and vulnerabilities, and collaborate on improving it. The interviewer played a vital part in this dialogue by encouraging the respondent to elaborate on his recollection of experiences with his locale. This elaboration contrasts sharply with the respondent's other responses to more structured questions requiring little more than a yes or no answer or selecting answers from a provided list of choices. The excerpt is as follows:

As far as I know from photographic record and what my father and mother told me initially this was a place they came to I guess out of love for the area. They came here before they were married, which is very unusual. My father worked for the railway; he had been an Olympic runner with the Canadian team, and I think he got some special consideration from the railway as a result of that. He participated in the 1908 London Olympics as a marathon runner, and was with the railroad at the time, and I think they gave him special consideration. He used to get railway passes, and so ah, he could come up here—there were really no roads in this area at the time, certainly not passable roads as there are now—so he would come by train to the station at the landing called Severn Falls. There used to be a lovely old train station there (it's gone now) ... (see Appendix for full text)

(Luka interview S02)

5.3.1.2.2. Value-Rationality

The second emerging theme from respondents' narratives is value-rationality (judgement), resulting from the set of values or personal ethics acquired through life long experiences of

prudent actions. This theme permeated respondents' narrative from the three case study areas in a variety of ways, all of which were demonstrations of the respondents' value-rationality in narrative form, which, in turn, was a translation of the respondents' personal values into value-judgements concerning one's own cottage, residence, or locale. It was sometimes expressed as continuity of family values in terms of historical ties to an individual residence or neighbourhood or local community. At other times, it was expressed as a physical or emotional attachment to "place"; this was especially true of respondents with shorter histories of occupation. In such instances, it was expressed as a uniquely individual response to a "sense of place," or a "sense of community" for the social, physical, cultural, and experiential interaction with one's own cottage, residence, or locale.

In this theme, all of the following selected narrative excerpts amply demonstrate that under circumstances of local change, the respondent possesses the capacity of a citizen practitioner to articulate and be willing to share, as circumstances require, a narrative of local place knowledge demonstrating a translation of personal values into value judgments concerning one's own residence.

The next two narrative excerpts below express respondents' physical or emotional attachment to "place," demonstrating the respondents' value-rationality in narrative form as a characteristic identifying the respondents as citizen practitioners. Luka (2006) argues, "owing to the sense of personal impact in shaping their own cottage setting literally with one's own hands. A comparable statement is made by Crystal Lake respondent who saw the lake as interchangeable,

but his own cottage property as special.” (250) As the respondent explains in the following narrative excerpt:

This is not that shabbily built that you'd want to tear it down. ... My son-in-law asked me, would you buy a lot and build again? Ah, yeah, I'd like to do that, but I don't know—there are so many slivers in my hands from this place, you know, you've given a lot of yourself, so to lose this place ... you'd have to be careful that you don't lost what's really valuable to you, not in the money sense, but in terms of feelings.

(Man in his 60s, seasonal cottage owner-occupier at Crystal Lake and owner-occupier of a dwelling in a GTA suburb)

(Luka 2006, 250)

Luka (2006) introduces the narratives of a respondent and his wife, explaining his attachment to the land he inherited on the Severn River:

[Husband] *The cottage was built by me [in 1953].... I was going to be a bachelor, so I was going to build a bachelor cabin, so that's what I did, number one. And then that didn't work out, and so after growing up and with a limited space, I came across, down at the Big Chute, a log house, that belonged to one of the workers down there; he had built it on Hydro property, and he worked for Hydro and he was being transferred to Penetang.... So I bought a log house for \$200, and we had it dismantled, and moved up to the property, so that was the next thing [in 1960]. Then we have this bunkie that we built, and I guess it was the second thing that was built.*

[Wife] *We have buildings all over the place.... When [my husband] and his dad built the original cabin, they started it out by making it out of stone that they found right on the property, and they got a whole basement done ... they then said it was so difficult they switched to wood!*

(A professional consultant couple in their 60s, life-long seasonal cottage owner-occupiers on the Severn and owner-occupiers of a dwelling in Orillia)

(Luka 2006, 250)

Luka (2006) explains, “Accounts such as these are typical among the longer-term respondents across both the Severn River and Crystal Lake case study areas. Even where individuals did not themselves build the structures, the fact that their parents, grandparents, or great-grandparents did so gives them a sense of family continuity. One Severn River respondent strives to maintain the look of his cottage, built in the 1920s.” (251)

Basically we try to keep the exterior as much to the original as we can, and if we do any exterior renovations we will try to keep them within the pattern of the existing building. ... the building probably looks about the same as it did when it was built....

[Interviewer] *Do you consider it unique?*

Yes, ah, yes, in terms of how it was built; when it was built. It's one of a few that's still standing that was built that long ago, that's still in its original condition. There's a couple of others, but not too many. Ah, it has its shortcomings that we kind of work around and are gradually improving, but that's part of the challenge.

(Man in his 60s, life-long seasonal cottage owner-occupier on the Severn and owner-occupier of a dwelling near Blue Mountain)

(Luka 2006, 251)

A narrative excerpt is presented below to demonstrate a respondent's value-rationality emerging from experiential knowledge of past decisions or impressions. This, in turn, stems from the positive or negative impact on the respondent's cottage residence by developments; interaction with neighbours, professionals, or crime; or other social, economic, or political factors.

The respondent displays value-rationality in explaining his concern for the perceived impact on his land from an encroaching development of a future sub-division and its perceived impact on runoff, shoreline access, and the regulatory controls that accompanies it. The interviewer played a vital part in this dialogue by encouraging the respondent to elaborate on his recollection of

experiences with other sub-divisions, as well as the one in question. This elaboration contrasts sharply with other respondent responses to more structured questions by the interviewer requiring little more than a yes or no answer or selecting answers from a provided list of choices. The excerpt is as follows:

***C5.1 Q.** How important is it for you to be able to control the decision-making concerning physical changes to this dwelling and property (in terms of sharing it with other family members, and in the context of any applicable zoning or construction by-laws, etc.)?*

a) ... with reference to your dwelling and the property on which it sits?

b) ... with reference to the broader context (this lake, bay or general area)?

[amalgamation of two: more relaxed planning guidelines prevailed]

[... widespread concern over trailer parks, people shudder, they're not by definition bad, but a lot of them do look seedy, unplanned]

***A.** Back-lot development, where it would be behind us, you hear rumours, of course—I guess regardless of where you are living, it could even be in the US or whatnot—you'll hear things about well you know someone's planning on building a subdivision; they're going to be on that side of the road, but where do they gain access? So, that means, more impact on the lake, and the turbidity of the lake, the activity on the lake, the impact of runoff and whatnot, septic drainage, and things of that nature, even though they'd have to comply to regulations.*

You do get concerned with that type of thing. There is one development, it's been in for years in the far end of the lake, and it's that kind of thing, it's a subdivision, and they've got a road that goes down to the water where there's a bunch of boats all moored there, but it's like a subdivision, and I know there was controversy about that, but that's been in there longer than we've been here, but it functions, but they've had some problems recently with respect to—ah, because of the water—they have their own little kind of treatment, mini-treatment plant, and you know what's happened with the water because of Walkerton, well, the Province has come up with very very strict regulations, and it was going to cost them thousands of dollars to upgrade, so it looks like they've been fighting the government, and it looks, too, as if the people will be drilling their wells, but doing it, where, like, you, John, and I would use it and maintain it, and then I think that they would allow like up to three people to use so if there's three dozen dwellings there, each three would have their own well. Now, this is the latest that I've heard that they're planning that, but it was because of the Walkerton thing. Initially they had their little wee treatment set-up there, where they'd put chlorine in, and that wasn't sufficient. [Kinmount has a boil-water advisory...]

(Luka interview C01)

5.3.1.2.3. Praxis

The third emerging theme from respondents' narratives is praxis, which is the application of one's life experience to choices, actions, and perspectives. This theme permeated respondents' narratives from the three case study areas in a variety of ways. The most significant of which were demonstrations of respondents' praxis in actual choices that exemplified the willingness of an ordinary resident to integrate experiential place knowledge into decisions affecting one's locale. This includes sharing and exchanging such knowledge with similarly committed neighbourhood residents and with professionals/representatives pursuing projects affecting such neighbourhoods and shows Phronesis sensibilities at work.

In this theme, all of the following selected narrative excerpts amply demonstrate the respondents' praxis as a characteristic identifying the respondents as citizen practitioners. As with the two preceding themes, although there are hints of the other two citizen practitioner characteristics embedded within the respondent narratives, praxis in actual choices emerged as the most dominant citizen practitioner characteristic within this theme.

The narrative below is from a male respondent in his 60s who is a "permanent cottage" owner-occupier at Crystal Lake and was previously also a tenant in a dwelling in central Toronto. The interviewer asked the respondent the following short question concerning how secure the respondent feels in his locale, the respondent was encouraged to elaborate. The respondent gave a long and detailed narrative describing his involvement in forming neighbourhood watches and

conducting patrols to thwart criminals and look out for each other's properties amply demonstrating his praxis in decisions affecting his residence and locale. The respondent's account includes collaboration with police officers and the exchange of crime statistics through his involvement with another group in his local neighbourhood, all of which shows Phronesis at work:

E02 agree unsure disagree *I feel very safe and secure when I am in this area.*

A. *Hmm. I do, now, ah—probably, going way back, at the time when we were living in the city; it might be a slightly different thinking on it because the cottage at the time when we were coming up on weekends and things we had problems with break-ins, and that's why a group was got together, with a former reeve, myself, and a group of us, ___ being one, got involved with forming a neighbourhood watch. I think that's helped. I think, too, probably living up here has helped, as compared to the cottage being vacant, but we had over the period of the early years, three or four break-ins. We've lost several outboard motors.*

It was a problem, and of course you know when you were in the city, you'd always be worried about that. I never really worried about someone breaking in at the time when we're here, but there was always that feeling of you were powerless to basically do anything because you were down there, and you were 2-1/2 hours away, 2-1/4 hours away. I know that one time when we hadn't been up for a while, maybe it was the winter, it might have been the early spring; and I told ___ I have to go up to the cottage, it was a sixth sense. So I came up, and sure enough the door was kicked in, the screen was closed, the heater was blowing away like gangbusters. Kids had broken in, and they drank a little bit of booze, and pop, and you know mussed up the bed, and they'd just sort of stayed, and I guess what really irked me was the fact that I looked down at the floor, and I thought believe it or not there was a dead mouse or something down there; I went to pick it up, and it was a used condom ... (see Appendix for full text)

(Luka interview C01)

The narrative excerpts that follow demonstrate a respondent couple's praxis in actual choices and decisions made regarding their residence and locale. The respondents are professional consultants (61-70 age bracket) with college education. Their interaction with planning officials and other professionals as well as elected officials (a mayor in this case) is expressed vividly in

their narrative. This narrative clearly displays the respondents extensive local place knowledge and exhibits all three identifying characteristics of citizen practitioners with praxis being the most identifying characteristic in display. It must be emphasized, however, that while most of the couple's history of praxis was at the level of a citizen practitioner, this was no longer the case in the last 15 years. They felt that they were forced to join a cottaging lobby group (SRAPO) out of a sense of frustration that elected representatives and planning officials were ignoring their concerns and their voices, on matters that directly affected their locale. The narrative is as follows:

C5.1 Q. *How important is it for you to be able to control the decision-making concerning physical changes to this dwelling and property (in terms of sharing it with other family members, and in the context of any applicable zoning or construction by-laws, etc.)?*

a) ... with reference to your dwelling and the property on which it sits?

b) ... with reference to the broader context (this lake, bay or general area)?

[amalgamation of two: more relaxed planning guidelines prevailed]

[... widespread concern over trailer parks, people shudder, they're not by definition bad, but a lot of them do look seedy, unplanned]

[H] As regulations tighten up, and as I did with the renovation project, you soon learn to keep your mouth shut, and don't ask questions, because you know that the answer is going to be no; and so Georgian Bay Township have a word for that now, and they say—it's called a 'creeping cottage'—people start off and say the Township will let me build a 15'x20' and I wanted to have a 15'x30', so they build the 15'x20' and in a couple of years' time they take an end wall out and extend it out a couple of feet, and then a couple of feet more, just a bit at a time, so it doesn't look like they've done anything. [L] ... (see Appendix for full text)

(Luka interview S08)

In the following two narrative excerpts, respondents' praxis is expressed in choices related to a "sense of community" where respondents are engaged in forming an extended care system for

their children. Luke (2006) contrasts respondents perception of city living in the Greater Toronto Metropolitan Area with their cottage living experience in the Thunder Bay case study area, as he explains, “It is seen as part of the GTA in practical terms, but as very much ‘apart’ in experiential terms. Unlike the city, for instance, the complexity of social networks and the related ‘sense of community’ at Thunder Bay seem to translate into an extended care system through which children are collectively monitored.” (251)

I think it's almost or has been a throwback to the 50s, where your kids could wander about freely; you don't need to worry about them ... one thing I really see is the children, and the freedom they can have that they can't have anywhere else, and how nice it is to see kids able to go exploring or whatever of they wanted to do—be out of their parents' sight and not be worried about ... you can let them swim and you don't need to worry, you know.

(Woman in her 60s, seasonal cottage owner-occupier at Thunder Bay and owner-occupier of a dwelling in a Vancouver suburb)

[In the city], my next-door neighbour, my house could blow up, and he probably wouldn't say anything, or call the fire department. I think that people are less aware of their surroundings, whereas up here, the neighbours know; they watch our kids. I had an incident way back on Centre Beach years ago when the kids were little, ... and I had to go run back for a pair a boots, so I thought, it'll take forever to get to the store if I don't let them keep walking. Well, one mum watched these three kids walk by and she kept watching until I walked by. She was aware of the fact that three kids were walking that maybe shouldn't be there by themselves. That's when I realised that people really watch what goes on, which is why I think the kids are a bit safer; because I think people are aware.

(Woman in her 40s, seasonal cottage owner-occupier at Thunder Bay and owner-occupier of a dwelling in a GTA suburb)

(Luka 2006, 251)

Luka (2006) argues that regional development change patterns have alerted local residents in the three case study areas to the need to be proactively engaged in protecting their way of life and managing the effects of local change. The author explains, “The discourse of respondents in all

three case study areas is permeated with a sense that cottage country is being ‘citified’ through the use of urban form elements — ranging from building materials and architectural styles to the massing and structural types of housing now being built in lakefront settings.” (260)

In the next narrative excerpts, the respondents’ praxis takes the form of an open exchange of experiential local place knowledge with the interviewer on the effect of broader patterns of metropolitan development expansion on local change in the Crystal Lake area. In this exchange, the respondents offer their qualified narratives without interviewer prompting. Luka (2006) explains, “Hinted at in this exchange is that while these changes at Crystal Lake may seem innocuous, they are tinged with what can only be called gentrification, as GTA residents seeking lakefront cottage properties push real estate values up. The transformation is illustrated in the following discussion among a husband, a wife, and the wife’s brother who owns the cottage next door to the couple.” (259)

[Wife] *They’re all good changes.... One good thing is that a lot of people I think now that are buying cottages, and if they buy older places, or something like that, in their mind, they are [already] planning to tear them down; they are improving them, hence they are looking at the septic systems. You only get the odd one that’s been there for 15-20 years*

...

[Husband] *... Not too many people buy an average cottage and leave it, because it costs so much to buy a cottage.... If it’s an average or less-than-average cottage, it’s probably going to be a tear-down, or they’re going to spend a lot of money fixing it up, which means that the septic systems will be addressed, and all that stuff; ... So anyone who’s buying now, they’re making improvements. They’re keeners; they could be first time cottage-owners, or whatever; they’re going to get a new dock, they’re going to do this, they’re going to get involved in the stuff, and take ownership or pride as being a resident on the lake too, and say ‘Oo, geez, that’s not good, and that’s not good’.... People that have bought are generally making good improvements, because the lake is already populated.*

It’s not like Muskoka, where people are worried that somebody’s going to build hotels, condos, and all that stuff. This lake stays all cottages, and people just go from buying a

tear-down cottage and build a nice cottage; so I see that as a good thing. You're trading a shitty old cottage for a new one, in my mind.

[Wife's brother] I would take a different perspective on that; I see that as the urbanisation of the lake. I like more basic stuff. I like a nice cottage — don't get me wrong—and I appreciate people that have a nice thing. It's great. But if I had the lake surrounded by places like [theirs], all around the lake, to me that's not a lake; it's a waterfront community. It's urbanisation.... when I see everybody putting them up — well, it'd be like people moving into a neighbourhood, a quaint neighbourhood in the city, and then the guy behind puts up a monster home.

You know, sure, that's a great house, but what's it do to the neighbourhood? If everybody put great big cottages up all the way around the lake, it's not the same lake. You need the diversity....

[Interviewer] It sounds to me that what [wife's brother] is saying is that it's nice to see a mix; you don't want to see all the old cottages replaced.

[Wife's brother] Exactly: whenever you see the old cottage with the screened porch wraparound, ah! I love that, because that's what cottages really are—

[Wife] Because that's your fondest memory, when you see the little quaint cottages, like that old one by the marina. We saw that old one, and I said, now that's exactly what I remember! I would like a cottage like that. I wouldn't tear that cottage down. I would like a classic.

(Couple in their 40s and man in his 40s, seasonal cottage owner-occupiers at Crystal Lake and owner-occupiers of dwellings in GTA suburbs)

(Luka 2006, 259-260)

As was discussed in earlier chapters, for a Phronesis-based approach to be effective and relevant, planners, urban designers, elected representatives, and other professionals must engage local citizen practitioners early on the design and development of projects affecting local change. Local place knowledge should also be valued, not only as a necessary resource for such development, but also in its role in facilitating a dialogue of mutual learning. When combined with the life experience-based narrative exchange method this leads to creating an environment of mutual trust and respect between all stakeholders.

The following excerpts are a good example of how disregard for local citizen engagement processes and cultural capital lead to negative local respondent perceptions of public officials and their role in urban design development projects. Aux Vent is a controversial development in Thunder Bay. Here, respondents' narratives are rife with feelings of powerlessness and frustration in the face of what is perceived to be public-private development complicity undertaken with complete lack of concern for and feedback from existing residents. Luka (2006) states:

At Thunder Bay, where the recent construction of the 'Aux Vents' on the site of the 'public' beach fronting the former Thunder Bay Inn (as discussed in the previous chapter) is seen by many interviewees as almost abhorrent. Its architectural design and its assertive presence are both considered incongruent with the setting. Respondents—none of whom have formal training in planning or design—in effect spontaneously articulate that part of what makes cottage country distinctive as a cultural landscape is a certain sort of responsiveness in building design and site planning. This, many explain, is somehow embodied by the 'classic' wooden cottages that are older and more modest. Such is the case with the comments made by interviewees in the other two case study areas cited above. The Aux Vents compound at Thunder Bay flies in the face of what might be termed this cultural-landscape-sympathetic design approach:

You've seen that structure that's on the beach? That is ostentatious and vulgar and ugly. And I think—well, I might as well be forthright in my thoughts about this.... I think it's a little in-your-face... Why they tore down that gorgeous building that was historically such a part of this whole area, I don't know;... architecturally, it was so much a part of what was beautiful in this area.... The by-law said they couldn't build on the beach; how they got around it, I don't really see, but ... somehow they got permission to build on the beach, and they've ruined the whole landscape of that beautiful beach. They really have.... I'm not saying—I mean, I don't think that there are many original cottages left—but they still maintain the feeling and the shape of the contours of the land, and the beach feeling. But this is SO bad, that it's really upsetting to walk by it. It is ... That place represented so much, and such beauty, and such history, and it's been decimated [sic] by this ugly structure.

