CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: A PRIMER

A THESIS
PRESENTED TO THE
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, CANADA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF CITY PLANNING

BY

Frederick Malcolm Curry

MAY, 1984

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: A PRIMER

by

Frederick Malcolm Curry

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF CITY PLANNING

© 1984

ABSTRACT

This thesis attempts to understand the individual and social bases of citizen participation in a manner shich will be beneficial to a student of city planning. In addition to literature available through academic sources, a number of papers, consulting reports and articles from journals were consulted. Personal interviews and first hand study of citizen participation were extremely important.

As result of these investigations it became apparent that while there are real personal and social benefits to be obtained from properly run programs of citizen participation. There are also very real barriers to participation. These barriers include obstacles posed by both individuals and entrenched social practices. There are means by which these barriers can be circumvented.

Because citizen participation is in the increase, planners should be familiar with the problems and pitfalls which can bedevil the interaction between citizens and their government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This document is intended to be a master's thesis written for the Department of City Planning of the University of Manitoba. If curiosity prompts you as it did me, to wonder about the subject matter of a city planning thesis, then you might be moved to examine the master's thesis card index in the architecture library. I was thinking of doing a thesis on citizen participation, and I wanted to find out if the topic had been considered by some other student. I found that there are theses dealing with a variety of issues which are important to planning such as land use, housing, law, theory, etc. In particular there are a number of theses in which the authors have done a lot of face to face interviews with members of the community. There are no theses which identify and examine issues which are relevant to the participation of the community in planning. I think that this is odd. All planning decisions once implemented have a profound effect on the lives of some group of people. The attitudes and responses of that group of people can influence the success of planned initiatives. Because of this I believe that understanding how to work with those persons whose lives are affected by planning decisions should be an important objective of a student of city planning.

However, my interest in participation as it relates to planning is prompted by two other events which affected me deeply. The first event was the inquiry into the expropriation of land north of Logan for the purpose of creating a "high tech" industrial park. The expropriation was opposed vigourously by a group of citizens who called themselves the North

Logan Community Committee. Their opposition coupled with a change in the provincial government led to the establishment of the inquiry.

The conflict between citizens and government quickly became a conflict between citizens, and the planning staff of the City of Winnipeg. Among the numerous attempts made by the planners to discredit the residents' position, one point was made repeatedly. The planners argued that if the residents' arguments had the wide support in the neighbourhood as claimed by the North Logan Community Committee, then why wasn't this support backed up by a larger turnout of the area residents at public meetings? Of more than 300 residents allegedly living in the area fewer than twenty attended the hearings to support the Logan Committee. The planners believed apparently that if people want something or if they oppose something they will band together and fight for their beliefs and desires. I too believed this and was puzzled by the apparent lack of support. When I questioned those whom I thought would know why more people were not attending, I was answered with blank looks and vague responses.

The second event involved school closure in the City of Winnipeg. In seeking a suitable thesis topic, I had decided that re-use of vacant schools would make an excellent thesis. After all, school yards and buildings are an important social and physical focus of most neighbourhoods. In carrying out research on the issue of closure and re-use of school buildings I found that a tremendous amount of effort has gone into the various technical and administrative aspects surrounding school closure, but that little research had been done on the actual impacts on neighbourhoods of closing schools. Also, most school closures have been implemented in the face of extreme opposition from parents who objected to the closure. Parental participation

in closing schools was deemed important only as an afterthought, but seemed to have little or no impact on the decision of whether or not a given school should be closed.

These factors whetted my interest in the issues surrounding school closure and particularly in the process by which schools are closed. As I considered these two areas, another fact emerged which convinced me that my real interest was citizen participation. During interviews with teaching professionals who were directly involved with school closure, a number of them commented that the responses of middle class parents to closures differed from those of working class parents. The latter group were identified as lacking interest in such matters. Once again I was confronted by the same question that had troubled me during the North Logan Inquiry. I needed to find out why some people get involved in an issue while other people don't in situations where both groups are similarly affected by the issue.

Having settled on a topic area, and having completed a number of interviews on school closures, I started a library search for relevant material. Unfortunately this proved to be in short supply. Due to the generosity of a number of people I was able to accumulate a number of books, papers, reports, and interviews to supplement my own experiences. I was able to put together a document which consists of five chapters not counting the introduction or the conclusion.

Chapter two consists primarily of material gleaned from books on demographic theory. Much of this literature was written by distinguished political philosophers of the late 18th, 19th and 20th centuries or by

commentators of their works. The value of this literature is manifold. Firstly, the basic democratic principles are stated and defended. Certain of the theorists are in favour of mass citizen participation. Certain of them are opposed. Out of these basic positions on democracy, it is possible to assemble a basic position for participation, and a basic position against participation. Further examination of each of these basic positions reveals that the central focus of these differing positions is a disagreement over the value of human development given the factual basis for that development. Those opposing participation argue on the grounds of political expediency based on a rational assessment of human nature and development, that participation is more trouble than it is worth. Those who favour participation argue on moral and psychological grounds, that participation is an absolute necessity. Because the focal point of this debate involves human development I felt obliged to incorporate into the text some discussion of a theory of human nature and motivation. Several people who work in community settings recommended Maslow's theory, and so I used this theory in an attempt to further understand the political theorists.

The theory of motivation, plus the differeing positions on participation provide a set of characteristics or categories through which examples of citizen participation can be examined. These categories are historical and abstract. In the third chapter I attempt to update this set of characteristics and to move the set of characteristics one step closer to actual examples of citizen participation. In order to do this I considered a number of contemporary pamphlets, studies, articles, and consultants' reports on citizen participation. Some of these articles were

written by citizen activists and radical reformers, while others were commissioned by government agencies. For the most part they are based upon direct or almost direct experience with examples of citizen participation. However, instead of providing case studies, they attempt to create an overview of different types of participation. In some cases, strategies which might benefit a citizen's group or a government agency are elaborated. The interesting thing about these articles is that they don't draw upon the historical literature. For this reason they provide both a test for the accuracy of this literature, as well augmenting the set of categories that developed from the literature. Incidentally, the basic positions drawn from this literature are confirmed by the contemporary commentators.

At this point in the thesis, I have abstracted a set of characteristics which can be used to examine case studies of citizen participation. These characteristics include observations about the basic nature and development of human beings in social settings. They include discussions of factors which will promote participation, as well as factors which will inhibit it. The next thing I wanted to do was case studies of citizens' participation in order to see if these categories had any practical application. The fourth chapter consists of two case studies. One study is drawn from events which took place in Toronto, the other from events which took place in Calgary. Both authors had been involved directly with citizen groups. Although their personal styles differed drastically in terms of both organizing and writing, their accounts confirm the usefulness of the categories. In addition their firsthand accounts provide detailed insights into participation which refine even further the set of categories.

My final step was to apply this set of categories directly to a case of citizen participation in Winnipeg. The case I chose to study was school closure in the City of Winnipeg. Again the categories prove useful. However, because much of the information I collected came from personal interviews, I was able to make even further refinements to the set of categories.

In the sixth chapter I tried to tie up a few loose ends and to formulate a tentative answer to my questions about who participates and why. In the conclusion I will attempt to assess the value of citizen participation for a student of city planning.

Before I proceed with the body of my thesis, I want to make a few comments about the method of research and writing. Our culture places a high value on scientific method, rationality, and positivism. It is believed that with proper tools, proper methods, and proper analysis propositions can be formulated which truthfully depict the world. This belief is so dominant that virtually every area of human endeavour carried on in our society uses rational models, rational methods, and has positivistic goals. Personally, I believe that the high expectations we place on these systems cannot be fulfilled. Whenever a rational system is applied to the everyday world it eventually falls short of its expected performance. This is especially true of those theories which attempt to systematically analyse human behaviour. On this view, human behaviour is not susceptible to abstract symbolic representation and analysis. This is not to say that we cannot have knowledge about human behaviour. It does say that what we know about human behaviour, and what we can write or say about human behaviour are two separate things. Theories of human behaviour

function as pointers or indicators of their subject matter. They do not define that subject matter. To understand human behaviour one has to experience it. Reading, writing, or discussion about human behaviour will not enlighten anyone who lacks the direct experience of the subject being studied. For example, imagine trying to learn how to ride a bicycle by reading a book about it. The only reliable method for learning how to ride a bicycle is to get on a start riding. I think that learning about participation is like learning how to ride a bicycle. Words written or spoken won't make any sense unless there is some basis of relevant experience from which these words can be examined. Participation is primarily something we do, and secondly something we talk about.