(Woman in her 60s, seasonal cottager and owner-occupier of a dwelling in a Toronto suburb)

As suggested in this comment, some respondents realise that the Aux Vents compound is offensive not only in its architectural form, but also because it represents the privatisation

of what has long been considered a public space:

[Husband] *The whole sort of context, or the subliminal message of the place, is that it's almost a fortress. And it's an intrusive fortress. It projects itself out into the walk, out into the visual landscape; it is the clearest statement that you could have imagined of 'I am here! This is mine! I own this! This is our family's place!' And it's got 'KEEP OUT' all over it, right?*

[Wife] *As a codicil, though, people have gotten outraged by every cottage that's been built ... But that cottage is ... it is visually jarring.*

[Husband] *I find the change personally painful to watch. ... I know that memory turns everything rosy, but they were very lovely times [at the Homes]. ... Now you have the object that we're now talking about sitting there as a symbol of the absolute irrevocable loss of that, I find it spiritually painful to walk by it. It's a sense of loss; well, I never lost a limb, but it's certainly a feeling of personal loss.*

(Couple in their 50s, year-round cottagers and owner-occupiers of a dwelling in central Toronto)

(Luka 2006, 261-262)

On a more positive note, a different example of development in the Severn case study area is perceived by local respondents as more responsive to the local context and as a step in the right direction in terms of local urban development. Luka (2006) explains as follows:

Musing on how an intensification of activity at Port Severn on Little Lake would be desirable, they refer to the appeal of the Intrawest-led project at Blue Mountain near Collingwood, where they also have a 'winter' dwelling. These comments on the need for more vital and vibrant public spaces in cottage country settings—something that arguably is a positive aspect of urbanisation—imply that projects such as Muskoka's Gravenhurst Wharf initiative are steps in the right direction:

[Wife] *If over on Little Lake, they had this big huge Intrawest-type village, over there, that'd be kind of cool! We could go over with everyone, walk along, and go to the shops and restaurants --*

[Husband] *It'd be kind of like Bala.*

[Wife] *Yeah, something like that, that would actually be really nice; but we don't want it right here. So it's selfish.*

[Interviewer] *So you mean to say you'd like to see it near here, but only in a place where it fits, which for you would be in a village or town?*

[Husband] *Yes, if it doesn't disturb the serenity of this place.*

*(Couple in their 40s, seasonal cottagers on Gloucester
Pool and owner-occupiers of a dwelling in a GTA suburb)*

(Luka 2006, 264)

5.4. Synthesis

In this chapter, we have explored the role of a citizen practitioner as an individual whose life experiences and local place knowledge shapes that individual's locale in the form of lay-expertise through praxis. The chapter presented an explanation for the notion of a citizen practitioner and the influence of life experience-based self-narratives as an enabler for the mutual exchange of local place knowledge between ordinary citizens and their elected and professional representatives.

The chapter also explored the implications of a Phronesis-based approach to local knowledge expertise (lay-expertise) by contrasting the polarizing roles of citizen practitioners with those of project-driven expert-citizens and everyday makers in citizen engagement strategies and their implications for local communities and for the democratic ideals that they espouse.

In section 5.2, we analysed the notion of a citizen practitioner through the lens of self-narrative praxis. We then explored the nuances of its role in facilitating direct communication and exchange of life experience narratives between ordinary citizens and their elected and professional representatives, in order to facilitate a reciprocal knowledge exchange. Bringing the exchange to the individual level, through citizen praxis, in the manner described by a Phronesis-based approach minimizes real obstacles to such an exchange, namely, trust, validity, and

credibility. The ultimate aim being improved outcomes for citizen engagement in planning, architecture, and urban design policy (see exploratory question 1 in Chapter 1).

Section 5.3 presented demonstrations of Phronesis in selected interview material with second-homeowners in central Ontario within the context of its cottage industry, revealing key assumptions and components of a Phronesis-based approach and advancing it as a transforming approach to existing planning and urban design practices in citizen participation/engagement. The subsection presented a thematic analysis of key themes in respondent narratives revealing the efficacy of the main assumptions and components of a Phronesis-based approach. The respondents, viewed as citizen practitioners, articulated their own narratives, thereby revealing richer details of local place knowledge built on experienced events and memories from a life trough of such experiences. The thematic analysis report, in its two stages, revealed the identifying characteristics of a citizen practitioner respondent, and contrasted them with those of a non-citizen practitioner respondent. Category-based themes revealed by data coding in the analysis identified several reasons for citizen practitioner respondent engagement. While the reasons for the respondents' engagement with their land varied, themes or patterns running through the respondents' narratives reveal that those reasons are built on a foundation of components that are at the heart of a Phronesis-based approach. Citizen practitioners, who exhibit value-rationality in decisions situated in their local context, draw such engagement decisions from a life trough of experiential knowledge (see exploratory question 3 in Chapter 1).

While the demonstrative interviews revealed that the life experience-based narrative exchange of

the respondents drew on singular components of a Phronesis-based approach, the synergy achieved from all the components working together in a singular approach is all the more powerful, effective, and relevant. The desired outcome is for a life experience-based self-narrative exchange to take place between citizen practitioners (ordinary and professional alike) where local place knowledge is shared to achieve desired outcomes for projects affecting the relevant neighbourhood (see exploratory question 3 in Chapter 1).

6. DISCUSSION, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

With this dissertation, I have attempted to find a common ground on which ordinary citizens and their elected and professional representatives can engage in a dialogue. Citizens can offer meaningful information about their home landscapes and neighbourhoods, but they do not possess the authority to effect change; city officials, planners, urban designers, architects, and other professionals do not have such knowledge, but they do possess the authority and credentials to direct change. The most desirable situation would be one in which an ordinary citizen shared his or her local place knowledge as a life experience narrative with a professional citizen who would in turn contribute a narrative of project-specific knowledge to the exchange. Such a collaborative effort adds meaning and relevancy to policy design, planning and implementation and is at the core of this research.

This dissertation is an introspective work (non-instrumental or empirical) whose main premise is the meaningfulness and validity of non-agenda driven subjective perspectives of ordinary citizens, based on their life experience, for the effective and relevant exchange and dissemination of local place knowledge for policy formation in planning, architecture, and urban design. Its target audience are individual citizens, be they citizens, professionals, researchers, academics, or elected representatives, who seek an improved perspective on their daily lives or on their professional endeavours in engaging the processes of a strong democracy.

It is about the impact of Phronesis on citizen participation/engagement, not citizen participation/engagement per se. Where it concerns citizen engagement strategies, it is about informal direct face-to-face citizen engagement through the operationalization of context, value-rationality, and praxis in a strong democracy. It is about empowering individual citizens as experts on local place knowledge through giving their knowledge exchange credibility in policy design, development, and implementation. Specific narrative recall of one's past experiences in a locale forms that individual's local place knowledge, which is subsequently shared with others or exchanged as a series of autobiographical narrative scenes. Thus, this is emphatically an empowering approach, which seeks to validate and empower individual and ordinary citizens by increasing their credibility as local place knowledge experts and promoting their self-referential place knowledge for early inclusion in the formulation of policy guiding planning, architecture, and urban design processes.

The focus of the dissertation is on the formation of an informed public policy that guides the processes, research, and practices of the fields of planning, architecture, and urban design. It presents a participatory approach to policy which challenges the dominant normative values of traditional architecture, urban design and planning. It is not about building design, nor is it about user-engagement or interaction in building design projects, but rather about the informal face-to-face engagement of individual ordinary citizens (through narrative-exchange relationship building) in the design, development, and implementation of social and public policy that requires local place knowledge for neighbourhood project proposals to be effective and relevant.

This dissertation is specifically developed within the field of Architecture, rather than in other fields, for an important reason. The reason being that, in stark contrast to planners and social scientists in other fields and disciplines, it is in architecture and urban design that we are more often engaged with personal perceptions and relationship- building than with public representatives of institutions and group agenda advocacy. However, as pointed out previously, there is no tradition of rigorous research-based theories and approaches to policy on informal face-to-face individual citizen participation/engagement in the field of architecture and urban design, and certainly none that addresses Phronesis.

While planning has its own instituted research and practice-based approaches to engage citizens (see Chapter 3), this is not the case for the architecture and urban design fields. At best, what does exist in those fields is anecdotal evidence of project-based ad-hoc attempts by individual architects and urban designers to mediate on behalf of their clients to navigate the political and permit hurdles from outside the processes of planning to affect successful outcomes for their client projects. This is also the case when individual architects and urban designers advocate on behalf of community groups to facilitate group objectives for desired project outcomes and, on rare occasions, for desired policy outcomes.

The reason for this is understandable for while planners have some exposure in practice and to a lesser degree through their education to the social and political theories and model processes guiding social and public policy, architects and urban designers have very limited exposure to such processes in practice and in education. However, the voice of architects and their

contributions are needed in the public policy debate, since it is often the case that such policy determines outcomes for local neighbourhood projects and urban design developments in which architects and urban designers are the professionals most involved. The lack of a rigorous research-based approach and theory to guide architects and urban designers' inclusion in policy processes is to blame. In addition to the explicit dissertation objectives cited earlier, this dissertation seeks to answer this need by providing just such an approach, which enables individual architects and urban designers to have a valid, meaningful, and research-based position on the formation of public policy.

For architectural and urban design practice, the dissertation advances a theoretically sound and historically grounded approach that enhances architectural practice and architects' relationship with potential and existing clients (future research may corroborate that). The approach adds the perspective of life experience-based narrative exchange to architects and urban designers' dialogue with ordinary citizens, to enhance mutual trust and derive meaning from the local place knowledge exchanged, in a manner that is relevant to the design, development and execution of building projects undertaken, as seen through the lens of context, value-rationality and praxis.

In Architectural and urban design education, this contribution can have an even greater impact if it is incorporated within the academic traditions of design studio for project proposals that involve accessible neighbourhood sites, wherein narrative exchanges with neighbourhood individuals can be carried out and to have those individuals engaged with the students throughout the design of projects. This is in lieu of the conventional studio method of having the teacher act

as both client and critic on student projects. A reciprocal exchange between architectural practitioners and students can have a mutually beneficial effect in both mentoring future practitioners and re-learning design foundations with an emphasis on context, value-rationality and praxis, as guiding principles. An understanding of the role of the phronetic components in enhancing the theoretical perspective of design education can only benefit the field, by bringing the academy closer to the realities of practice and by giving meaning and relevancy to their research (in conducting case studies) while enriching practice by enabling practitioners to engage effectively in matters of policy.

The approach is concerned with relationship building between individual ordinary citizens and planners, architects, and urban designers to facilitate the inclusion of ordinary citizen's local place knowledge and perspective, on the one hand, and the perspective of planners, architects, and urban designers, on the other, in the formation of public policy that subsequently governs proposed neighbourhood projects.

At this later stage, which is outside the focus of this dissertation but is appropriate for future research, the approach would define an informal process that takes place much earlier than the formal pre-design, contract, and post-contract design processes in architecture and urban design. It is about giving credibility to agenda-less local place knowledge, shared and exchanged by individual citizens, not through their affiliation with advocacy groups and community groups or other forms of indirect citizen representation, but through their informal direct face-to-face engagement with professionals and policy-makers, on matters that directly affect those citizens

daily living in their own homes.

It is also about outlining, defining, and producing a learning method for local place knowledge exchange for individual citizens, professionals, academics, researchers, and elected representatives in both policy decision-making and academic/research circles. In the latter, the case study method itself is redefined through the lens of a Phronesis-based approach.

In order to advance the Phronesis-based approach for citizen participation/engagement in architecture, urban design and planning policy and the research and practices of case study methods, practitioners, researchers, academicians, elected representatives and ordinary citizens can do the following:

1. Utilizing the self-narrative of the Lay Citizen Practitioner, in direct communication with professional and elected representatives, as a relevant and effective means of transmitting, harnessing, and distributing local knowledge of their respective environments to their municipal governments and professional organizations.
2. Delineating the quality of expertise in research, professional, and academic literature to the individual level, thereby affording all stakeholders an equal platform for dialogue and thus enabling consensus.

6.1. Exploration and Recapitulation

The research question was: *How can current architecture, urban design, and planning research methods and practices concerned with citizenship participation/engagement be redefined as learning systems in a Phronesis-dominant approach?* This was explored through various objectives:

- To evaluate the current state of citizen participation/engagement research and practices of policy formation through a mixed method that includes integrative, methodological, historical and theoretical literature reviews (Chapters 2 and 3) covering more than four decades of studies.
- To provide a redefinition of the expertise of ordinary citizens engaged in the harnessing and transmission of local place knowledge as citizen practitioners and to redefine their engagement roles in local planning, architectural, and urban design policy as citizen praxis.
- To introduce a Phronesis-based approach for citizen participation/engagement in urban design, architecture and planning policy and case study research utilizing the self-narrative of the citizen practitioner in direct communication with professional and elected representatives as a relevant and effective means of transmitting local knowledge. This calls for a redefinition of professional expertise in planning, architecture, and urban design and all its processes of doing (conception, development, adoption, and implementation), including policy. All of this is predicated on the division of labour,

specialization, professional distinction, and the very notion of the “layperson.”

The mixed method used in this research included analysis of the body of knowledge and integrative, methodological and historical reviews of Phronesis and citizen participation / engagement in policy literature and a philosophical treatise that constructed a theoretical argument providing a theoretical basis for an analysis of semi-formal interview transcripts, and demonstrating the efficacy and relevance of the life-experience-based self-narrative of the citizen practitioner, as a means of transmitting local knowledge in face-to-face communication with professional and elected representatives. The mixed method helped us to identify, analyze, and address challenges facing citizen participation / engagement research, practice, and methods in policy. It also helped us to advance an effective and relevant Phronesis-based approach that addresses and resolves those challenges and generates a meaningful dialogue based on individual narrative to be added to the existing social dialogue.

In my treatment of research harnessed from a multitude of fields and disciplines, I stayed clear of unique and idiosyncratic terms that are specific to each discipline or field. Instead, I only incorporated terms and concepts that are universally understood and defined across the variety of fields and disciplines targeted by my integrative, theoretical, methodological and historical reviews of the literature. I did this in order to avoid any ambiguity or misapplication of such terms in the analysis and subsequent application of a Phronesis-based approach in this dissertation.

Additionally, I am using a specific definition of Phronesis in this dissertation, along with Flyvbjerg's (2001) phronetic research components, to address the issues facing citizen participation/engagement. Wall's (2005) reconfiguration of poetics into "Recoeurian Critical Phronesis" is similar to my own point of departure from pure Aristotelian Phronesis to a contemporary understanding and application of Phronesis (or practical wisdom) as both a process and an end in itself. It is distinct from sophia (or theoretical wisdom with its emphasis on universal values). Its focus is the individual, whose narrative story is his/her life experience being woven and expressed as the ever-evolving dialogue between the self and others. This narrative evolves and is concurrently shaped by the public official/planner/architect/urban designer and the citizen/client who are inclusively all individuals. At the heart of it is the moral ethos and poetics of the person who builds the narrative by collaborating with others who share a community of resources, activities, and values stemming from a common culture.

I chose to stay clear of Aristotelian scholarly dogma delineating differing shades of Phronesis. Instead, I adopted a centrally coherent phronetic definition, which is focused on the individual as a citizen practitioner, to resolve the tension and re-tension of narratives between ourselves and others. This transformation of narrative tensions into meaning also characterized the work of Macintyre (1962), Nussbaum (2010), and Ricoeur (1991). Wall (2005) aptly reviewed the works of the above-mentioned authors as transformations of "moral tensions" into "moral meaning."

Research Exploration Context: Chapter 2 described the similarities and differences between the Aristotelian concepts of Phronesis and sophia. The chapter's first section (Phronesis and

Sophia) explains the connections between the three branches of knowledge and the five modes of truth in the Aristotelian tradition. It is noted that Phronesis, in particular, is necessary to guide and actuate good outcomes for the applied and social sciences, including planning, urban design, and architecture.

In the following section, citizen engagement is defined as a notion with significant links to democratic governance and public policy decision-making. Its primary principles are examined via the policy and civic arena literature and the work of its influential writers.

The third section of Chapter 2 (Expertise as Explicit Knowledge) covers the contributions of prominent authors and researchers to our understanding of expertise, lay-expertise, and direct communication; it also focuses on the debate on authoritative knowledge. We discover that expertise is multifaceted and involves both formal and informal knowledge acquisition. While the discussion's main focus remains on lay knowledge expertise and acquisition, it, by necessity, involves the identification of experts from historical to contemporary traditions and their role in relevant practice in its two varieties: professional and lay-practice. Additionally, Ericsson, Krampe, and Tesch-Romer (1993) explain the role of relevant experience in what is termed "deliberative practice" (see exploratory question 4 in Chapter 1).

In the fourth section of the chapter (Tacit Knowledge and Communities of Practice), the role of interactional expertise in validating lay experience, as well as the individual perspective as a credible source of local place knowledge are explored. This chapter documents Collins and

Evans (2002) and Dreyfus and Dreyfus (2005) observations that while interactional and contributory expertise both display tacit knowledge-laden qualities, interactional expertise alone is primarily concerned with meaning embodied in context and its important link between individual and social approaches to expertise development. Furthermore, it explains Wenger's (1998) elaboration on this notion of practice as meaning in a given context; Wenger articulates the role of participation and reification as a duality in the negotiation of meaning in a community of practice and in the formation of a community of action (see exploratory question 4 in Chapter 1).

In section 2.5 (Expressions of Expertise in Planning, Design, and Public Policy), I explore the direct relationship between citizen participation/engagement and democracy. To do so, I draw from Fischer's (2000) work, who explained that the most significant problem is distrust of government and institutions and lack of a meaningful dialogue between citizens and policy-makers. This author cited the non-technical expertise of ordinary citizens as a major obstacle in intelligent deliberation on matters of public and social policy.