Because of these beliefs I have drawn much of my information from my own direct experience, or from that portion of the direct experiences of others which I was able to understand. Most of this latter information was acquired from interviews and informal conversations with a number of people in the city. Also because of my beliefs, I have tried to construct a model of participation. While it appears that there are certain general principles that can be applied, they cannot be applied in the abstract or a priori. Participation and human development are highly individualised.

None of the foregoing should be construed as downplaying the usefulness of rational models. Nor should the fact that I am not building a rational model cause anyone to assume that what follows is not value laden. However, if any of what follows is going to make sense, the reader has to relate what is said to his or her own experience. Everybody has experience in participation, although they may not think of it as such. Like planning, participation is political in the broad sense of the term. Any time people

get together to do something, or just to talk that is a political gathering.
When people congregate they influence each other. When people influence
each other, questions about power and leadership are relevant. Power and
leadership are the essence of politics. Seen in this manner, people's
participation in schools, churches, families, etc. is a political event.
It is from this perspective that I would like the reader to view what
follows. Participation is about human nature, human development, and
politics in the broad sense. I do not ask the reader to agree with this
view, nor do I seek the reader's approval of this view. I do seek his
indulgence of this view. Onward!

CHAPTER TWO

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The first task to be undertaken in examining citizen participation is to define or characterise what is meant by the term "participation". As a working definition we can say that citizen's participation takes place when actions are performed by citizens that are "intended to influence the attitudes and behaviour of those who are empowered to make decisions." (20, 12) Originally the term was associated with participatory democracy. As our present system of government evolved, the original notion of participation in government was replaced by a viewpoint which can be described as representative democracy.

For the purposes of this discussion, the terms "representative democracy" and "participatory democracy" can be partially characterised as follows. A person who subscribes to the representative theory of democracy believes that participation in government by citizens is best limited to: 1. voting by secret ballot, 2. only those citizens who are well informed about government by reason of their experience and position in society. (A person who subscribes to participatory theory believes that participation by government by citizens should include all citizens in as direct a manner as possible.) These opposing ideas are offered on the one hand by the participatory theories of democracy, and on the other hand by the representative theories of democracy. Pateman attributes participatory theories to both Mills, Bentham, Rousseau, and Cole. (6, 18) The Mills works were written circa 1800-1850, Bentham's circa 1850, Rousseau's circa 1750, and Cole's circa 1920. Representative theory is espoused by Berelson, Dahl, Santori, Eckstein, and especially

Schumpeter. (6, 2) These gentlemen wrote circa 1950-1965. Using Pateman's analysis plus Schumpeter and Cole, I will examine both groups of theories and briefly discuss their respective views on the issue of citizen's participation.

Participatory Theories

Pateman points out that there is really no single body of theoretical propositions that can be identified as being accepted by all participatory theorists. (6, 17) However, there is a set of issues identified by Pateman which are of immediate concern with respect to the theories under discussion. These issues are associated with 1) the role of voting, 2) the growth and development of the community, 3) the role of leadership in democracy.

1. The Role of Voting

The choice of leaders or representatives in most democratic systems is made by means of voting. Most theorists agree that the nature of government has an important effect on the day to day lives of the citizens. Voting in elections is seen as the means by which a citizen can both participate in the business of government, and protect his own private interests. Having to compete for the support of the citizens ensures that the representatives will strive to protect the interests of the citizens. (6, 18, 20)

2. Community Development

While all participatory theorists acknowledge the protective aspect of voting, Rousseau and Cole in particular emphasize the role of more direct active participation in the growth and development of the

community. (6, 22) (1, 181-182) For my purposes, growth and development
have two attributes. These are: 1. the development of critical con-
sciousness, 2. the development of personal, social, and technical skills
by which groups and individuals can meet their own needs and contribute
to meeting the needs of others. Cole and Rousseau adopt this position
for the following reason. All theorists from both groups accept the
position that the psychological attitudes and behaviour of individual
citizens are shaped by the social institutions that affect their lives.
So, "...participation has a psychological effect on the participants,
ensuring that there is a constant interrelationship between the working
of institutions, and the psychological qualities and attitudes of
individuals interracting with them." (6, 22) The participatory theorists
conceive this relationship in a dynamic way so that "...the central
function of (institutional) participation is...the education of an entire
people to the point where their intellectual, emotional, and moral
capacities have reached their fullest development." (6, 22) In this
context, the function of institutions and the role that participation is
to play in them is to foster the total growth and development of the
individual and society.

In addition, the well being of society is conceived in terms of the
well being of its individual members. The process of participation helps
to produce and to promote freedom and equality and a sense of belonging
in its members (6, 27) The individual is free to be human and to be
unoppressed. (2, 23-24)

Through voting a citizen can protect his private interest. Through
direct participation, the individual learns that he has to consider wider

matters than his own private interest. He learns that public and private interest are linked. (6, 25) According to Pateman, the participatory theorists believe that lack of participation can produce a socially dangerous self interest. (6, 29)

3. Leadership

The issue of leadership or authority is ignored largely by the participatory theorists since the issue is usually associated with the exercise of power. In this sense it is authoritarian and is not compatible with participatory democracy. On this view, leadership is a "prescription (which) represents the imposition of one man's choice upon another, transforming the consciousness of the man prescribed to into one that conforms to the prescriber's consciousness." (2, 23) However, in a participatory system a leader will "lead by influence...not by forcible imposition of his will." (1, 51) A leader in this sense does not substitute his will for the will of the people, nor does he implement his interpretation of their will. He carries out their will as understood by them. (1, 51)

A leader in this sense can be described as a servant of the people or a facilitator. His role is one of service, not the exercising of power or authority. Leadership is a pedagogical exercise which is carried on with the people, not for them (2, 25), to them, or against them. Thus according to participatory theorists there is a direct link between the structure of social institutions, leadership or authority, community development, education, and participation.

The View of the Representative Theorists

The representative theorists adopt a viewpoint which is generally opposed to that of the participatory theorists on the three issues.

1. The Role of Voting

The secret ballot is the sole acceptable means by which citizens may participate. By means of their vote individual citizens protect their equality and their private interests.

2. Community Development

Institutions educate the citizenry with respect to their role in society. That these institutions are largely authoritarian in structure is acceptable. It is better for the government to be controlled by a relatively small number of persons drawn from a narrow stratum of society. A group of this sort will have shared values and experiences. This will make it easier for them to make decisions, and will promote stability of government. Too much participation by too many people will have a destabilizing effect on government due to the inevitable clash of values. (6, 14)

3. The Role of Leadership

Leadership is chosen by the competition for the votes of the citizens by those who are interested in leading. According to Schumpeter, this competition is the defining characteristic of democracy. These individuals secure the favour of the voter by identifying issues which affect the interests of the voter and by proposing to solve these issues in a manner which is acceptable to the voter. (7, 269) It is the leaders who identify the issues, not the citizens. (1, 51)

What is the Critical Issue?

It is apparent from this very superficial examination of these three issues that there are significant differences between the two groups of theories. Most of the dispute can be attributed to differing views of human nature. The participatory theorists maintain a view of human nature such that the goals of society are identified with the values and development of all persons. The representative theorists support a view of human nature which makes plausible the identification of the goals of society with the values of the ruling elite. Schumpeter supports his views on the goals of society in the following ways:

1. Most people (in particular the lower classes) have authoritarian not democratic attitudes. They are not interested in and are psychologically unsuited for decision making and politics. (7, 250) This statement is used both to explain and justify the low levels of interest and involvement in civic affairs by the lower classes.

2. The participatory theories assume that a) people are rational, b) that there is a common good or common will to which all rational persons subscribe, and c) individuals will seek to realize this common good. (7, 250)

Having set up this view of human nature, Schumpeter proceeds to attack it. He makes the following critical observations:

a. Human beings are not rational about most matters. In order to behave rationally with respect to most issues, he argues, the individual must be well informed in isolation from social influences. That is, social

influences are irrational. Since most people have only a very narrow direct acquaintance with most issues, their ability to respond rationally is restricted.

b. Because people are not well informed in a direct manner with respect to most issues, their behaviour with respect to these issues will be irrational. They will be susceptible to manipulation of the sort practised in mass advertising. (7, 256-265) So, any and all public or mass behaviour will be irrational. Any attempt to formulate a common will or common good is doomed to failure.