In this section, I also argue for comprehensive and integrated political and social inquiry employing the notions of *Phronesis* and citizen practitioner as defined by my research. The participation of ordinary citizens—their offering of local place knowledge—is accommodated and transformed into meaningful policy according to the level of political and social inquiry that occurs. This, in turn, is linked to the type and the power of the adopted democratic system. I observe, as well, that scientific and degenerative policy design leads to an apathetic political

system—one that restricts inclusion in its processes to select businesses, private associations, and citizen groups and rejects the input of individual ordinary citizens. While lending credence to the notion of a citizen practitioner, policy analysts and designers insist that individual citizen empowerment could occur either through better policy designs or through the inherent “intelligence” of democratic politics. This is a position akin to that of market economics reliance on market mechanisms to resolve internal conflicts (see exploratory question 4 in Chapter 1).

The section then explored the historical and emergent differences between the processes of participatory democracy and those of representational and nominal democracies where it concerns citizen participation/engagement and citizen activism. We encounter the two types of citizen activism, namely, ordinary citizen activism and expert-citizen activism. Bang and Dyhrberg (2003) argued that the latter type of activism, citizen activism and expert activism, as representing the term expert-citizen, is a new form of republican elitism, which poses a threat to nominal democratic values and stands in opposition to non-expert ordinary citizen participation. Bang and Sorenson (1997, 1999, 2001) have used the term everyday maker to define this type of ordinary citizen activist and to express the legitimacy of practical experience as a source of authentic knowledge.

Chapter 3, methodologically reviewed strategies and approaches utilized by planning professionals, architects, designers, academicians, and researchers aiming at engaging citizens with their professional and elected advocates. The chapter also historically reviewed various types of participatory research in multiple fields. This was followed by a brief coverage of the

evolution of user/expert interaction and the role of the user as coauthor in participatory design research, through four decades leading to our present time.

A thorough historical review is made of the array of practical and theoretical attempts to increase user participation in architecture and urban design since the 1960s, along with key figures and key works, exploring the impact of dominant theories on the practice of participation, and the existing differences between theoretical ideals and real-world practices. Comparisons were drawn between participation and democracy's traditional and contemporary conceptualizations and their effect on real-world practices. The rest of the chapter covered citizen participation/engagement strategies and approaches for planning policy, from the profession's inception to the present.

The first section also covered different ways of approaching types and stages of citizen participation. Some prominent examples are: Wiedemann and Femers's (1993) ladder, presented as an administrative and government-oriented mandate; Dorsey, Doney, and Rueggeberg's (1994) ladder, which views citizen participation within the conventional stages of planning processes; and Conner's (1988) ladder, which views citizen participation as a series of approaches to dispute resolution in the public policy process. The subsection (Illustration of Different Approaches) presents a comparative analysis of two dominant planning approaches to citizen participation/engagement through illustrative case studies, which demonstrated the inefficacy of currently available strategies while advancing a Phronesis-based approach as a viable and complementary alternative to such strategies.

In the subsequent sections (Rational Comprehensive Planning; Advocacy Planning, Transactive Planning and Pluralism; Communicative Action and the Deliberative Practitioner), I look at dominant approaches and planning paradigms. These have historically arisen either internally within the planning profession (as a means of synthesizing its most effective approaches into operative ones) or externally (as a way of formalizing its methods and its professional identity). The subsection also enumerated ways in which exchange as ideal communication (communicative action) differed from a Phronesis-based approach to the engagement of citizen practitioners through their life experience-based narrative exchange of local place knowledge with representatives and professionals (see exploratory question 2 in Chapter 1). Those differences are as follows:

- Habermas (1987) employs theories of communicative rationality to describe the processes of communicative action. Its ultimate aim is to enhance rationality through effective communication. A Phronesis-based approach to the engagement of citizen practitioners describes the narrative exchange of local place knowledge as emerging from an individual's phronetic sensibility as expressed through value-rationality (as opposed to communicative rationality) in a specific context and praxis based on an individual's life experience.
- Habermas (1987) asserts that rationality is essentially a social endeavour, rather than an individual one, and that language itself is a social and rational phenomenon, rather than one that stems from individual initiative. As such, it would be of special interest and benefit to a select and well-trained group of adherents who would have to follow its linguosemiotic rules of communication to the letter in order to be effective. By contrast, a

Phronesis-based approach describes value-rationality as stems from individual initiative and social interactions, as well as from the language of narrative exchange with its use of metaphors and tacit knowledge-laden qualities. The form of language that the narrative takes is uniquely shaped by each individual and is based on that individual's life experience.

- Habermas (1987) ties morality to a social common will, rather than positioning morality as stemming from each individual, as expressed through his or her individual actions. This is a fundamental difference between communicative action and a Phronesis-based approach, which has a focus on individual praxis and value-rationality, in contrast to communicative rationality, of the particular variety posited by Habermas.

The last section of Chapter 3 initially covers covered several theories that had a profound impact on the theoretical discourse within the fields of planning, architecture and urban design in both research and practice. Foremost among those theories are the theory of social learning by Bandura (1973) and the process of reflection, which, as Schön (1983) pointed out, encompasses an individual's life experience both as action events and "ethics of action." Equally important to the life experience-based situated place knowledge of ordinary citizens or citizen practitioners is Schön's (1993) "generative metaphor." Schön and Rein (1994) collaborated to devise "learning systems," whose processes reconstruct interpretations of deliberative processes and dialogues between ordinary citizens and organizational representatives. It is this understanding and usage of the metaphor as a uniquely derived and self-actuated perspective on the world that gives the citizen practitioner's self-narrative meaning and relevancy in the act of local place knowledge

exchange (see exploratory question 4 in Chapter 1).

We also discover that for post-structural feminist geographers like Katz (1992) and Haraway (1988), power is the context within which the practitioner or researcher seeks transparent reflexivity at the micro level of locally produced knowledge and at the macro level of economic-political power relations. Rose's (1997) own research conclusions are examined as well, leading us to conclude that it is not feasible or even preferable to achieve a comprehensive, transparently reflexive positionality. It is far better to allow knowledge gaps to occur in the research process as a natural consequence of knowledge production (see exploratory question 4 in Chapter 1).

Toward the end of the chapter, I describe three main barriers to obtaining better results from citizen participation/engagement efforts, utilizing dominant planning approaches for sustainable development. By avoiding these obstacles, planners can improve their attempts to establish effective strategies to assist their respective communities. Each of the planning approaches could have its own unique response to those challenges, which follow its own unique processes.

Chapters 2 and 3, the literature reviews of Phronesis and citizen participation, survey the relationship between citizens and their representatives by identifying the issues faced by citizens who wish to participate in municipal planning, architecture, and urban design policy. Most of the authors covered in the integrative, methodological and historical reviews maintain that current approaches to citizen participation in policy are constrained by financial and time considerations and by their predictability; they see such approaches as ineffective in harnessing citizen input in

any meaningful fashion. The literature also lacks comprehensive approaches or strategies that could lead to effective policy design and implementation.

Chapter 4 explores the Aristotelian concept of Phronesis and its three fundamental components through an analysis of citizen-participation strategies. The chapter also looks at the role of the citizen practitioner whose life experiences and practical knowledge shape his or her community and its policy strategies and outcomes (see exploratory question 1 in Chapter 1).

Beginning with a specific definition of Phronesis adapted to the purposes of this research, a Phronesis-based approach was applied to the case study method to reinvigorate its research methods and practices, make them more useful in recording citizen participation/engagement processes, and give them greater meaning and relevance. Next, the development of those processes was charted in order to reposition them within a historical context and a broader critique (see exploratory question 4 in Chapter 1).

In summation, a Phronesis-based approach calls for integrating planning, architecture and urban design processes and policies with input from citizens very early in the design and formulation of such processes and policies. The emphasis would be on the role of citizens as individual “experts,” whose life experiences and practical knowledge of their respective dwellings define their knowledge base and describe their engagement in their local community’s development. Such local communities of grassroots citizen practitioners can have a positive impact in guiding their city towards a more enlightened urban design, architecture, planning, and policy design. It

would serve to empower their voices and their effective impact not only on their respective communities, but also regionally and throughout the nation.

In practice, this may mean forming citizen task forces to define issues and guide planning policy. Such an influence may find its way into scholarly research circles to reinvigorate its existing research approaches to policy design. Therefore, a phronetic approach that imbues citizen participation/engagement with value-rationality and context through the exercise of praxis would have a double purpose: it informs individual citizens as to what acting as an expert entails by introducing them to sustainable local policy strategies and promoting positive planning, architecture, and urban design policy initiatives, and it offers public officials, planners, architects, and urban designers, along with other stakeholders, guidance in encouraging citizen participation/engagement efforts.

Chapter 5 deals with the citizen practitioner as an individual whose life experience and local place knowledge have the power to transform aspects of his or her neighbourhood. The chapter provides an explanation of what it means to be a citizen practitioner and details the ways in which life experience-based self-narratives facilitate a positive exchange between ordinary citizens and their elected and professional representatives.

It also outlines the effects a Phronesis-based approach has on local knowledge expertise (lay-expertise) by juxtaposing the role of citizen practitioners with those of project-driven expert-citizens and everyday makers in citizen engagement strategies; the implications for local

communities and for the democratic ideals they espouse are also discussed (see exploratory question 1 in Chapter 1).

In the second section of the chapter, I look more closely at the citizen practitioner through the lens of self-narrative praxis; I go on to scrutinize the ways in which praxis facilitates direct communication and exchange of life experience narratives between ordinary citizens and their elected and professional representatives.

The rest of the chapter presented demonstrations of a Phronesis-based approach through the thematic analysis of respondent narratives from interviews conducted with second-homeowners in central Ontario in the context of cottage country. The demonstrations revealed phronetic themes and identified three essential characteristics of citizen practitioners that differentiated their narratives from casual respondents' narratives within the three case study areas. A hypothesis was postulated from the findings that have implications for future research on the roles of citizen practitioners in citizen engagement for planning, architecture, and urban design policy.

6.2. Analysis: Redefining Citizen Engagement Research Methods in Planning, Architecture, and Urban Design to Include Phronesis-Based Approaches

The research undertaken in this dissertation was built on the conclusions and propositions advanced by a multitude of authors, thinkers, and writers over the last half century from a

multitude of fields and disciplines. All of which share the continually evolving debate on citizen participation and its relatively recent offshoot, citizen engagement. Although the focus of this debate has shifted over the decades, following the dominant concerns of each era and its historical context, its aim remains to affect better outcomes for the relationship between citizens and their representatives within a democratic framework. Research methods of citizen participation/engagement have more or less followed in their historical progression of the academic debate, in terms of theories, models, methods, and methodologies emerging from each era, while keeping a tenuous connection to field-applied techniques and strategies for citizen participation. This is due, in a large extent, to the varying reach and impact of the role that politics plays in shaping the debate in academic circles, on the one hand, and the decision-making arena, on the other.

This disconnection between theoretical models and actual practice is more apparent in some fields than others. This is especially relevant to the applied scientific fields of planning, architecture, and urban design and less so for other social science fields. Most planners (and to a lesser degree for urban designers and architects) have adopted the identification of “technical expert” to describe their academic training and their role in practice in the shaping of cities. However, Planners and urban designers (and architects least of all) on the whole, are not versed in the political strategies and compromises that stakeholders, politicians, elected officials, lobbyists, policy-makers, and a multitude of others utilize to dominate the debate using every advantage at their disposal. Planners and urban designers, possess a general “feel” for political and social issues, but lack the essential skills and in-depth comprehension that such political

issues require.

This dissertation covered direct and indirect citizen participation processes because of their link to the allocation of authority. In terms of power distribution, however, there are two other types of participation that have links to the planning profession: formal and informal citizen participation, whose processes are integrative because they both impact local matters. Those two types of participation are expressed in planning as formal and informal planning networks. Expert-citizens and everyday makers, as discussed in previous chapters, often utilize informal planning networks to gain influence in local matters with elected politicians and city officials. They do so by circumventing planner mitigation to interact with officials directly. Their input is placed in direct competition with planners' recommendations to influence policy-making decisions and outcomes.

Planners are often unaware of the social mechanisms that participants in informal planning networks use to gain influence and acquire favourable outcomes for their agendas. Also, with a few exceptions, most notably those of Forester (1989), planners often do not regard the experiential knowledge of ordinary citizens as valuable to the planning profession. Forester, by contrast, insists that the experiential input of ordinary citizens should be embraced by planners when making plans and recommendations because planning is inherently value-laden.

In addition to the above, planners, urban designers and architects, often lack academic exposure to citizen participation issues and processes, as most planning schools do not offer citizen

participation courses as part of their core curriculum. Planners and urban designers also lack such exposure in their professional practice, since most planning practice organizations ignore everyday experiential knowledge as a key requirement for making plans along with social capital network shared experience (see APA 1992, 2005; PAB 2012). As for architects, the issue of user concerns and desires often collide with architects' own idealized conception of practice, which ultimately results in a pseudo or partial participatory architectural process. Architectural discourse's aversion to discussions on the influence of political relations on the profession, has kept it blind to socio-political and ethical considerations. However, such discussions are needed in order for the profession to transform its participatory processes into relevant and effective practices, especially in matters of policy.

When policy issues are debated, what is often at the heart of the debate is not the content of the issues, but the political relationships, alliances, coalitions, and compromises that are forged between stakeholders that often decide the issues and forms policy. Planners are often at a loss here, not only because of their lack of political skills, but also because of their adoptive stance of neutrality as technical experts, which puts them, quite often, at the disposal of one coalition or another to acquire a political advantage (which might, in fact, be at odds with the planner's own view). The debate on the environment is one such example. The citizen participation/engagement debate is another example and the policies that shape it are relevant to this dissertation's goals and objectives. There is a valid need, therefore, to understand the nature of this debate, uncover its underlying issues, and be able to describe their implications in an effective and relevant fashion.

It must be stressed, however, that a Phronesis-based approach advanced by this dissertation should in no way be viewed as a prescriptive model that seeks to replace existing methods of citizen participation/engagement in policy. This dissertation, its recommendations, and the Phronesis-based approach it presents explore and describe mindful engagement on the part of ordinary citizens and the professionals who represent them to enable and enhance existing perspectives rather than replace them.

As I discussed in earlier chapters, building on the work of Foucault (1973), the tenets of the expert/citizen relationship have also been disputed by the post-positivists. They support a participatory expert/citizen relationship over scientific rationality and all of its methodologies and assumptions related to professional expertise; they also promote an alternative framework based on practical reason and deliberative processes (Fischer 1990). Nonetheless, post-positivists provide little more than an undetailed endorsement of the general need for a participatory expert/citizen relationship.

The form that the processes of deliberation take are of particular importance in understanding the nature of citizen participation/engagement and are called for by the advocates of a strong participatory democracy, post-positivist proponents, and citizen engagement strategists. This research has undertaken the articulation of such a form wherein citizen engagement research methods in architecture, in urban design and planning were redefined to include Phronesis-based approaches. In such an approach, citizen praxis defines the exchange of local place knowledge through self-narratives by citizen practitioners within the context of a particular project and for a

particular locale. It is hoped that this form of citizen engagement by citizen practitioners would answer the above-mentioned need.

Finally, it must be noted that in regards to ‘agenda-less’ knowledge, a phronesis-based approach regards the dialogue and deliberation between citizen practitioners and their elected and professional representatives as unconstrained, unstructured and unscripted exchanges of local place knowledge. Such knowledge is informed by their individual life-experiences and articulated as self-narratives encapsulating mutual trust, acceptance of differences and avoidance of stereotyping in their expression. As expressed previously this work, in a narrative exchange, ordinary individual citizens represent their life experiences as storylines embedding values in a coordinated description of the experienced events. Such representational narrative devices enable an individual to relay a linear progression of temporal events, as life experience narratives.

However, the inclusion of “inaccurate” sets of perceptions in a citizen’s life-experience based self-narrative (‘e.g., racism or other forms of stereotyping’) mirrors only that individual’s experiential knowledge and perceptions. Such perceptions are neither to be encapsulated as consensual truth nor do they invalidate that citizen’s right to exchange a self-narrative in whatever manner deemed acceptable by that individual. This does not characterize the self-narrative as a form of consensual truth, whether expressed by an ordinary citizen or his representative. It is situated knowledge only in the sense that the project-specific dialogue gives it form. The role of the professional then is to understand and draw out the spatial implications of the exchanged self narrative. This role requires both knowledge and imagination and an

acceptance of difference. Aristotle's reminds us that "deliberation refers to the process of considering alternatives and reasoning to the best ... excellence in deliberation will be correctness in assessing what is conducive to the end [i.e. the goal], concerning which practical wisdom gives a true conviction." (Aristotle 1999, Book 6, Ch. 9:1142b30) As a form of best reasoning, a dialogue is:

a process that allows people, usually in small groups, to share their perspectives and experiences with one another about difficult issues we tend to just debate about or avoid entirely ... Dialogue is not about winning an argument or coming to an agreement, but about understanding and learning. Dialogue dispels stereotypes, builds trust and enables people to be open to perspectives that are very different from their own. Dialogue can, and often does, lead to both personal and collaborative action ... starting with dialogue and encouraging deliberation after people have had the chance to share their personal experiences with the issue at hand.

(NCDD Online, What are Dialogue and Deliberation? 2012, 1).

6.3. General Conclusions

With this dissertation, I have presented an exploration of the Aristotelian concept of Phronesis, as well as Flyvbjerg's (2001) three fundamental components of phronetic research. This has entailed an examination of strategies for citizen participation/engagement within the context of Phronesis and its components. I have also discussed the individual's role within his or her community (physical locale or neighbourhood) and depicted that individual as a citizen practitioner whose life experiences and practical knowledge help to form the community and the policy strategies and outcomes that characterize it. I go on to reposition these strategies and processes within a historical context using a broader engagement critique that culminates in a

Phronesis-based approach for citizen participation/engagement in planning, architecture, and urban design policy and the research and practices of the case study method.

The scope of this dissertation emphasizes the importance of live, face-to-face communication in the form of life experience-based self-narrative exchange. Such communication can achieve positive outcomes related to the acquisition of valuable local place knowledge. The research also posits that this approach to mindful-engagement facilitates partnerships and collaborations in the design, development, and implementation of policies affecting neighbourhood projects. These shared self-narratives, based as they are on the individual life experiences of citizen practitioners and professionals, become the vehicle for the transfer of local knowledge that impacts such neighbourhoods.

Key Contributions of the Research:

This study contributes a conceptual framework that explicitly integrates knowledge and learning into an understanding of authority and expertise, and redefines classical case study research and practice. It also provides an original contribution to the research, education and practice of policy-oriented participatory processes in architecture, urban design and planning with an impact that extends to other fields. My manuscript makes a unique and original contribution to the field of architecture and urban design, by giving architects and urban designers a credible role in the dialogue and debate on direct individual citizen engagement in the formation of policy, along with other social and applied scientists, guiding proposed architectural and urban design projects in affected neighbourhoods.