According to Schumpeter, these features of human nature make it desirable that participation in government affairs be limited to the well informed few. This principle of limited participation extends to voting. All people are equal in that they have the right to vote. It is better from a standpoint of rationality that some people choose not to exercise their franchise.

This point of view is a thinly veiled attempt to justify our present system and our present society on the grounds that it is stable and rational despite its great inequities of wealth and power.

However, there is a chicken-or-the-egg problem with this position. All theories agree that the institutions of society have a profound effect on the psychological makeup of the citizens. If people are not rational in their public behaviour, and if they are disinterested in or poorly informed about public issues, then it is likely that social institutions are at least partly to blame. It is not sufficient to justify a social system on the basis of the psychological makeup of its

citizens, when the attitudes of those citizens are intimately affected by the nature of the social system.

Schumpeter's contention is that the individual must form his views in isolation from his fellows. An immediate consequence of this view is that all matters which transcend the most basic day to day lives of the majority of people will be beyond the grasp of those individuals. Thus, those who are fit to rule are those whose daily lives acquaint them with leadership and power.

missed a step

This argument can be turned on its head. If the views of most individuals are narrow when formed based upon their own direct experience, then in order to broaden these views, social interaction is required. Participation can be a means to overcoming the inadequacies of pursuing only individual goals. The common good or common will is something which can only be developed through active involvement in social activities. If that process of social interaction is irrational according to some a priori notion of rationality, then so what?

Thus, the belief that human beings are limited to a narrow self interest is a cornerstone of the views of the representative theories. In addition to this belief, there are other points of conflict:

1. On both points of view, participation and democracy are equivalent. Representative theory maintains that participation should be limited to voting. The virtue of this position is that it permits strong leadership, and eliminates from government the destabilising element of the politically unwashed.

Participatory theory claims that participation has virtues which are independent from the ends of the process (in this example, the choice of leadership). (6, 37) These virtues are the increased moral and intellectual development of the citizens. This development parallels a shift in the interests and attitudes of the citizens from narrow self interest to broader public interest. The representative viewpoint maintains a static view of society. Apparently, the defenders of this view do not deny that social interaction has a profound effect on the consciousness of the individual. However, what is called growth and development by the participatory theories is termed irrational and potentially dangerous behaviour by the representative theories. It is potentially dangerous because by increasing the number of persons interested in government, it decreases the stability of that government. This occurs because the greater the number of persons interested in government, the greater the likelihood that there will be clashes of values. These clashes reduce the effectiveness of government leadership. (6, 2; 7, 252)

2. Participatory theory stresses the need for freedom and equality in all areas of society, particularly in the areas of politics and economics. These are "the indispensable conditions for the quest for human completion." (2, 24) That is, political and economic equality are necessary to the growth and development which on the participatory view, are implicit in society. Although institutions shape the values, attitudes, and behaviour of the community, they are also shaped by the values, attitudes, and behaviour of the individuals who are involved in them. This is especially true for the individuals who control them. Thus social and economic inequality breed social and economic inequality.

This inequality will defeat the educational and developmental goals of participatory democracy.

Both representative and participatory theories accept the intimate educational relationship that exists between the development of individuals which which they interact. However, where participatory theory stresses the need for dynamic institutions that will produce growth and development the representative theory stresses the need for authoritarian institutions that will discourage participation and preserve the status quo. To preserve the status quo is to preserve existing economic and political inequality. "Economic inequality renders true democracy impossible (1, 13) (since) the present machinery of society expresses the point of view of the social classes which controls society." (1, 16)

3. Participation creates equality and democracy. Lack of participation creates authoritarian power structures. There is a near circularity here. The representative theorist claims that apathy among the general populace, plus authoritarian tendencies (6, 2; 7, 256-264) plus irrational behaviour due to lack of awareness as reasons why mass participation is not only undesirable, but impossible. Yet these theorists also agree that social institutions inculcate and encourage the development of these attitudes among the people. So if people are apathetic, irresponsible, authoritarian, and poorly informed, it is likely that their social environment has played a role in their development. Thus the social environment is an obstacle to persons who find themselves in these circumstances. It is the aim of participatory theory to overcome the barriers to equality through participation. (6, 22)

4. Representative theory rejects participation on the grounds that most individuals have a narrow spectrum of interests which are conditioned by daily experience. It would be unreasonable to expect people to be concerned or knowledgeable about issues which transcent these narrow interests. (7, 259-260) Political issues are supposed to be good examples of issues which are above the daily experience of most persons. However, it is precisely because these issues affect the daily lives of all people, that all people should be involved in government. This is especially true at the local level.