The value of this dissertation's contributions and its insights also extends to planning education, research and practice by enhancing and enriching existing planning theory and practice methods and approaches and to other applied and social scientific fields and disciplines.

The dissertation's contributions to practice can be summarised as follows:

- Demonstration of the claim that (relative to approaches now dominant in practice) applying a Phronesis-based approach can make direct individual citizen-participation efforts in the formation of architecture, urban design and planning policy and processes both relevant and effective, furthering knowledge generated through participatory processes with citizen-led innovation.
- Impacts for everyday practice among architects, municipal planners, urban designers, policymakers, and non-profit organizations engaged in the design and implementation of policy strategies/interventions. This impact extends to a multitude of fields and disciplines in the technical sciences, social sciences, health sciences, communication and information technologies including PPGIS, mediation, management, law, education, entertainment and media among others.
- Advancing a Phronesis-based approach for citizen participation/engagement in urban design, architecture and planning policy and the research and practices of the case study method is accomplished by utilizing the self-narrative of the citizen practitioner in direct communication with professional and elected representatives as a relevant and effective means of transmitting, harnessing, and distributing local knowledge of their respective

environments to their municipal governments and professional organizations. It would additionally delineate the nature of expertise in research, professional, and academic literature to the individual level, thereby affording all stakeholders an equal platform for dialogue and deliberation. This ability to move between the two worlds of experts and users with equal ease, allows both sets of tacit and explicit knowledge and experience to inform each other. In order to develop this local knowledge from within, architects, urban designers and planners must situate themselves into the spatial context, physical and social, of the user; the architect, urban designer or planner, in effect, becomes an embodied citizen practitioner, working on behalf of and *as* a dweller (citizen practitioner).

Direction for Further Research: Several directions for further research are revealed. What is known is that a Phronesis-based approach calls for integrating planning, architecture, urban design, and social policy strategies in which citizen practitioners are engaged directly in the decision-making processes and policies of professional organizations and local municipalities. Input from citizen practitioners must occur very early in the design and formulation of such policies and processes and is to be viewed as “expert testimony.” The emphasis would be on the role of citizen practitioners as individual “experts” on their own residences and within their own communities. Citizen practitioners’ life experiences and local place knowledge of their respective dwellings and its locale defines their knowledge base and guides their engagement and praxis in shaping the planning, architecture, urban design, and policy strategies in their local

communities. A citizen participation/engagement Phronesis-based approach, therefore, should achieve three specific goals:

1. Citizens, urban designers, architects, planners, public officials, and other stakeholders learn from each other and educate each other about problems and issues that confront their local communities in order to arrive at satisfactory solutions. This interaction takes the form of directly delivered self-narratives based on individual life experience in which situated local knowledge is exchanged in direct individual engagement and repositioned through citizen praxis into local community-level policy decisions.
2. Provide citizen practitioners with direct methods of engagement in which partnerships, deliberations, and collaborations are formed that are transparent, equitable, and hold all stakeholders accountable for decisions that shape their local community's strategies, including the transformation of constitutional frameworks already in place, to reflect the local community's goals and objectives.
3. Empower citizens as citizen practitioners and actively engage them in the design, development, and implementation of planning, architecture, and urban design processes and policy with other stakeholders.

Limitations of the Research and Areas of Controversy: The principal limitation of the proposed approach is in the area of interpretation. Therefore, the effects of partial or misconceived implementation of the major elements of this Phronesis-based approach on actual direct citizen practitioner interaction with local municipalities would require

further research. The narrative exchange method embodied in the Phronesis-based approach goes further than mere storytelling and scenario-building towards establishing, trust, acceptance of difference and accountability and in finding a balance between ordinary citizen and professional contributions to meaningful, relevant and effective place knowledge, it exhibits numerous limitations which can only be addressed through subsequent research.

Five important areas of work that need attention are:

- Resistance by local officials, politicians, and other stakeholders to the notion of citizen practitioners and citizen praxis as those new formulations mark a shift in perspective on the role of expertise and knowledge in policy design, development and implementation.
- Resistance by academicians and researchers to Phronesis or any of its components if it is viewed as a threat to current dominant practices and research methods. This also applies to the Phronesis-based approach presented in this dissertation, since it represents a participatory approach to policy for architecture, urban design and planning which challenges the traditional normative values of those fields.
- The Phronesis-based approach is limited where a power struggle exists. It addresses the dynamics of Authority versus Knowledge and it's agents in an idealized context of power dynamics (strong democracy) rather than the compromised context of (Real Politic).
- The approach is dependent on each stakeholder's subjective ability and desire to

achieve a meaningful dialogue. When some stakeholders dominate the outcome at the expense of others, the approach falters. Although it addresses the process of engagement with an effective mechanism, it only mitigates the shortcomings of the process of ownership (power dynamics) with general recommendations. Its outcomes are not definitive in terms of satisfying all stakeholder needs and are best described as an informed compromise.

- While the approach satisfies architecture, urban design and planning's emphasis on interpretation and values, it needs to be adjusted, however, to the internal sets of assumptions and practices of other fields and disciplines to achieve desired outcomes within those fields.
- On the effects of power and communication structures of professional and political networks on ordinary citizen praxis.
- On the effects of social/media networks, information technologies (including GIS and Enhanced Virtual Reality) and telecommunication applications in supporting a baseline of face-to-face communication in citizen engagement strategies.

Questions Requiring Further Research: The self-narrative exchange method, embodied in the Phronesis-based approach, goes further than mere storytelling and scenario-building, towards establishing meaning, acceptance of difference, trust and accountability. In finding a balance between an ordinary citizen's and a professional's contributions to meaningful, relevant and effective local place knowledge, it exhibits numerous limitations which can only be addressed through subsequent research on the limits of interpretation, on the effects of power and

communication structures of professional and political networks on lay citizen praxis, and on the effects of social/media networks, information technologies (including GIS and Enhanced Virtual Reality) and telecommunication applications in supporting a baseline of face-to-face communication in citizen engagement strategies.

In closing, there remains a set of questions requiring further research. The answers that may be gained from such research can greatly enhance citizen engagement practices in the formation of policy for the fields of planning, architecture, and urban design: What are the effects of the adoption of a Phronesis-based approach on individual empowerment? How can a Phronesis-based approach contribute to effective deliberation when institutional citizen representation is included alongside direct individual representation? Is there a point of homeostasis that can be reached in balancing the content requirements of professional expertise with the citizen practitioner's cultural and environmental perception of aspects of local knowledge acquisition that may be useful for local project development?

The answers that may be gleaned from further research into the above questions may further elucidate the conclusions of this dissertation. What can be surmised, however, is that approaches, such as the one advanced by this work, extend and enhance the current work on citizen engagement and deliberation for the fields of architecture, urban design and planning (planning's deliberative practitioner, public administration's deliberative citizen engagement, among others) that are necessary responses to the evolving processes of democratic governance and its policy outcomes.

While the processes of reflection (Planning's reflective practitioner discourse, for example) have their place within the fields of architecture, urban design and planning, they are, however, best utilized separately from the processes of deliberation, as they tend to hinder rather than enhance cooperation if utilized, instead of deliberation, in collaborative decision-making (see Rand et al., 2012 and van Veelen et al., 2012). Deliberation is best suited for decision-making among multiple stakeholders in policy, while reflection is more effective and relevant for inward introspection of professional and citizen practitioners on their own expertise, before and after the processes of deliberation have taken place. Among the many advantages of a phronesis-based approach, which are elucidated on in this work, is the proper placement of deliberation and reflection in relation to each other. The approach places them in their most effective and relevant positions within the participatory practices of municipal planning agencies, architecture, urban design, non-profit organizations, and policymaking bodies engaged in the design, development and implementation of policy.

The roles played by the citizen practitioner are threaded upon the fate and significance of the phronesis-based approach to the cycles of citizen engagement and formation of policy. While citizen engagement represents the ripened promise of historical citizen participation movements, such engagement remains, with its myriad ineffective iterations of techniques and strategies, a dislocated vision.

This work is a journey through time as well as ideas, helping to put to rest dead-ends and pulling

together parallel paths of inquiry. So what remains to be said at this parting of ways, perhaps only that a new chapter for engagement in policy has begun...

APPENDIX

Source:

Luka, N. Unpublished transcribed excerpts from interview S07 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on Severn River, October 2003.

Luka, N. Unpublished transcribed excerpts from interview S02 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on Severn River, July 2003.

Luka, N. Unpublished transcribed excerpts from interview C01 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on Crystal Lake, July 2003

Luka, N. Unpublished transcribed excerpts from interview S08 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on Severn River, October 2003.

1. Citizen-expert/everyday maker narrative example: Full text of Luka, N. transcribed long excerpts from interview S07 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on the Severn River, October 2003. A professional (51-60 age bracket) from the Severn case study area that worked in the health sciences and raced watercraft professionally for 30 years. (Chapter 5, section 5.3.1.2. Analysis of Key Themes in Respondent Narratives, page 224)

We were for example able to purchase our shore allowance, which originally was a so-called road allowance all through the area, the townships owned the 60' from the high-water mark on your property; we were able to purchase that for a very reasonable amount, I guess again prior to my taking ownership of the property, which enabled you then to control things right down to the waterfront, whereas previously people could actually use the front 60' of waterfront, so at least in our area, that's gone. There's a tremendous number of things that need to be controlled: building of docks, boathouses, that sort of thing, that's certainly a major problem, to make sure that things are done properly and that they're not overdone;

- In what sense?

Ah, that every—originally they were allowed to build on 50' lots on some of the area around us, which I think is just horrible; now it's 200' lots. In our area I think they have almost totally stopped the building of boathouses; I think you can build a boat-port sort of thing, you can't even put a roof on it, so certainly that has been controlled. Septic systems have to be controlled, and I think mandated; anybody that has a place either should have a holding tank or a proper septic system.

I just don't think there's any room for anybody not to have that. And certainly in areas like Severn, and Muskokas, and whatnot, I really think development, such as here [Collingwood], with condominiums, and big higher density types of things really have to be controlled, or an absolute lid put on them, because that area won't support them, from the ecology, from all these things, transportation, roads, ah, servicing, and all this sort of thing; that area just won't support it, or the whole substructure has to change, and I don't want to see that happen, and I don't think that most people do want to see that happen. It can be limited to areas that can be properly developed and serviced for that type of thing, but I think general redevelopment is not a good thing at all.

This type of thing that's here [Collingwood], I think has been a good thing, and it's been well done, and it's been properly managed. They've spent a huge amount of money on it and they know what they're doing (Intrawest), and it's completely different than a lot of other developments that I've seen where they kind of get it all off the ground, they run out of money, and it all falls apart. This thing is really done well, it's I think been good for the whole area, but the substructure was put in properly beforehand, and I think the area can handle it, the way they're developing it, I think, it's a good thing. But in other areas that are not geared for it, I think it's a very bad thing.

- By substructure what do you mean?

Well, here, they were able to put in and already had in place sewage treatment plants, water treatment plants, ah, the ability to get the infrastructure in properly before the thing gets going, and plan it all out, and say okay, we're going to do this, it can get to be this big, but we can handle it: the roads are there, all the stuff is there, that it can handle the traffic, and all the rest of it; whereas over on the other side [Severn], it's just not there.

- So this kind of condo-cluster-townhouse at a higher density as fairly incongruent with - In the Muskoka area, the Kawarthas, I just can't say that it's a good thing at all.

- Here relatively close to Collingwood, to the town, Blue Mountain, Thornbury ... do you see the fact that it's part of a town as a factor making it more amenable in terms of infrastructure?

Yes. Because the stuff was here, as I said, they put in a water pumping station right down at the bottom of the road here, put a pipeline up, and our pressure tanks are halfway up the mountain here; that also supplies Blue Mountain with their snowmaking, so they were able to put in some of that infrastructure themselves, too. Sewers have now come in, we just got our sewers a couple of years ago; everything built down here had sewers, when

the subdivision came in here, which, again, was late 80s and early 90s; but this little area here did not have sewers, so that just came in a couple of years ago.

...

[they have close to 400' of frontage; 6 acres originally on 800']

- Your sense is that you are not of new development of this sort of cottage country because of the adverse effects

Then it's no longer cottage country, obviously! And I think that the area that you have to apply to become a permanent resident and meet certain specifications in order to do that—so you just can't sit there and turn your cottage into a permanent home without going through a lot of the [unintelligible] before doing that.

- So you would like to see some process in place so that anyone who wanted to live permanently in cottage country had to actually go through some sort of application or screening process?

Absolutely. Well I think that there are some people that are living even in water-access only areas, which makes access for them difficult, but access for emergency situations extremely difficult and costly to the taxpayers

- In terms of ambulance and the like?

Absolutely, all of those things. So then we are subsidising people that choose to try and live in that lifestyle, which I sort of object to; there are lots of places where you can go and live and still maintain your cottage, use it as long as you're able to, but let's not push the envelope and have everybody try and live out in the wilderness where they really don't need to.

- It sounds almost as though it's a question of responsibility that should be exercised?

Yes, absolutely. We can't be selfish and just say well, I'm going to live here all the time, and I really don't care about anything else, and that's what I want to do. I have a very very good friend who is now 90 years old and considering he's just bought a little tractor, and his place is fully winterised—he went through the process of getting it approved to live in as a full-time residence, which did; now he's not there all the time in the winter, but he's there a lot of the time, and I was just talking to him a couple of days ago and he said You know, I think I'm going to be moving out this winter because I'm too old, and if anything happened to me then I'm a burden for everybody else to try to look after; my family isn't here any longer, so I'm going to be going down south for a while, and then I'm going to come up to one of the small towns in the area, find a little apartment or something to stay in, until April comes, and then if I'm able to I'll go back and stay the summer, and ah, then I'm not somebody else's responsibility or the taxpayer's responsibility to come in and look after me.

- In terms of living at the cottage?

Yes. He's down at the other end of our road. A great person.

Post-interview [wife returns]

I want to come back to the personal watercraft situation, and just explain maybe our brief history of an event; I never did like them from the beginning, [wife: 1990, on the river it was about 1990, etc.] ... I have a son and daughter from a previous marriage, my son is now 27, and my daughter and her friends were up for the weekend, and I had another cottage about a mile down the river on the other side with my ex-wife, but we had bought that in the 1970s, which was sort of the thing to do, my parents had this place, so we ended up with another piece of property, so anyway we set off one day on a Civic [holiday] weekend and my daughter and her friends stayed over one night with us and then the next day wanted to go down to the other cottage, which was fine, and I had a problem with the throttle or whatever on one of the boats.

My son was out in the one boat, we had another old boat sitting, and I said well you know I'm really concerned about that thing because this thing is jamming and I haven't fixed it yet, and so they said well can we take the canoe, and there were three of them, and I said sure, by all means, away you go, no problem. Two were expert canoers, and one was sitting in the middle, and they left at about 10 or 11 o'clock, we were messing around with some painting or I don't know, and that was the last we saw of two of them.

They were killed—a seadoo out playing around, tried to spray them, ran over the canoe, killed two and one survived, and so, that's our seadoo story. So my [17-year-old] daughter was killed, and another girl was killed, and their friend who was in the bow was slightly injured, but she's okay. But that happened just down the river from the cottage.

So that's you know the story of the traffic, and people really not being cognisant about what they're doing and what they're able to do, and that sort of situation; another reason why I guess I'm very familiar with watercraft and boats in general is that I raced powerboats for probably about 30 years professionally, so I kind of know what to do and what not to do, and safety, and licencing. So we had a lot to do with the current boating regulations and licencing and all that coming into play.

(Luka interview S07)

2. Citizen practitioner narrative example, Context theme: Full text of Luka, N. transcribed long excerpts from interview S02 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on the Severn River, July 2003. A Canadian professor with a college degree (61-70 age bracket) and a long family history in the Severn River case study area that dates back to the beginning of the twentieth century.

(Chapter 5, section 5.3.1.2.1. Context, page 233)

As far as I know from photographic record and what my father and mother told me initially this was a place they came to I guess out of love for the area. They came here before they were married, which is very unusual. My father worked for the railway; he had been an Olympic runner with the Canadian team, and I think he got some special consideration from the railway as a result of that. He participated in the 1908 London Olympics as a marathon runner, and was with the railroad at the time, and I think they gave him special consideration.

He used to get railway passes, and so ah, he could come up here—there were really no roads in this area at the time, certainly not passable roads as there are now—so he would come by train to the station at the landing called Severn Falls. There used to be a lovely old train station there (it's gone now). He would come to the train station and he kept a canoe at what was called the clubhouse, just down the hill from the train station, and then he would come by canoe up—ah, well actually, down, correctly speaking—and initially he came to a place called Pretty Point, where there was a camp; it had been a lumber camp that was either loaned or ceded to the Baptist church, Methodist I guess, and it was operated by a fellow from Toronto, a Baptist minister, and he ran it as I guess a retreat.

My mum sang in the choir at the church, and that's how my mum and dad met. They came up here as an unmarried couple to this camp, along with others, and part of a sort of church retreat, I guess, and that's how they have first discovered the area, I believe. And sometime after that my dad bought a property, not too far from Pretty Point, that he kept for a while, and then came to this location; he sold the other location, it was on Lost Channel, and came here, bought the land here. Some of what he bought was Crown patent that had gone to either family or family members of the Fenian Raids—[those] who did military service—so some of the ah land that we now own was initially Crown patents to different families. He bought in a couple of cases from people who were just family members that had been bequeathed it, and had no interest—and didn't even know, in one case, where it was! So he bought it and joined a number of lots to give us what you see now.

- Was your mother coming up here separately?

I think they came together. I don't know exactly if she had come up here on her own initially; I just know by photographs that they were here together as part of a group, and some photographs are dated in the album 1913, 1912 - they appear to be some of the earliest dates. And in talking to others—I've done a little bit of local, I guess 'research' from a family point of view, in talking to other people that seems to be confirmed in terms of the operation of the Baptist camp from the lumber company.

The dates of the transfer were sometime prior to 1910, and Reverend Fitzpatrick from Toronto got it—either it was deeded to the church or it was loaned to them, I'm not sure which—sometime around 1909-10. [—] My dad did a lot of the work himself. I think it was initially done probably in conjunction with the contractors whom he hired. In fact, that's not entirely true. The cottage—if you look to your right—that cottage wasn't built here, it was built somewhere else and brought here by boat, ah, I think that was from the

Peterborough area; he bought it I think as a cabin somewhere else, and it was transported.

- That was before the cottage was built?

I think so, I don't know that for sure.

- What year ...?

Ah, I don't know the year but I would guess it was sometime—let me clarify—this cottage is not the first cottage. There was a previous cottage which I think you'd call a shack, now; it was just a very temporary, I guess a sleeping sort of facility, and I think it was built as a trapper's cabin or that kind of thing, and I'm really uncertain of dates. It's just what I've heard.

I've heard that from one or two families I guess that there had been a sort of I guess it was almost like a houseboat that was anchored here, and that was the first sort of actual residence, but that would be ah I guess at the very earliest 1910-1912 somewhere in there, and this was part of a trapper's line; I think ah there may also have been prior to that a lumber camp, not a full camp, but a base camp here; there's tremendous amount of evidence of that just in this little bay to my left, and it would make sense in terms of the access point, its relation to some of the other camps in the area—for example, there are parts of what appear to be an old Ford, might be a Model T or that vintage, just on the rocks over here to the left, and a tremendous amounts of broken glass in several locations that would appear to be appear to be—and tins—that would appear to be dumps ... [when he's digging etc. has come across] ... and there are four or five of those sort of, just call them garbage dumps - they're small, I don't mean that they're like a Metro dump, but they suggest to me that several people (more than one person) was here and using it over some period of time.

I'm thinking sort of overnight, or something like that, or extended time. There were cans of Carnation milk, for example; I still recognise some of the labelling or the shape and size of the tin, and bottles, for ketchup and liquor bottles, and my dad ah was certainly not a teetotaller, but he could not possibly have consumed that much in his lifetime—all of the broken glass that I find around the property, in fixed locations—I don't mean it's strewn, it's in fixed locations where you would know people were putting things as a point where they could put them and not be stumbling upon them in the dark, ... [they're in swales, etc. four or five of them] so there was some use of the property before my parents, before they acquired it, and I think that may have been a combination of logging and certainly trapping; I know for sure this was part of a trapline and I had occasion to speak to the trapper before he left the area, and I knew him, knew of him and knew him, and I think my daughter also knew him, and he worked this area for about 35 years as a trapper.

So long story short, I think there was perhaps a building here before the present cottage, and since then—that could have been as early as the end of the logging period, up to the point of my parents acquiring it, and building—so a rough date for this present building would be maybe late 20s.

- *The original shack was on approximately the same site?*

I think so, in relation to the water, either it was on the point, where the cabin is, or it was here in the bay, and ah—the other thing that's sort of odd, one family remembered this as being an attempted farm area—which surprised me, and they remembered the location as I guess an attempt at farming, that would be like a squatter, attempting to farm and keeping a couple of farm animals; not farming as in agriculture, but farming as in husbandry. That may have been the same group of people that may have been squatters who were here by houseboat, perhaps, I don't know.

... [trails and paths, a swimming location, etc.—there was a winter road from Severn Falls to Big Chute]

... The power plant had a winter road, and the logging company had a winter road, same road, and it later became the county road that you drove in on from Severn Falls down to the Chute, but it also went up to Swift, the power plant, and it was I think used as in Vic Connor's book, he mentioned a number of times driving a team of Clydesdales and pulling logs, ah, downed trees to the water, where they'd be floated to the mill; there was a mill at Port Severn, and they also later used it as a hydro line road between the Swift and the Chute.

The cottage initially was a two-room, sorry, a three-room cottage that would have been 20x20 when it was first built, and then my dad added the kitchen and then the kitchen-bedroom-bathroom and then that was the early 50s I guess, and then I bought it from my dad's estate (my dad remarried after my mum died, and he left the cottage to my stepmother, and I bought it from her in the early 70s), and then I—in the early 80s I guess—I raised the cottage—raised it as in jacked it up—and put a full block foundation, and then ah added decking over the intervening 10 years I guess, decking all the way around, and then I guess the other things are non-significant, utility sheds, for example, and the roofing that we're doing now is probably the—I guess it's the third roof that's been added over the age of the cottage.

- *And that's a fairly significant job, it appears—?*

Yes, changed the ah, as you can see, we've changed the hip-roof to a gable, and it's—in terms of snow load, it's a better pitch, and gives a little bit of storage room inside. The loft storage area is a little more accessible than the lower hip-roof. ... [four layers, roll roofing at the bottom, threadbare, etc.]

(Luka interview S02)

3. Citizen practitioner narrative example, Praxis theme: Full text of Luka, N. transcribed

long excerpts from interview C01 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on the Crystal Lake, July

2003. A male respondent in his 60s, “permanent cottage” owner-occupier at Crystal Lake.

(Chapter 5, section 5.3.1.2.3. Praxis, page 237)

E02 agree unsure disagree *I feel very safe and secure when I am in this area.*

A. Hmm. I do, now, ah—probably, going way back, at the time when we were living in the city; it might be a slightly different thinking on it because the cottage at the time when we were coming up on weekends and things we had problems with break-ins, and that's why a group was got together, with a former reeve, myself, and a group of us, ___ being one, got involved with forming a neighbourhood watch. I think that's helped. I think, too, probably living up here has helped, as compared to the cottage being vacant, but we had over the period of the early years, three or four break-ins.

We've lost several outboard motors. It was a problem, and of course you know when you were in the city, you'd always be worried about that. I never really worried about someone breaking in at the time when we're here, but there was always that feeling of you were powerless to basically do anything because you were down there, and you were 2-1/2 hours away, 2-1/4 hours away. I know that one time when we hadn't been up for a while, maybe it was the winter, it might have been the early spring; and I told ___ I have to go up to the cottage, it was a sixth sense. So I came up, and sure enough the door was kicked in, the screen was closed, the heater was blowing away like gangbusters. Kids had broken in, and they drank a little bit of booze, and pop, and you know mussed up the bed, and they'd just sort of stayed, and I guess what really irked me was the fact that I looked down at the floor, and I thought believe it or not there was a dead mouse or something down there; I went to pick it up, and it was a used condom.

I was absolutely livid! All of this was—I had just, we hadn't been up for a while, I thought, we just have to check the place. I was so teed off, you know, all the bedding came off, even though everything was sort of untouched in the other rooms, everything was taken off to the city and laundered. But it was the kind of thing you were powerless to do anything. It's a little different now with our two vehicles, ___'s away at the moment as you know, so that if we just go to Toronto or if we go to Sarnia for a week, ___ keeps an eye and other friends do because of the neighbourhood watch, and not only that, there's another vehicle in the driveway and I think that helps, and you know we've got the timers and things like that, the lights, it looks like there's activity going on rather than something that's closed up.

[Interviewer]- So things are better.

A. I would say they are. Overall, the thefts and break-ins and things are down in the last while on the lake, I think primarily because probably more people are moving up, spending more time; you look at ___ and ___, you look at us, I think it helps. Just a few cottages, about five cottages that way, another lady's living here full-time, so I think that

that has a tendency to scare the thieves off. [...] Those that spend a lot of time up here do patrol. There was even one point when it was more of a serious problem where we were actually at various intersections along the road marking down licence numbers.

It may appear to be paranoid, but what was happening, we were doing it say the fall of the year. [...] but we were concerned because of what had been transpiring. And I've heard of one instance where a young fellow was caught breaking in, and one of the first things he said to the police officer that nabbed him—how they ended up doing it, I don't know, whether they caught him in the act, or whatever—and he told him that my friends told me to stay away from Crystal Lake because they're really very observant there. It's not the place to sort of break in. It's all I think as a result of the neighbourhood watch. [...] Watching what's going on. A number of times I've stopped by someone's place, and don't recognise the car or whatever I'll mark the licence number down. The person's a contractor doing work! And you know, you'd sort of 'Hi, is Joe around?' kind of thing—kind of very laid back kind of way, without being threatening 'What are you doing here'—we all have pads in our cars and we're marking down licence numbers even to this day, but like I say, it really has eased up considerably.

We used to get the stats from the police department with the thing that I'm involved with, you know through the ratepayer's group, and they almost don't give us the sheets anymore, because there's nothing occurring. It's really really helped considerably (touch wood!)—that doesn't necessarily mean that something won't happen, but certainly the incidents I think are really far less than what they were; and I think frankly because more people are spending more time up here, and more people are in fact keeping an eye open for things that just don't look the way that they should.

(Luka interview C01)

4. Citizen practitioner narrative example, Praxis theme: Full text of Luka, N. transcribed long excerpts from interview S08 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on the Severn River, October 2003. The respondents are professional consultants (61-70 age bracket) with college education. (Chapter 5, section 5.3.1.2.3. Praxis, page 242)

C5.1 Q. *How important is it for you to be able to control the decision-making concerning physical changes to this dwelling and property (in terms of sharing it with other family members, and in the context of any applicable zoning or construction by-laws, etc.)?*

a) ... with reference to your dwelling and the property on which it sits?

*b) ... with reference to the broader context (this lake, bay or general area)?
[amalgamation of two: more relaxed planning guidelines prevailed]
[... widespread concern over trailer parks, people shudder, they're not by
definition bad, but a lot of them do look seedy, unplanned]*

[H] As regulations tighten up, and as I did with the renovation project, you soon learn to keep your mouth shut, and don't ask questions, because you know that the answer is going to be no; and so Georgian Bay Township have a word for that now, and they say—it's called a 'creeping cottage'—people start off and say the Township will let me build a 15'x20' and I wanted to have a 15'x30', so they build the 15'x20' and in a couple of years' time they take an end wall out and extend it out a couple of feet, and then a couple of feet more, just a bit at a time, so it doesn't look like they've done anything. [L]

[W] It's the same thing with boathouses. You're not allowed to have boathouses with living quarters; well, the TSW has gotten really sticky, and I swear this is only a financial grab, that's all that it is.

- In terms of the permit process?

[W] Because Parks Canada, and the TSW comes under Parks Canada, like all kinds of government places with cutbacks, they're always trying to find a way for funds. Well they virtually don't own any land unless it's under the water, and that's where they start to get you for these permits, you see, because the rules say that they're allowed to get money for that. So what they've done now to ensure that you don't have any living quarters above, they've told you can't even put a roof! So now you can put a plastic trap over it ... because people are now building grandiose cottages, now what we would call, or what we would have called cottages.

You know they put big bucks in and some of them are absolutely gorgeous, and I don't call them a cottage either; it's a beautiful summer [end of cassette] So it's exactly as ___ says; they wait for a year, they know that they're not going to come back and inspect, you know, the final inspection has been done, and then they just quietly put a metal roof on, and they watch other people do that, and so they have a boat port and at least it's covered.... So, it's that kind of thing...

[digression into waterway issues - meeting in Port Severn]

[W] The Trent-Severn Waterway, how sticky they have become and how they're not staying up with the times, and what we were listening to and what we were hearing, and this is course was what I became so aware of when I was on the TSW Advisory Board, how cottagers are only 'other'—we were not a recognised stakeholder; I mean

[H] The boaters put money into the system when they use the system; the resort-owners are on the system and pay taxes, marinas are the same way; but cottagers don't pay any taxes to the water system, so they're trying to find ways to get that. And they've already been around and measured up, and they wouldn't tell you who they were hired by, but they measured all the dockage and all the boathouses in our area.

[comments on TSW meeting; slowness, 18 months for a permit to replace dock wrecked in storm for an islander who needs it for access]

[W] The rules and regulations for how you build a crib are so antiquated ...

[digression into how obtuse TSW management is ... ignorant of technology ... claiming that they have authority under BNA Act...]

[W] Another place that I don't think—they don't have the staff, and that's the problem with the TSW, they don't have the staff to get into this; they should be leaving it to the municipalities. Anyway, they won't let you put in compost toilet; all kind of municipalities will not let you do the environmentally friendly stuff that is available and out there. You can have a septic system and a composting toilet, but if you want to build, the very first thing you have to put in is a complete septic system.

[H] They won't give you a building permit until you do.

[extended discussion about waste treatment ... requiring full septic on old places, etc. even that have compost toilets...]

[W] So one of the things that's happening that are making it out of sight for people that are not wealthy, because to build a cottage now is very expensive. It's just ... it is making it very difficult for people who have the limited economies that I think our parents had, who weren't wealthy, but they could have a cottage.

Now, if you add into it the fact that you've got a very wealthy population that's just south of us [i.e. Toronto] who are dying for a piece of water, and they don't care if it's swamp; they don't care where it is, even if you can't swim in it because it's not deep enough because it's full of weeds.

[H] Right off the bat, if you're water access, you're minimum \$16000 for a septic system. And then before they'll even talk to you they want \$2700 up front just to cover their costs of going in to check the property.... the municipality, Georgian Bay Township.

[building inspector with a grudge against cottagers on Severn Twp side]

[W] One of the things about being on the particular piece of geography that we're on—we've got government coming out our ears; because just within the SRAPO [?] are we have three townships, two districts, one Province, and one federal waterway; I mean you couldn't have more if you tried, right? The only plus is that you get to know what each township does, and what their rules and regulations are against others; so Severn Township at the moment hasn't even got a re-inspection thing going for their septic systems.

Both Muskoka Lakes and Georgian Bay Townships do, and we've been pushing this, as a cottage association; however, when they came to do anybody's septic system that either wasn't on the books, as in we don't have the permit registered with us, and we don't know when it was, or your septic system is 20 years old, then they were going to come and reinspect it. And I'm telling you, it's a joke! [digression into letting decrepit systems pass..., lousy testing; creative tension here—municipalities, and lack of action of boating and trash-dumping etc.]

[W] Looking at cottage country, the simplicity of cottaging has now disappeared

[H] It's now complex.

C5.2 Q. *Along the same lines, is it important for you (or your family) to be the owner of this property? Please explain.*

[H] I don't think we get a say AT ALL [now] in what's being done. That's governed by the townships.

[W] That's governed by the townships, but my experience is that if you've got a developer who is coming along to the Township, and you want to have a say, that is—you've got to be a lot more organised, and you really need a group of people ... [in Orillia system in place, e.g.] whereas we have now on the Severn a man who is a real entrepreneur, and he is developing land, and he is going to the Townships, and he's just done one in Georgian Bay Twp, and we didn't put in stuff, but we don't think it made any difference.

- In terms of a statement of position?

[W] Yes, we did, we were concerned that there were lots that were—ah, the piece of property is where the developer himself has the cottage on the front of the piece of property, and it's a point; and then there's a good deep bay that goes down either side, but the backs of those bays are very shallow, and very weedy, and they've always just—except for the one side, in the 50s, of course, the Government allowed people to build in there, and there's probably all the building and more that should never have been allowed in the first place, and I know they've killed the weeds so that they can get into the water, and they're not supposed to do that.

Anyway, so now you're allowing two more lots on that side, and two more in on the other side, and two out the front, like he has six or seven lots altogether. Now the Twp made him extend the frontage of the lot by 25' but the land is minimal; when you go back, by the time you get your 60' back from the water, then they build their cottage, they're going to have to their septic systems back to back. Now, each cottage, when they have a septic system has to have a big roadway so that the trucks can in there to build it; so the invasion now on all those pieces of property—

[H] And the other thing is, the Twp's allowing that to go ahead, and it's crowding things in, which means there's more cottages in there than there probably should be, and they're all going to want docks; and none of them are going to have one boat, they're going to have at least two docks, so that's more docks, and we've got the TSW saying, well, we don't want you to put in docks and stuff. But if you don't want them to put in docks, why are you allowing subdivisions?

[W] I think you have to remember that people don't have just one dock—cottages are used by a lot of people, in the main, and there's always a lot of boats. In this area there's a narrow gap and then it opens up into this back bay where there are a lot of cottages. Well, that little gap becomes a danger point, because you've got boats going in and out, and you're moving onto the channel; it's not like you come to a place with lights, you

know, where you have a green light and a red light—you've got boats going in all directions.

This same developer is also developing what's called the Sny [?] which is across the river from where he developed this one, on the road side, there's all cottages down one side, it's very very high from the water, and those cottages have been there for a long time, and they look across to nothing. Now he's bought all that land, plus across the road, now—that's a whole other case—he wants to develop it, but they're fighting it. They know they can't stop it, but what they were hoping they could influence is—well I don't want to sit in my living room and look at you sitting in your living room, and I don't think anybody buying it would want to do that.

So do you think we could stagger the cottages, so that I can still look across at land, and you can still look across at land—but they don't know whether they'll get anywhere, because you're dealing with Severn Twp, and Severn Twp is not terribly organised; it's a twp where 35 % of the people are cottagers and the rest are all rural people;

[H] GB is about 85% cottagers.

[W] So when you ask if we have influence, well, you have to be so vigilant. And this is the one thing that may come out of more permanent people up there. Because I live here now, I will get to council meetings, I will go etc. etc. So those cottagers that don't want this piece of development to happen, you know, they live in Toronto, and they come back, they come up to every single Council meeting there is, because they want to try to stay on top of this. And this is such a narrow channel, the water's quite deep, certainly through most of it, but then at the back it's not, but for boat traffic? I mean it's lethal.

[H] Because if you've got a cottage with a dock and boats at it, and on the other side, a cottage with a dock and boats at it, and two boats trying to pass in the middle, they're going to be just about hitting each other.

[W] And I don't think the planning department does anything around that. They don't really [—] between all the ah the government that we've had over the last 10 years in Ontario, which has got out of all that stuff and dumped it all onto the municipalities without giving them any power to levy taxes, um, we get caught with this in-between stuff. So that is why SRAPO has had to get organised in the last 15 years. We've had to become a real lobby group, and some people don't like that. There's a lot of people that go, ah, I've just come up here to have a good time. Don't bother me. But our membership has really increased tremendously.

[H] We're consistently getting over 50% of the cottagers.

[W] Thing is that now we have this mindset of well, some people are doing it, so I don't have to do anything about it, good, you can stay there forever. But no, I'm sorry; this has to be a shared experience. This is too time consuming and intense! We need to share this. But one step at a time.

(Luka interview S08)

REFERENCES

1. Published scholarly sources

Abele, Frances, Katherine Graham, Alex Ker, Antonia Maioni, and Susan Phillips. 1998. *Talking with Canadians: Citizen Engagement and the Social Union*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development.

Abelson, Julia and François-Pierre Gauvin. 2006. "Assessing the Impacts of Public Participation: Concepts, Evidence and Policy Implications." Centre for Health Economics and Policy Analysis Working Paper Series 2008-01. Centre for Health Economics and Policy Analysis (CHEPA), McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada.

Adam, Charles, and Paul Tannery. 1976. *Oeuvres de Descartes*, vols. I-XII, revised edition. Paris: J. Vrin/C.N.R.S.

Agrest, Diana. 1991. *Architecture from Without: Theoretical Framings for a Critical Practice*. London and Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Alexander, Christopher. 1996. "The Origins of Pattern Theory. The Future of the Theory, and The Generation of a Living." (ACM Conference on Object-Oriented Programs, Systems, Languages and Applications, San Jose, California, 1996.)

———. 2004. "The Interaction of Architecture and Science." *Katarxis: New Science, New Urbanism, New Architecture?* No. 3.