From this discussion there are three points that need to be emphasised:

1. It is the claim of the representative theorist that no development and growth are fostered by participation. No broadening of self interest takes place.

2. Authoritarian personality structures within the lower classes will prevent meaningful participation.

3. Narrowness of self interest plus the impossibility of developing collective goals will prevent participation because of the inevitable clash of narrowly self interested values.

If point one is correct then the aims of participation are meaningless, and participation is unnecessary. If points two and three are correct then mass participation as envisaged by Cole and Rousseau is impossible. These points have to be examined.

The Critical Issue: Is Participation Possible

The focus of the conflict between the participatory and representative theorists concerns the proper description of self interest and whether there is a growth and development through participation. A person whose interest is narrowly focused will be interested in meeting his own needs and will be more or less indifferent to the needs and to the individuality of others. As growth takes place an awareness of the needs of others and of the individual nature of those needs will occur. This increased awareness can be called a broadening of self interest. That the growth and development of self interest takes place through participation is the major thesis of the participatory theorists. The representative theorists claim that this growth does not take place.

In order to gain more insight into this conflict, I want to introduce a modern theory of human motivation, and examine the issues from the perspective of this theory. People have been inventing theories of human motivation for a long time e.g. cf. Phaedrus, a Socratic dialogue by Plato. Abraham Maslow developed a theory of human nature based on the hierarchy of human need. (5) I selected this theory because it was recommended as having practical application to the question of why people do or do not participate, and because it addresses the nature of and the process of human growth and development.

The basic premise of Maslow's theory is that human beings will be motivated to satisfy needs. There is a hierarchy of need from lower to higher. The more basic the need, the stronger will be the drive to satisfy it. The gratification of a need releases the individual to satisfy higher and weaker needs. That is, the interests of the

individual will grow or develop. The frustration of basic needs threatens
the individual and diminishes the capacity of the individual to meet
higher needs. That is, the growth and development of the individual will
be frustrated. The hierarchy of basic needs is as follows:

1. Physical and bodily needs

These include the desire for food, clothing, shelter, oxygen,
water, sleep, etc.

2. Safety and security needs

These include the desire for peace, protection, lack of danger or
threat, stability, and security. We want a predictable world.

3. Need for belonging and love

These include the desire to have affectionate relations with others,
to have a place in the family, and other groups. This includes both the
giving and receiving of love.

4. Self esteem and self worth needs

These include the desire for strength, freedom, and independence,
reputation, recognition, and attention.

I want to apply Maslow's theory to the three issues mentioned at the
end of the last section. Recall that these issues were: 1. No growth
of interest takes place. Human interest is narrow and self interested.
2. Authoritarian personality structures in the lower classes will
prevent meaningful participation. 3. The narrowness of self interest
combined with the impossibility of growth will lead inevitably to clashes
of value. This clash will prevent meaningful participation.

1. According to Maslow, there is a growth of self interest.

    a. Love needs are third in potency in the hierarchy. When satisfied these needs create feelings of belonging and commitment. (5, 42) These feelings are also considered to be an essential product of the participatory process. (6, 27) The gratification of the fourth level of basic needs, esteem needs, produces feelings of adequacy, mastery, and self confidence. Again, these feelings are an important part of the theory of human development which is implicit in participatory theory. To this extent at least, Maslow's theory, and participatory theory are compatible.

Bodily and safety needs are lower on the hierarchy than love and esteem needs. Accordingly, there are more powerful, and must be gratified first. Frustration of bodily or safety needs will prevent the individual from addressing and meeting his need for love and self esteem. Frustration of these same needs will also prevent the individual from participating in a meaningful way, i.e. in a way calculated to produce feelings of belonging and mastery, etc. If the production of these feelings is essential to a successful participatory process, then persons whose bodily needs have not been met will have no reason to participate. If growth and development are to occur, basic needs must be met.

    b. Higher needs are less selfish. (5, 111) The participatory process broadens the individual outlook and his notion of self interest. Again, there is a parallel between Maslow and participatory theory. This broadening of interest is seen as being indispensable to the development of higher needs by Maslow, and as being both a benefit of and a requirement for participation by participatory theorists.

c. Persons whose basic needs have been gratified for long periods of time can withstand deprivation of basic need gratifiers. (5, 52-53) Thus fortunate individuals can achieve a degree of relative freedom from the demands of basic bodily and emotional needs. Conversely, persons whose basic needs have not been gratified, and who suffer long term deprivation of basic need gratifiers may lose the capacity to have that need gratified. (5, 52) Thus a society that wanted to promote growth in its members would place a high value on meeting basic needs.