Aleshire, Robert A. 1970. "Planning and Citizen Participation: Costs, Benefits and Approaches." *Urban Affairs* 5 (4): 369-93.

Almond, Gabriel, and Sidney Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and*

Democracy in Five Nations. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Altshuler, Alan. 1966. *The City Planning Process: A Political Analysis*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.

Altshuler, Alan, and David Luberoff. 2003. *Mega-Projects: The Changing Politics of Urban Public Investment*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

APA (American Planning Association). 1992. "Ethical Principles in Planning."
<https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicalprinciples.htm>

———. 2005. "AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct."
<http://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode.htm>.

Arendt, Hannah. 1979. *The Recovery of the Public World*. Edited by Melvyn A. Hill. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Aria, Susan. M., and Allison. M. Pedlar. 1997. "Building Communities Through Leisure: Citizen Participation in a Healthy Communities Initiative." *Journal of Leisure Research* 29 (2): 167–182.

Aristotle. [384 BC] 1976. *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics*. Translated by James A. K. Thomson. London: Harmondsworth, Penguin.

———. 1999. *The Nichomachean Ethics*. Translated by Martin Ostwald. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall/ Library of Liberal Arts.

Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 35 (4): 216-224.

Babbitt, B. E., Carpenter, A., Hawken, P., Heid, J., Howe, C., Kellenberg, S., et al. 2006.

“Sustainable Cities: Envisioning the Future.” *Urban Land*, 65 (6): 62-67.

Baert, Patrick, Sokratis Koniordos, Giovanna Procacci, and Carlo Ruzza, eds. 2010. *Conflicts, Citizenship and Civil Society*. London: Routledge.

Bahl, S. and Milne, G.R. 2006. "Mixed methods in interpretive research: an application to the study of self concept". In *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods in Marketing*, edited by Belk, R.W., 198-218. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Bandura, Albert. 1973. *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

———. 1977. *Social Learning Theory*. New York: General Learning Press.

Bang, Henrik P., ed. 2003. *Governance as Social and Political Communication*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

———. 2004a. “Everyday Makers and Expert Citizens Building Political Not Social Capital.” Paper delivered to ANU, School of Social Science.

———. 2004b. “Culture Governance: Governing Reflexive Modernity” *Public Administration* 82 (1): 159-190.

———. 2005. “Among Everyday Makers and Expert Citizens.” In *Remaking Governance: Peoples, Politics and the Public Sphere*, edited by Janet Newman, 159-178. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.

———. 2009. “‘Yes We Can’: Identity Politics and Project Politics for a Late-Modern World” *Urban Research & Practice* 2 (2): 117–137.

Bang, Henrik P., and Torben B. Dyhrberg. 2000. "Governance, Self-Representation and Democratic Imagination." In *The Democratic Imagination*, edited by M. Saward, 146-161. London: Routledge.

———. 2003. Governing at Close Range: Demo-Elites and Lay People." In *Governance as Social and Political Communication*, edited by Henrik Paul Bang, 222-240. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bang, Henrik P., Allan D. Hansen, and Jens Hoff. 2000. *Demokrati Fra Neden*. Copenhagen: Djoef.

Bang, Henrik P., and Michael Saward. 2000. *Democratic Innovation: Deliberation, Representation and Association*. London: Routledge.

Bang, Henrik P., and Eva Sorensen. 1997. *Fra Græsrodder til hverdagsmagere*. Pilot Project, The Democracy Project, Democracy from Below, University of Copenhagen.

———. 1999. "The EM: A new challenge to democratic governance" *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 21 (3): 325-342.

———. 2001. "The Everyday Maker: Building Political Rather than Social Capital." In *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life*, edited by Paul Dekker and Eric M. Uslaner, 148-161. London: Routledge.

Barber, Benjamin R. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1998. *A Place for Us*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Barki, Henri, and Jon Hartwick. 1989. "Rethinking the Concept of User Involvement." *MIS*

Quarterly 13 (1): 52-63.

Barnard, Robert, Denise A. Campbell, and Shelley Smith. 2003. *Citizen Re:Generation: Understanding Active Citizen Engagement Among Canada's Information Age Generations*. Toronto: D-Code.

Bartky, Sandra. 1992. *Femininity and Domination*. New York: Routledge.

Bellah, Robert. 1996. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Benhabib, Seyla, ed. 1996. *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bernstein, Richard J. 1976. *Restructuring Social and Political Theory*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.

Bingham, L. B., T. Nabatchi, and R. O'Leary. 2005. "The New Governance: Practices and Processes for Stakeholders and Citizen Participation in the Work of Government." *Public Administration Review* 65 (5): 547-558.

Bocheński, Joseph M. 1951. *Ancient Formal Logic*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Botti, S., K. Orfali and Iyengar, S. 2009. "Tragic choices: autonomy and emotional responses to medical decisions", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (3): 337-52.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. London: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 1997. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." In *Power and Ideology in Education*, edited by Jerome Karabel and A. H. Halsey, 487-511. New York: Oxford Press.

———. 1998. *On Television*. Translated by Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson. New York: The New Press.

———. 1999. *Acts of Resistance: Against the Tyranny of the Market*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. 1976. *Schooling in Capitalist Society*. New York: Basic Books.

Bowman, Ann, and Richard Kearney. 1985. *The Resurgence of the States*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Braitwaite, V. A., and Margaret Levi, eds. 1998. *Trust & Governance*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Brandenburg, Andrea M., Matthew S. Carroll, and Keith A. Blatner. 1995. "Towards Successful Forest Planning Through Local Based Qualitative Sociology." *Western Journal of Applied Forestry* 10 (3): 95-99.

Braun, Virginia and Victoria Clarke. 2006. "Using thematic analysis in psychology". *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 3 (2): 93.

Brendler, Thomas, and Henry Carey. 1998. "Community Forestry Defined." *Journal of Forestry* 96 (3): 21-23.

Braun, Virginia and Victoria Clarke. 2006. "Using thematic analysis in psychology". *Qualitative*

Research in Psychology 3 (2): 83.

Brody, Samuel D. 2003. "Measuring the Effects of Stakeholder Participation on the Quality of Local Plans Based on the Principles of Collaborative Ecosystem Management." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22: 407-419.

Brody, Samuel, David R. Godschalk, and Raymond J. Burby. 2003. "Mandating Citizen Participation in Plan Making: Six Strategic Planning Choices." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 69 (3): 245-264.

Brogan, Hugh. 2005. *Alexis de Tocqueville: A Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Brosius, J. Peter, Anna. L. Tsing, and Charles Zerner. 1998. "Representing Communities: Histories and Politics of Community-Based Natural Resource Management." *Society and Natural Resources* 11 (2): 157-168.

Brown, Wendy. 1995. *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Burby, Raymond J. 2003. "Making Plans that Matter: Citizen Involvement and Government Action." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 69: 33-50.

Burns, J. O., K. Roettiger, M. Ledlow, and A. Klypin. 1994. *The Politics of Decentralization*. London: Macmillan.

Burns Nancy, Kay L. Schlozman, and Sidney Verba. 1997. "The Public Consequences of Private Inequality: Family Life and Citizen Participation." *American Political Science Review* 91: 373-389.

Butler, Judith. 2010. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York:

Routledge.

Cable, Sherry, and Charles Cable. 1995. *Environmental Problems, Grassroots Solutions: The Politics of Grassroots Environmental Conflict*. New York: St. Martin's.

Calthorpe, Peter. 1993. *The Next American metropolis: Ecology, community, and the American Dream*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Campbell, Donald T. 1975. "Degrees of Freedom and the Case Study." *Comparative Political Studies* 8 (2): 178-193.

———. 2003. "Foreword." In *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, edited by Robert K. Yin, vii-viii. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Campbell, Donald T., and Mark H. Bickhard. 2003. "Variations in Variation and Selection: The Ubiquity of the Variation-and-Selective-Retention Ratchet in Emergent Organizational Complexity." *Foundations of Science* 8 (3): 215–282.

Campbell, Scott. 1996. "Green Cities, Growing Cities, Just Cities?" *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62 (3): 296-312.

Campbell, Scott, and Susan S. Fainstein. 2003a. "Ethics, the Environment, and Conflicting Priorities." In *Readings in Planning Theory*, edited by Scott Campbell, and Susan Fainstein, Oxford, England: Blackwell.

———. 2003b. *Readings in Planning Theory*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Cantrill, J., B. Sibbald, and S. Buetow. 1996. "The Delphi and Nominal Group Techniques in Health Services Research." *International Journal of Pharmacy Practice* 4 (2): 67–74.

Carey, Henry H., V. A. Sample, T. Brendler, and T. Cheng. 1994. "Developing Partnerships for Forest Stewardship and Rural Economic Development." Synthesis of the Conference of the National Network of Forest Practitioners, Washington, DC, January 19-20.

Carpini, Michael X. Delli, Fay Lomax Cook, and Lawrence R. Jacobs. 2004. "Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation, and Citizen Engagement: A Review of the Empirical Literature." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 315- 344.

Carr, Deborah S., and Kathleen Halvorsen. 2001. "An Evaluation of Three Democratic, Community-Based Approaches to Citizen Participation: Surveys, Conversations with Community Groups, and Community Dinners." *Society and Natural Resources* 14: 107-126.

Carr, Stuart C., Elish McAuliffe, and Malcolm MacLachlan. 1998. *Psychology of Aid*. London: Routledge.

Cassidy, Serena. "Citizen Engagement & Participation: Building Trust in Public Governance." Draft – 2007. Accessed 10 October 2008. http://www.ipac.ca/novascotia/files/Cassidy_MPA-Conference-2007.doc

Chavis, David M., Paul E. Stucky, and Abraham Wandersman. 1983. "Returning Basic Research to the Community: A Relationship Between Scientist and Citizen." *American Psychologist* 36 (4): 424-434.

Cherubin, Rose M. 2005. "Why Matter? Aristotle, the Eleatics, and the Possibility of Explanation." *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 26 (2): 1-29.

———. n.d. "Niomachean Ethics Book VI." Accessed April 4 2011. <http://classweb.gmu.edu/rcherubi/ancient/nevi.htm>

Chima, Jugdep S. 2005 "What's the Utility of the Case-Study Method for Social Science

Research?: A Response to Critiques from the Quantitative/Statistical Perspective.” Paper for delivery at the 2005 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. September 1. http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p41952_index.html

Chong, Dennis. 1991. *Collective Action and the Civil Rights Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Church, John, Duncan Saunders, Margaret Wanke, Raymond Pong, Carol Spooner, and Marlene Dorgan. 2002. “Citizen Participation in Health Decision-Making: Past Experience and Future Prospects.” *Journal of Public Health Policy* 23 (1): 12-32.

City of Miramar “Regional Profile & Identity” The Strategic Regional Policy Plan for South Florida, Miramar, Florida, USA: *South Florida Regional Planning Council*, August, 1995 Accessed November 22, 2007. <http://www.commdev.miramar-fl.gov/cityclerk/about/>

City of Miramar “General Demographics, Statistics and Features,” Miramar, Florida, USA: *Planning and Zoning Division*, 2003: 1-30. Webpage accessed November 22, 2007. <http://www.commdev.miramar-fl.gov/cityclerk/about/>

City of Miramar “A Brief Historical Overview,” Miramar, Florida, USA, 2007: Webpage accessed November 22, 2007. <http://www.ci.miramar.fl.us/information/foundg.htm>

City of Miramar “Resolutions/Ordinances,” Miramar, Florida, USA, 2007: Webpage accessed November 22, 2007. <http://www.ci.miramar.fl.us/information/res-ord.htm>

City of Miramar “Government Structure,” Miramar, Florida, USA, 2007: Webpage accessed November 22, 2007. <http://www.ci.miramar.fl.us/information/gov.htm>

Clarke, Desmond M. 2006. *Descartes: A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, Susan, and Woden Teachout. 2012. *Slow Democracy: Rediscovering Community, Bringing Decision Making Back Home*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Clift, S., 2003. "E-Democracy, E-Governance, and Public Net-Work." *Publicus.Net*. Accessed June 8, 2011. <http://www.publicus.net/articles/edempubli network.html>

Cohen, Jean L. and Andrew Arato. 1992. *Civil Society and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Collins, Harry M. 1990. *Artificial Experts: Social Knowledge and Intelligent Machines*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Collins, Harry M., and Evans, Robert J. 2002. "The Third Wave of Science Studies: Studies of Expertise and Experience." *Social Studies of Sciences* 32 (2): 235-296.

Collins, Kevin, and Raymond Ison. 2006. "Dare We Jump Off Arnstein's Ladder? Social Learning as a New Policy Paradigm." Proceedings of PATH (Participatory Approaches in Science & Technology) Conference, 4-7 June, Edinburgh.

Comerio, M. C. 1984. "Community design: idealism and entrepreneurship," *Journal of Architecture and Planning Research* 1: 227-243.

Comerio, M. C. 1987. "Design & Empowerment: 20 Years of Community Architecture," *Built Environment* 13 (1): 15-28.

Conner, Desmond M. 1988. "A New Ladder of Citizen Participation." *National Civic Review* 77 (3): 249-57.

Corburn, Jason. 2003. "Bringing Local Knowledge into Environmental Decision-making: Improving Urban Planning for Communities at Risk." *Journal of Planning Education and*

Research 22: 422–33.

Cornwall, Andrea, and Rachel Jewkes. 1995. "What is Participatory Research." *Social Science and Medicine* 41 (12): 1667-1676.

Cowan, Robert. 1998. "The People and the Process." In *Introducing Urban Design: Interventions and Responses*, edited by Stephen Harriot, Marion Roberts, Clara Greed and Lesley Roberts, 188-196. London: Longman.

Cowen, Taylor. 1998. "Do Economists Use Social Mechanisms to Explain?" In *Social Mechanisms : An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*, edited by P. Hedstrom and R. Swedberg, 125-146.

Craglia, Max, and Harlan Onsrud. 2003. "Workshop on Access to Geographic Information and Participatory Approaches in Using Geographic Information." *URISA Journal: Special Issue on Access and Participatory Issues* 15 (2): 9-15.

Cranston, Maurice. 1968. *Rousseau's Social Contract*. USA: Penguin Classics: 9-42.

Creighton, James L. 2005. *The Public Participation Handbook: Making Better Decisions Through Citizen Involvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W. 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crosby, Ned, Janet M. Kelley, and Paul Schaefer. 1986. "Citizen Panels: A New Approach to Citizen Participation." *Public Administration Review* 46 (2): 170-178.

Cruikshank, Barbara. 1999. *The Will to Empower: Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*.

Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Crush, Jonation, Bruce Frayne, and Wade Pendleton. 2012. "The Crisis of Food Insecurity in African Cities." *Journal of Hunger & Environmental Nutrition* 7 (2-3): 271-292.

Cunningham, James V. 1972. "Citizen Participation in Public Affairs." *Public Administration Review*, 32: 589-602.

Cuthill, Michael, and John Fien. 2005. "Capacity Building: Facilitating Citizen Participation in Local Governance." *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 64 (4): 63-80.

Dahl, Robert A. 1956. *A Preface to Democratic Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1961. *Who Governs?: Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

———. 1967. *Pluralist Democracy in the United States: Conflict and Consent*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Daly, Kellehear and Gliksman. 1997. *The public health researcher: A methodological approach*. Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press: 611-618.

Dandaneau, Steven P. 2001. *Taking It Big: Developing Sociological Consciousness in Postmodern Times*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Darier, Eric. 1999. *Discourse of the Environment*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Davenport, Guy. 1979. *Herakleitos and Diogenes*. Translated by Guy Davenport. Bolinas: Grey Fox Press.

Davidoff, Paul. 1965. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." *American Institute of Planning Journal* 31 (4): 331-338.

Davis, Kingsley, and Wilbert E. Moore. 1945. "Some Principles of Stratification." *American Sociological Review* 10 (2): 242-9.

de Carlo, G. 1969. "Architecture's Public." In *Architecture and Participation*, edited by Peter Blundell Jones, Doina Petrescu, and Jeremy Till, 3-22. Abingdon OX: Spon Press.

de Carlo, G. 2007. "Architecture's Public." In *Architecture and Participation*, edited by Peter Blundell Jones, Doina Petrescu, and Jeremy Till, 3-22. Abingdon OX: Spon Press.

de Vise, Daniel. 2001. "Broward has had Enough, Readers Say." *The Miami Herald*, December 30.

Dean, Mitchell. 2009. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: SAGE Publications.

Dean, Mitchell, and Barry Hindess. 1998. *Governing Australia: Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dekker, P. and E.M. Uslaner, eds. 2001. *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.

Dorcey, A. H. J., Doney, L., and Rueggeberg, H. 1994. *Public Involvement in Government Decision Making: Choosing the Right Model*. Victoria, BC: BC The Round Table on the Environment and the Economy.

Dreyfus, Hubert L, and Stuart E. Dreyfus. 1986. *Mind Over Machine: The Power of Human Intuition and Expertise in the Era of the Computer* New York: The Free Press.

———. 2005. "Expertise in Real World Contexts." *Organization Studies* 26 (5): 779-792.

Duberman, Martin. 1994. *Stonewall*. New York: Penguin Group.

Dundee: Urban Regeneration with a Partnership Approach: *European Academy of Urban Affairs*, 2007. Accessed November 22 2007. <http://www.eaue.de/winuwd/171.htm>

Durkheim, Emile. 1997. *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: The Free Press.

Eason, K. 1987. *Information technology and organizational change*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Easton, David. 1947. *The Theory of the Elite*. (Doctoral thesis, Harvard University.)

Eagleton, T. 2003. *After Theory*. New York: Basic Books.

Eisenman, Peter. 1984. "The End of the Classical: The End of the Beginning, the End of the End." *Perspecta 21: The Yale Architectural Journal* 21: 154-173.

Eldred, Michael. 2008. *Social Ontology: Recasting Political Philosophy Through a Phenomenology of Whoness*. Frankfurt: Ontos.

Ericsson, K. Anders, Ralph Th. Krampe, and Clemens Tesch-Römer. 1993. "The Role of Deliberate Practice in the Acquisition of Expert Performance." *Psychological Review* 100: 363-406.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1973. "Mixed Scanning." In *A Reader in Planning Theory*, edited by Andreas Faludi. New York: Pergamon Press.

———. 1968. *The Active Society: A Theory of Societal and Political Processes*. New York: Free Press.

Etzioni-Halevy, Eva. 1993. *The Elite Connection: Problems and Potential of Western Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

European Academy of the Urban Environment. 1998. "SURBAN: Good Practice in Urban Development." European Commission, DG XI and Land of Berlin European Academy of the Urban Environment, 46-48. Bismarckallee Berlin.

Ewald, Francois. 1986. *L'Etat Providence*. Paris: Grasset & Fasquelle.

Eysenck, Hans. 1995. *Genius: The Natural History of Creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Faden, Ruth R., Nancy E. Kass, Steven N. Goodman, Peter Pronovost, Sean Tunis, and Tom L. Beauchamp. 2013. "An Ethics Framework for a Learning Health Care System: A Departure from Traditional Research Ethics and Clinical Ethics." *Hastings Center Report* 43 (s1): S16-S27.

Fainstein, Norman I., and Susan S. Fainstein. 1985. Citizen Participation in Local Government. In *Public Policy Across States and Communities*, edited by Dennis R. Judd, 223-38. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Faludi, Andreas. 1973a. *Planning Theory*. New York: Pergamon Press

———. 1973b. "Towards Comprehensive Planning? Introduction." In *A Reader in Planning Theory*, edited by A. Faludi, 113-126. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Fenno, Richard. 1986. "Observation, Context, and Sequence in the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 80 (1): 3-15.

Ferguson, James. 2010. "The Uses of Neoliberalism." *Antipode* 41 (1): 166-184.

Field P.A. and J.A. Morse. 1985. *Nursing Research: The Application of Qualitative Research*. London: Croom Helm.

Fiorino, Daniel J. 1990. "Citizen Participation and Environmental Risk: A Survey of Institutional Mechanisms." *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 15 (2): 226-243.

Fischer, Frank. 2000. *Citizens, Experts, and the Environment: The Politics of Local Knowledge*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Fischer, Gerhard. 1990. "Communications Requirements for Cooperative Problem Solving Systems." *The International Journal of Information Systems* Special Issue on Knowledge Engineering 15 (1): 21-36.

———. 1993. "Shared Knowledge in Cooperative Problem-Solving Systems - Integrating Adaptive and Adaptable Components." In *Adaptive User Interfaces: Principles and Practice*, edited by Matthias Schneider-Hufschmidt, Thomas Kühme, and Uwe Malinowski, 49-68. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Florin, Paul, and Abraham Wandersman. 1990. "An Introduction to Citizen Participation, Voluntary Organizations, and Community Development: Insights for Empowerment through Research." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 18 (1): 41-54.

Flynn, James, Paul Slovic, and C. K. Mertz. 1994. "Gender, Race, and Perception of Environmental Health Risks." *Risk Analysis* 14: 1101-1108.

Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2001. *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How It Can Succeed Again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1991. *Rationalitet og magt (Rationality and Power)*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag 1-2.

———. 1998. *Rationality and Power: Democracy in Practice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1996. "The Dark Side of Planning: Rationality and Realrationalität," in Seymour Mandelbaum, Luigi Mazza, and Robert Burchell, eds., *Explorations in Planning Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research Press: 383–394.

Force, Jo Ellen, and Kevin L. Williams. 1989. A Profile of National Forest Planning Participants. *Journal of Forestry*. 87 (1): 33-38.

Forester, John. 1980. "Critical Theory and Planning Practice." *Journal of the Americas Planning Association* 46: 275-86.

Forester, John. 1985. "Designing: Making Sense Together in Practical Conversations," *Journal of Architectural Education* 38 (3): 14–20.

———. 1989. *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1999. *The Deliberative Practitioner Encouraging Participatory Planning Process*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1973. *The Order of Things*. New York: Vintage Books.

———. 1986. "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics* 16: 22-27.

———. 1990. *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction*. New York: Random House Inc.

———. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House Inc.

Fourez, Gerard. 1992. *La Construction des Sciences*. Bruxelles: De Bœck.

Fowler, James. 1996. *Faithful Change: The Personal and Public Challenges of Postmodern Life*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Francis, Paul, and James Robert. 2003. "Balancing Rural Poverty Reduction and Citizen Participation: The Contradictions of Uganda's Decentralization Program." *World Development* 31 (2): 325-337.

Fraser, Nancy. 1998. *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Friedmann, John. 1971. "The Future of Comprehensive Planning: A Critique." *Public Administration Review*. 31: 315-326.

———. 1973. *Retracking America: A Theory of Transactive Planning*. Garden City New York: Doubleday/Anchor.

———. 1978. "The Epistemology of Social Practice: A Critique of Objective Knowledge." *Theory and Society* 6 (1): 74-92.

———. 1987. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 1993 "Toward a Non-Euclidian Mode of Planning." In *Readings in Planning Theory*, edited by S. Campbell and S. Fainstein, 75-80. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fultz, Elaine. 2004. "Pension Reform in the EU Accession Countries: Challenges, Achievements and Pitfalls." *International Social Security Review* 57 (2): 3-23.

Garver, Eugene. 1994. *Aristotle's Rhetoric: An Art of Character*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gaventa, John. 2004. "Towards Participatory Local Governance: Assessing the Transformative Possibilities." In *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation*, edited by Samuel Hickey, and Giles Mohan, 25-41. London: Zed Books.

Gawthrop, Louis C. 1984. *Public Sector Management, Systems, and Ethics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture". In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books: 3-30

Gericke, Kevin L., Jay Sullivan, and J. Douglas Wellman. 1992. "Public Participation in National Forest Planning." *Journal of Forestry* 90 (2): 35-38.

Ghose, Rina, and William E. Huxhold. 2001. "Role of Local Contextual Factors in Building Public Participation GIS: The Milwaukee Experience." *Cartography and Geographic Information Science* 28 (3): 195-208.

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Glaser, Natalie, Ralph Hall, and Steve Halperin. 2006. "Students Supporting Students: The Effects of Peer Mentoring on the Experiences of First Year University Students." *Journal of the Australia and New Zealand Student Services Association* 27: 4-19.

Goldstein, Jan. 2005. *Post Revolutionary Self: Politics and Psyche in France, 1750-1850*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gosling, David and Barry Maitland. 1984. *Concepts of urban design*, University of Minnesota.

Gould, Kenneth, Allan Schnaiberg, and Adam Weinberg. 1996. *Local Environmental Struggles: Citizen Activism in the Treadmill of Production*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Graham, Katherine A., and Susan D. Phillips. 1998. "Making Public Participation More Effective: Issues for Local Government." In *Citizen Engagement: Lessons in Participation from Local Government*, edited by Katherine A. Graham and Susan D. Phillips, 1-24. Toronto: IPAC.

Grant, J. 2006. *Planning the Good Community: New Urbanism in Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Guest, Greg. 2012. *Applied thematic analysis*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage: 11.

Gutmann, Amy, and Dennis Thompson. 2004. *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Habermas, Jurgen. (1962) 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

———. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

———. 1998. *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Hacker, P. 2005. "Thought and Action: A Tribute to Stuart Hampshire", *Philosophy* 80 (2005):

175-197.

Hacking, Ian. 1995. *Rewriting the Soul: Multiple Personalities and the Sciences of Memory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hajer, Maarten, and Arnold Reindrop. 2001. *In Search of a New Public Domain*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers.

Haraway, D. J. 1988. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism as a Site of Discourse on the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14 (3): 575-99.

Hardinghaus, Matthias. 2006. "Learning Outcomes and Assessment Criteria in Urban Design: A Problematisation of Spatial Thinking." *Cebe Transaction, The Online Journal of the Centre for Education in the Built Environment* 3 (2): 9-22

Harvey, D. 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Hamdi, N. 1991. *Housing without houses: participation, flexibility, enablement*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Hatch, C. R. 1984. *The social scope of architecture*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Haughton, Graham, and Colin Hunter. 1994. *Sustainable Cities*, Bristol, PA: J. Kingsley.

Hawksworth, David. L., ed. 1988. *Prospects in Systematics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———, ed. 1998. *Architecture Theory Since 1968*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

———. 1997. *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Society*. London:

MacMillan.

Hedstrom, Peter, and Richard Swedberg, eds. 1998. *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Herson, Lawrence J. R., and John M. Bolland. 1998. *The Urban Web: Politics, Policy, and Theory*, 2nd ed. Chicago, U.S.A: Nelson-Hall Publishers.

Hildreth, Paul, and Chris Kimble. 2002. "The Duality of Knowledge." *Information Research* 8(2002): (1).

Hillier B. and J. Hanson. 1984. *The Social Logic of Space*. Cambridge University Press.

Hindess, Barry. 1996. *Discourses of Power: From Hobbes to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hitchcock, L. 2006. *Methodology in computing education: a focus on experiences*. (Proceedings of the 19th Annual NACCQ Conference, Wellington, New Zealand, 7-10 July, 2006.)

Horlick-Jones, Tom, John Walls, Gene Rowe, Nick Pidgeon, Woulter Poortinga, Graham Murdock, and Tim O'Riordan. 2007. *The GM Debate: Risk, Politics and Public Engagement*. London: Routledge.

Horkheimer, Max. 1985. *Critique of Instrumental Reason: Lectures and Essays Since the end of World War II*. New York: Continuum.

Hrelja, Robert, Karolina Isaksson, and Tim Richardson. 2012. "IKEA and Small City Development in Sweden: Planning Myths, Realities, and Unsustainable Mobilities." *International Planning Studies* 17 (2): 125-145.

Hudson, Barclay M. 1979. "Comparison of Current Planning theories: Counterparts and

Contradictions.” *APA Journal* 45 (4): 387-398.

Hudson, L.A. and Ozanne, J.L. 1988. "Alternative ways of seeking knowledge in consumer research", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14 (4): 508-21.

Husserl, Edmund. 1970. *The Crisis of the European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press: 240.

Huxley, Margo. 2011. “Urban Nation: Australia’s Planning Heritage.” *International Planning Studies* 16 (4): 426-428.

IAP2. (2000) The IAP2 Public Participation Toolbox. Accessed October 11 2008.
www.iap2.org/associations/4748/files/toolbox.pdf.

Igbaria, Magid. 1999. “The Driving Forces in the Virtual Society.” *Communications of the ACM* 42 (12): 64-70.

Iles, Alastair. 2004. “Patching Local and Global Knowledge Together: Citizens inside the US Chemical Industry.” In *Earthly Politics: Local and Global Environmental Governance*, edited by Sheila Jasanoff and Marybeth Long Martello, 285-308. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Institute of Development Studies. 2007. “How do Local Governments Support Citizen Engagement?” The International Workshop for Champions of Participation in Local Government. May 29-June 4.

Jackson, Laurie S. 2001. “Contemporary Public Involvement: Toward a Strategic Approach.” *Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability* 62:135-147.

Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage Books.

Jankowski, Piotr, and Timothy Nyerges. 2003. Towards a Framework for Research on Geographic Information-Supported Participatory Decision Making. *Urban and Regional Information Systems Journal* 15:9-17.

Jay, Martin. 1984. *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jenkins, Paul, and Leslie Forsyth. *Architecture, Participation and Society*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Jenkins, Paul and Marcia Pereira. 2009. "International Experience." In *Architecture, Participation and Society 2009*, edited by P. Jenkins and M. Pereira. London: Routledge.

Jensen, Ole. 2011. "Sustainable Urban Development – Compact Cities or Consumer Practices?" *Danish Journal of Geoinformatics and Land Management* 46 (1): 50-64.

Jones, P. 2013. "People at SSoA", School of Architecture, University of Sheffield, accessed January 15, 2013, http://www.sheffield.ac.uk/architecture/people/blundelljones_p

Jones, Peter B., Doina Petrescu, and Jeremy Till, eds. 2005. *Architecture and Participation*. London: Spon Press.

Kaiser, Edward J., David R. Godschalk, and F. Stuart Chapin. 1995. *Urban Land Use Planning*, 4th ed. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Katz, Cindi. 1992. "All the World is Staged: Intellectuals and the Projects of Ethnography." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10 (5): 495-510.

Kennedy, Mary M. 2007. "Defining a Literature." *Educational Researcher* 36: 139-147.

King, Cheryl Simrell, Kathryn M. Feltey, and Bridget O'Neill Susel. 1998. "The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 58 (4): 317-326.

Koonz, Claudia. 2005. *The Nazi Conscience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kostof, Spiro. 1985. *A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lamnek, Siegfried. 2005. *Qualitative Sozialforschung. Lehrbuch. 4*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz Verlag.

Lane, M. B. 2005. "Public Participation in Planning: An Intellectual History." *Australian Geographer* 36 (3): 283-299.

Larice, Michael and Elizabeth MacDonald. 2007, editors. *The Urban Design Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Larsen, T.K. 2003. *ICT in urban planning*. Denmark: Aalborg University. Accessed January 4, 2013: http://www.audrep.auc.dk/publications/Torben_Larsen.pdf

Latour, Bruno. 1996. *Aramis, or the Love of Technology and Science in Action*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, Y. 2008. "Design participation tactics: the challenges and new roles for designers in the co-design process." *CoDesign: International Journal of CoCreation in Design and the Arts*, 4 (1): 31-50.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. London: Verso.

Levine, Peter, Archon Fung, and John Gastil. 2005. "Future Directions for Public Deliberation." In *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagements in the 21st Century*, edited by John Gastil, and Peter Levine, 271-288. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lindblom, C. E. 1959. "The Science of 'Muddling Through'". *Public Administration Review* 19 (2): 79-88.

Linstone Harold A. 1978. "The Delphi Technique." In *Handbook of Futures Research*, edited by Jib Fowles, 273-300. Wesport: Greenwood Press.

London, S. 1995. *Building Collaborative Communities*. Unpublished manuscript prepared for the Pew Partnership for Civic Change.

Lowery, David, Ruth H. DeHoog, and William E. Lyons. 1992. "Citizenship in the Empowered Locality: An Elaboration, a Critique, and a Partial Test." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 28 (1): 69-103.

Lindblom, Charles, and Edward Woodhouse. 1993. *The Policymaking Process*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Luka, N. 2006. *Placing the 'Natural' Edges of a Metropolitan Region Through Multiple Residency: Landscape and Urban Form in Toronto's 'Cottage Country'*. (Doctoral thesis, Department of Geography, University of Toronto.)

Luna, D., Ringberg, T., and Peracchio, L. 2008. "One individual, two identities: frame switching

among biculturals", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35 (2): 279-93

Lynch, Kevin 1961. *The Image of the City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Macintyre, Alasdair. 1962. "A Mistake About Causality in Social Science." In *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, edited by Peter Laslett and W.G. Runciman, 48-70. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Macintosh, Ann, and Angus Whyte. 2006. "Evaluating How eParticipation Changes Local Democracy." In *eGovernment Workshop 2006*, edited by Z. Irani and A. Ghoneim. London: Brunel University.

MacLeod, M., and E. Rubenstein. 2006, "Universals." In *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by J. Fieser & B. Dowden. Accessed July 21 2009.
<http://www.iep.utm.edu/u/universa.htm>.

Madison, G. B. 2001. *The Politics of Postmodernity: essays in applied hermeneutics*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Marsh, Dave, T. O'Toole, and S. Jones. 2003. *Political Liberty Cuts Both Ways: The Politics of Non-Participation Among Young People*. Political Quarterly Publishing.

Martinez-Alier, Joan. 2003. "Urban 'Unsustainability' and Environmental Conflict." In *The Human Sustainable City: Challenges and Perspectives from the Habitat Agenda*, edited by Luigi Fusco Girard, Bruno Forte, Maria Cerreta, Pasquale De Toro, and Fabiana Forte, 89-106. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Martinez-Cosio, Maria. 2006. "It is Not Just Who You Know: Dominant Knowledge and Civic Participation." *Journal of Civil Society* 2 (2): 123-141.

Marton, F., and S. Booth, 1997. *Learning and Awareness*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Marx, Karl. (1848) 1992. *The Communist Manifesto*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 1975. "Letter to A. Ruge. September 1843." In *Karl Marx: Early Writings*, translated by Rodney Livingston & Gregory Benton. New York: Vintage Books

McIntosh, Malcolm, Sandra A. Waddock, and Georg Kell. 2004. *Learning to Talk: Corporate Citizenship and the Development of the UN Global Compact*. Sheffield UK: Greenleaf Publishing.

McGill University Department of Family Medicine. PRAM website. Accessed November 22, 2012. <http://pram.mcgill.ca/>

Mennicken, Andrea, and Peter Miller. 2012. "Accounting, Territorialization and Power." *Foucault Studies* 13: 4-24.

Miami-Dade Urban Sprawl Redevelopment Partnership. 2010. *An Adaptive Management Plan for Recycled Building, Development and Land Use Guidelines in Miami-Dade County*. Accessed October 8 2012 http://www.academia.edu/224279/The_Miami-Dade_Urban_Sprawl_and_Redevelopment_Partnership.

Miller, Peter. 2008. "Calculating Economic Life." *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 1 (1): 51-64.

Miller, Neal E., and John Dollard. 1941. *Social Learning and Imitation*. New Haven, NJ: Yale University Press.

Milroy, Beth. M. 2009. *Thinking, Planning and Urbanism*. Toronto: UBC Press.

Mitchell, B. 2002. *Resource and Environmental Management*. 2nd edition, England: Prentice Hall, Harlow.

Miyamoto, Yuri, and Li-Jun Ji. 2011. "Power Fosters Context-Independent, Analytic Cognition." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 37 (11): 1449-1458.

Mohai, Paul. 1987. "Public Participation and Natural Resource Decision-Making." *Natural Resources Journal* 27 (1): 123-155.

Moser, Paul, Dwayne Mulder, and J.D. Trout. 1998. *The Theory of Knowledge: A Thematic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mostyn, B. 1985. "The Content Analysis of Qualitative Research Data: A Dynamic Approach." In M. Brenner et al., eds. *The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches*. London: Academic Press.

Mouffe, Chantal. 2000. *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso.

Nabatchi, Tina, John Gastil, G Michael Weiksner, and Matt Leighninger, eds. 2012. *Democracy in Motion: Evaluating the Practice and Impact of Deliberative Civic Engagement*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nagel, Jack H. 1987. *Participation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Nazarova, Tamara. 1996. "Linguistic and Literary Semiotics." *Applied Semiotics* 1 (1): 19-28.

NCDD (The National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation). *Core Principles of Public Engagement*. Accessed December 10 2012. <http://ncdd.org/rc/item/3643>.

NCDD (The National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation). *What are Dialogue and*

Deliberation? Accessed December 10 2012. <http://ncdd.org/rc/what-are-dd>.

NCDD (The National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation). *What is Deliberation?* December 10 2012. <http://ncdd.org/rc/item/1572>

Newton, Line. 2005. "It is Not a Question of Being Anti-Immigration: Categories of Deservedness in Immigration Policy Making." In *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*, edited by Anne Schneider, and Helen Ingram. 139-172. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Norberg-Schulz, Christian. 1971. *Existence, Space, Architecture*. London: Studio Vista.

Norris, Pippa. 1999. *Critical Citizens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Norton, Ryan and John Whitmire. 2008. *All You Need to Know: Plato's Noble Lie in Action*. Department of Philosophy and Religion. Cullowhee, NC: Western Carolina University. Accessed 12 June 2009. http://www.dominican.edu/query/ncur/display_ncur.php?id=2279.

Nunes Correia, Francisco, Maureen Fordham, Maria da Graca Saraiva, and Fatima Bernardo. 1998. "Flood Hazard Assessment and Management: Interface with the Public." *Water Resource Management* 12:209-227.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2010. *Not For Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

O'Dell, Carla C., and Jackson Grayson, C. 1998. "If we Only Knew What we Know: Identification and Transfer of Internal Best practices." *California Management Review* 40 (3): 154-174.

O'Toolea, Therese, Michael Listera, Dave Marsha, Su Jonesa, and Alex McDonagha 2003a.

“Tuning Out or Left Out? Participation and Non-Participation Among Young People.” *Contemporary Politics* 9 (1): 45-61.

Ozawa, C. P. 1993. “Improving Citizen Participation in Environmental Decision-Making: The Use of Transformative Mediator Techniques” *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 11 (1): 103-117.

PAB (Planning Accreditation Board). 2012. “PAB Accreditation Standards and Criteria Approved.” http://www.planningaccreditationboard.org/index.php?s=file_download&id=112.

Pateman, C. 1970. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Pattie, C., Seyd, P., and Whiteley, P. 2004. *Citizenship, Democracy and Participation in Contemporary Britain*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pearson, David. 2001. *The Breaking Wave: New Organic Architecture*. Stroud: Gaia: 72.

Perkins, Douglas D. 1995. “Speaking Truth to Power: Empowerment Ideology as Social Intervention and Policy.” *American Journal of Community Psychology* 23 (5): 765-794.

Petersen, Dana, Meredith Minkler, Victoria Breckwich Vásquez, and Andrea Corage Baden. 2006. “Community-Based Participatory Research as a Tool for Policy Change: A Case Study of the Southern California Environmental Justice Collaborative.” *Review of Policy Research* 23 (2): 339-354.

Phillips, Susan D., and Michael Orsini. 2002. “Mapping the Links: Citizen Involvement in Policy Processes.” CPRN Discussion Paper No. F|21. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

Pill, Juki. 1971. “The Delphi Method: Substance, Context, a Critique and an Annotated

Bibliography.” *Socio-Economic Planning Science* 5:57-71.

Powell, Maria C., and Mathilde Colin. 2008. “Meaningful Citizen Engagement in Science and Technology: What Would it Really Take?” *Science Communication* 30 (1): 126–136.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 1986. “Scratches on the Face of the Country; Or What Mr. Barrow Saw in the Land of the Bushmen.” In *Race, Writing and Difference*, edited by Henry Louis Gates Jr., 138-62. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2002. “Bowling Together.” *American Prospect* 13 (3): 20-22

Putnam, Robert, Robert Leonardi, and Raffaella Y. Nanetti. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Queen’s University. 2011. “Power Does Go To Our Heads.” *Medical News Today*. Accessed December 8 2011. <http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/releases/238796.php>.

Rabinow, Paul. 1996. *Making PCR: A Story of Biotechnology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1999. *French DNA: Trouble in Purgatory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rand, R., Joshua D. Greene and Martin A. Nowak. 2012. “Spontaneous giving and calculated greed.” *Nature* 489 (7416): 427

Ragin, Charles and Howard Becker. 1992. *What Is a Case?: Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reddell, Tim. 2005. “Local Social Governance and Citizen Engagement.” In *Community and Local Governance in Australia*, edited by Paul Smythe, Tim Reddell, and Andrew Jones.

Sydney: UNSW Press.

Reisert, Joseph. 2010. "General Will". In Bevir, Mark. *Encyclopedia of Political Theory*: 551–553.

Reynolds, Paul. 1971. *A Primer in Theory Construction*. Boston: MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Richardson, Timothy and Steve Connelly. 2002. "Reinventing Public Participation: Planning in the Age of Consensus." In *Architecture and Participation*, edited by Peter Jones, Doina Petrescu, and Jeremy Till, 2005. London: Spon Press.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1974. *The Conflict of Interpretations*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

———. 1976. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

———. 1991. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*. Edited and translated by John B. Thompson. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Riesman, Arnold, Burak Konduk, and Oral Muhittin. 2003. *Meta Research in Operation Research/Management Science: A Taxonomy, Bibliography and Classification of the Literature*. Sabanci University Press.

Roberts, Nancy. 2004a. "Direct Citizen Participation: Building a Theory." Paper presented at the 7th National Public Management Research Conference, Washington DC, Georgetown University.

———. 2004b. "Public Deliberation in an Age of Direct Citizen Participation" *The American Review of Public Administration* 34 (4): 315-353.

Rogers, Carl R. 1951. *Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications and Theory*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Rogoff, Barbara, and Jean Lave. 1984. *Everyday Cognition: Its Development in Social Context*. Lincoln NE: iUniverse.

Rose, Gillian. 1997. "Situating Knowledges: Postitionality, Reflexivity and Other Tactics." *Progress in Human Geography* 21 (3): 305-320.

Rosener, Judy B. 1978. "Citizen Participation: Can We Measure Its Effectiveness?" *Public Administration Review* 38 (5): 457-463.

Rossi, Peter H. 1961. "The Organizational Structure of an American Community." In *Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader*, edited by Amitai Etzioni, 301-312. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Rossi, Aldo. [1966]1982. *The Architecture of the City*, trans. Joan Ockman and Diane Ghirardo, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Rouse, Joseph. 2008. "Laboratory Fictions" In *Fiction in Science: Philosophical Essays on Modeling and Idealization*, edited by Mauricio Suarez, 37-55. New York: Routledge.

Rowe, Colin. 1984. *Collage City*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Russell, J. W., C. Bye, J. Caplan, H. A. Deutsch, O. D. Grossarth, M. Lunn, R. Scott, and T. Stewart. 1990. *Critique of Land Management Planning Volume 5: Public Participation*. USDA Forest Service, Report FS-456. Washington, DC.

Sackman Harold. 1975. *Delphi Critique*. Boston: Lexington Books.

Saldana, Johnny. 2009. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage: 18.

Salwasser, Hal, 1994. "Ecosystem Management: Can it Sustain Diversity and Productivity?" *Journal of Forestry* 92 (8): 6-10.

Sanders, E. and Stappers, P. 2008. "Co-creation and the new landscapes of Design," *Codesign*, 4 (1): 5-18.

Saunders, William S., ed. 2007. *The New Architectural Pragmatism: A Harvard Design Magazine Reader*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Scalbert, I. 2004. *The Right to Difference: The Architecture of Jean Renaudie*. London: Architectural Association.

Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram. 1997. *Policy Design for Democracy*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

———. 2005. *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Schwedler, Hanns-Uve. 2007. *Supportive Institutional Conditions for Policy Integration of Transport, Environment and Health*. Berlin: European Academy of the Urban Environment. <http://www.eaue.de/Publikation/THEPEP-brochure-content-final-B16.pdf>.

Schön, Donald A. 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. London: Temple Smith.

———. 1993. "Generative Metaphor: A Perspective on Problem-Setting in Social Policy." In *Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Anthony Ortony, 254-283. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge

University Press.

Schön, Donald A., and Martin Rein. 1994. *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies*. New York: Basic Books.

Services for Australian Rural and Remote Allied Health. *Reflective Practice*. Accessed Aug 30 2009. <http://www.sarrahrtraining.com.au/site/index.cfm?display=143715>.

Sewell, W. R. Derrick, and Susan D. Phillips. 1979. "Models for the Evaluation of Public Participation Programs." *Natural Resources Journal* 19: 337-358.

Shannon, Margaret A. 1990. "Building Trust: The Formation of a Social Contract." In *Community and Forestry: Continuities in Natural Resources Sociology*, edited by Robert G. Lee, Donald R. Field, and William R. Burch, Jr., 229-240. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Sharp, John. 2006. "Corporate Social Responsibility and Development: An Anthropological Perspective." *Development Southern Africa* 23: 213-222.

Sheedy, Amanda, Mary MacKinnon, Sonia Pitre, and Judy Watling. *Handbook on Citizen Engagement: Beyond Consultation*. University of Toronto, Canadian Policy Research Network, 2008. Accessed October 11 2008. www.cpm.com/documents/48583_EN.pdf.

Shepard, Jon, and Robert W. Greene. 2003. *Sociology and You*. Ohio: Glencoe McGraw-Hill.

Simon, Herbert A. 1980. "Cognitive Science: The Newest Science of the Artificial." *Cognitive Science* 4 (1): 33-46.

Somol, Robert, and Sara Whiting. 2002. "Notes around the Doppler Effect and other Moods of Modernism." *Perspecta* 33: *The Yale Architectural Journal*

Soja, Edward W. 2010. *Seeking Spatial Justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Stake, Robert. 1995. *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stengers, I. 1997. *Power and Invention: Situating Science*, Bains P (trans.), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Stivers, Camilla. 1990. "The Public Agency as Polis: Active Citizenship in the Administrative State." *Administration & Society*, 22 (1): 86-105.

Straus A. and Corbin J. 1998. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.

Surber, Jere Paul. 1998. *Culture and Critique: An Introduction to the Critical Discourses of Cultural Studies*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Swenson, James. 2000. *On Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press: 163.

Swindell, David, and Janet M. Kelly. 2000. "Linking Citizen Satisfaction Data to Performance Measures: A Preliminary Evaluation." *Public Performance and Management Review* 24 (1): 30-52.

Szakolczai, Arpad. 2009. *Reflexive Historical Sociology*. London: Routledge.

Tafuri, Manfredo. 1980. *Modern Architecture*. New York: Harry N Abrams.

Tafuri, Manfredo, and Barbara Luigia La Penta. 1976. *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Tanz, J.S. and A. F. Howard. 1991. "Meaningful Public Participation in the Planning and

Management of Publicly Owned Forest.” *The Forest Chronicle* 67:125-130.

Tashakkori, Abbas, and Charles Teddlie. 2003. “The Past and Future of Mixed Methods Research: From Data triangulation to Mixed Model Designs.” In *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research*, edited by A. Tashakkori, and C. Teddlie, 671-701. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Taylor, Lucy. 1998. *Citizenship, Participation and Democracy: Changing Dynamics in Chile and Argentina*. London: Macmillan.

Tauxe, Caroline S. 1995. “Marginalizing Public Participation in Local Planning: An Ethnographic Account.” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 61 (4): 471-481.

Thomas, Craig W. 2001. “Habitat Conservation Planning: Certainly Empowered, Somewhat Deliberative, Questionably Democratic.” *Politics and Society* 29:105–30.

Thompson, John B. 1991. *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

———. 1995. *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

———. 2000. *Political Scandal: Power and Visibility in the Media Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Thompson, John B., and Held, David. 1982. *Habermas Critical Debates*. London: Macmillan.

Till, Jeremy. 2005. “The Negotiation of Hope” In *Architecture and Participation*, edited by Peter Blundell Jones, Doina Petrescu, and Jeremy Till, 3-22. Abingdon OX: Spon Press.

———. 2006. "The Architect and the Other." *Open Democracy*. Accessed January 2 2012.
http://www.opendemocracy.net/ecology-landscape/architecture_3680.jsp.

———. 2009. *Architecture Depends*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Toker, Zeynep. 2007. "Recent trends in community design: the eminence of participation."
Design Studies 28 (3): 309-323.

Tschumi, Bernard. 1994. *Architecture and Disjunction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

United Nations. 1992. Report on the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development: Annex I (Rio Declaration on Environment and Development). Accessed August 20 2011. <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm>.

US Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2009. *The Practice of Low Impact Development*. Accessed January 2 2012.
<http://www.huduser.org/publications/destech/lowimpactdev1.html>

US Environmental Protection Agency. 2009. *Smart Growth Guidelines for Sustainable Design and Development*. Accessed January 2 2012.
http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/sg_guidelines.htm

USDOT (US Department of Transportation). 2003. Department of Transportation Strategic Plan 2003-2008. Washington DC: US Department of Transportation.

Vattimo, G. (1985) 1991. *The End of Modernity: Nihilism and Hermeneutics in Post-modern Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

van Eyck, A. 1953. "Het Verhaal van een Andere Gedachte" (The Story of Another Idea), with

the principle "Aesthetics of Number", *Forum* 7, 1959. Amsterdam-Hilversum.

van Heffen, Oscar, Walter J. M., Kickert, and Jacques J. A Thomassen. 2000. *Governance in Modern Societies: Effects, Change and Formation of Government Institutions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

van Kleef, Gerben A., Christopher Oveis, Ilmo Van der Löwe, Aleksandr LuoKogan, Jennifer Goetz, and Dacher Keltner. 2008. "Power, Distress, and Compassion Turning a Blind Eye to the Suffering of Others." *Psychological Science* 19 (12): 1315-1322.

van Kleef, Gerben A. 2009. "How Emotions Regulate Social Life The Emotions as Social Information (EASI) Model." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 18 (3): 184-188.

van Veelen, Matthijs, Julián García, David G. Rand, and Martin A. Nowak. "Direct reciprocity in structured populations. 2012 " *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109 (25): 9929-9934.

van Zoonen, Liesbet. 2005. *Entertaining the Citizen*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Venturi, Robert, Denise Brown, and Steven Izenour. 1972. *Learning from Las Vegas*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Vesely, Dalibor. 2004. *Architecture in the Age of Divided Representation. The Question of Creativity in the Shadow of Production*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vico, Giambattista. 1968. *The New Science of Giambattista Vico*. Translated by Thomas G. Bergin, and Max H. Fixch. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

———. 1990. *On the Study Methods of Our Time*. Translated by Elio Gianturco. Ithaca: Cornell

University Press.

———. 1993. *On Humanistic Education*. Translated by Giorgio A. Pinton, and Arthur W. Shippee. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Voorhees, C.M., M. K. Brady, and Horowitz, D.M. 2006. "A voice from the silent masses: an exploratory and comparative analysis of noncomplainers", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34 (4): 514-27.

Wadsworth, Yolanda. 1998. "What is Participatory Action Research?" *Action Research International* Paper 2.

Wall, John. 2005. "Phronesis as Poetic: Moral Creativity in Contemporary Aristotelianism." *The Review of Metaphysics* 59 (2): 313-331.

Wandersman, Abraham. 1981. "A Framework of Participation in Community Organizations." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 17 (1): 27-58.

Wandersman, Abraham, Paul Florin, Robert Friedmann, and Ron Meier. 1987. "Who Participates, Who Does Not, and Why?" *Sociological Forum* 2 (3): 534-555.

Wasserman, Barry, Patrick J. Sullivan, and Gregory Palermo. 2000. *Ethics and the Practice of Architecture*. New York: Wiley & Sons.

Wates, N., and C. Knevitt. 1987. *Community Architecture: How People are Creating Their Own Environment*. London: Penguin Books.

Weaver, Martin, and Frank Matero. 1997. *Conserving Buildings: A Manual of Techniques and Materials*. New York: John Wiley & Sons: 1.

Webler, Thomas. 1995. "'Right' Discourse in Citizen Participation: An Evaluative Yardstick." In *Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Evaluating Models for Environmental Discourse*, edited by O. Renn, T. Webler, and P. Wiedemann, 35-86. Boston: Kluwer Academic Press.

Webler, Thomas, and Seth Tuler. 2000. "Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Theoretical Reflections from a Case Study." *Administration and Society* 32 (5): 566-595.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary. 1976. Springfield, MA: Merriam.

Weiner, D., T. M. Harris, and W. J. Craig. 2002. "Community Participation in Geographic Information Systems." In *Community Participation in Geographic Information Systems*, edited by W. J. Craig, T. M. Harris, and D. Weisner, 3-16. London: Taylor and Francis.

Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wharf Higgins, J. 1999. "Closer to Home: The Case for Experiential Participation in Health Reform." *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 90: 30-34.

White, Charles S. 1997. "Citizen Participation and the Internet: Prospects for Civic Deliberation in the Information Age." *The Social Studies* 88 (1): 23-28.

Wiedemann, Peter M., and Susanne Femers. 1993. "Public Participation in Waste Management Decision Making: Analysis and Management of Conflicts." *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 33 (3): 355-68.

Wieviorka, Michel. 1992. "Case Studies: History or Sociology?" In *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*, edited by Charles C. Ragin, and Howard S. Becker, 159-172. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Winch, Peter. 2001. *The Idea of a Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Routledge Publishing.

Wolf, Naomi. 1998. *Promiscuities: The Secret Struggle for Womanhood*. New York: Ballantine Publishing Group.

Wondolleck, Julia M. 1988. *Public Lands Conflict and Resolution: Managing National Forest Disputes*. New York: Plenum Press.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1975. *On Certainty (Über Gewissheit)* ed. G.E.M. Anscombe and G.H. von Wright Translated by Denis Paul and G.E.M. Anscombe. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Yang, Kaifeng, and Kathe Callahan. 2005. "Assessing Citizen Involvement Efforts by Local Governments." *Public Performance & Management Review* 29 (2): 191-216.

Yankelovich, Daniel. 1991. *Coming to Public Judgment: Making Democracy Work in a Complex World*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Yiftachel, Oren. 2009. "Theoretical Notes On 'Gray Cities': The Coming of Urban Apartheid?" *Planning Theory* 8 (1): 88-100.

Yin, Robert K. 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yli-Pelkonen, Vesa, and Johanna Kohl. 2005. "The Role of Local Ecological Knowledge in Sustainable Urban Planning: Perspectives From Finland." *Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy* 1 (1): 3-14. Accessed June 10 2008 <http://ejournal.nbii.org/archives/vol1iss1/0407-007.yli-pelkonen.html>.

Zadek, Simon. 2001. *The Civil Corporation*. London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.

Zimmerman, Joseph F. 1986. "Populism Revisited." *State Government* 58:172-178.

Zimring, Fred. 1994. "Carl Rogers (1902-1987)." *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education* 24 (3-4): 411-22.

2. Poetry

Diels-Kranz. 1994. "Heraclitus." In *Philosophy before Socrates*, translated by Richard D. McKirahan, Indianapolis: Hackett.

Eliot, T. S. 1940. "East Coker," in *Four Quartets*: ii: lines 25-38
<http://www.coldbacon.com/poems/fq.html> (Accessed December 10, 2011).

———. "Dry Salvages," in *Four Quartets*: ii: lines 42-51
<http://www.coldbacon.com/poems/fq.html> (Accessed December 10, 2011).

3. Unpublished interview material

Luka, N. Transcribed excerpts from interview C01 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on Crystal Lake, July 2003

Luka, N. Transcribed excerpts from interview S02 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on Severn River, July 2003.

Luka, N. Transcribed excerpts from interview S07 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on Severn

River, October 2003.

Luka, N. Transcribed excerpts from interview S08 with owner-occupier of a dwelling on Severn River, October 2003.