I think it is clear from these brief discussions, that growth of human potential will take place if basic needs are met. Participatory processes and goals appear to be oriented to the meeting of basic needs.

2. The second major reason cited by Schumpeter and others as to why participation strategies fail is the presence among the lower classes of authoritian personality traits or processes, but there are a number of things that can be said.

Democratic processes are usually contrasted with authoritian processes. Where a democratic process will stress the equality of the participants and will emphasise the participation of the populace, an authoritarian process will exclude participation of all but the elite. However, Schumpeter's version of democracy is compatible with authoritarianism. The other contemporary theorists mentioned in Pateman don't deny this. (6, 1) In particular, Schumpeter's conception of leadership is authoritarian. (1, 51-52) Leaders determine the will of the people independently from the people themselves.

Authoritarianism is usually associated with the willingness to use force or coercion to sustain leadership decisions. Authoritarian power structures are usually hierarchical. Power is concentrated at the top and flows downwards. Armies, bureaucracies, and the Roman Catholic Church are excellent examples of authoritarian institutions. Order is maintained partly by the willingness of those in power to use force, but more by the willingness of the subordinate group to accept, respect, or fear and obey the authority of those in charge. (2) That is, where you have authoritarian personalities, you have two sorts of authoritarian individuals. In Freire's terms, there are the oppressors, and there are the oppressed. Ironically, Schumpeter recognises authoritarian personalities in the lower classes, but not in the ruling class.

Usually, democracy and authoritarianism are conceived as being at the opposite ends of a spectrum. Confusion is created when an attempt is made to define democracy in a way which does not exclude authoritarianism, as Schumpeter does (7, 232) According to Schumpeter, democracy can be defined as a method of meeting certain ends, independently of the ends themselves. For example, democracy can be defined as a political process where decisions are made by secret ballot. All citizens have a right to vote. The defining characteristic of democracy is the competition for leadership by means of secret ballot. However, when democracy is defined exclusive of the ends it serves, some persons who might otherwise be prepared to accept the definition will reject it when the ends to be achieved are morally suspect. For example, is it democratic to practice genocide by secret ballot? On Schumpeter's view it might well be, but I think that most people would object. This problem

arises because means and ends are relative in the absense of any
absolute goal. Any relative goal or end is capable of being subordinated
as a means to some other end. To maintain a meaningful distinction
between authoritarianism and democracy, some reference must be made to
absolute ends when democracy is defined.

Democratic theory cannot be merely an attempt to describe certain
sorts of human conduct without reference to goals as Schumpeter claims.
Democracy is not just a method of exercising the will of the people.
Democracy is also associated with the motives, ideas, goals, and
objectives of the people whose will is being made manifest. So the term
"democracy" applies not only to the methods by which we govern ourselves
but also to the ends at which the process of government is aimed. These
ends and this process cannot be ideal in the sense of being unattainable.
They deal with possibilities that are achievable through social action
which emphasises the meeting of people's basic needs through a partici-
patory process which educates and develops human beings.

Maslow argues that threatening or depriving the basic needs for
security and esteem is a surefire way to create a more authoritarian
society in which individual and social growth are sacrificed for security.
(5, 51) On this view the authoritarian nature of most of our social
institutions can be understood both as a sign of widespread social
insecurity and as a stumbling block to the development of higher needs.
Authoritarian institutions provide a measure of security, but because
they are essentially repressive, they create insecurity.

Thus, while the representative theorists can claim correctly that our social system exhibits authoritarian characteristics, they cannot plausibly claim that these characteristics are compatible with democratic values. Authoritarian institutions and the effect they have on human development are undemocratic. The presence of authoritarian institutions and leadership will prevent the development of the people on a mass scale through participation. So, Schumpeter's claim about the impossibility of participation due to authoritarian personalities is true because it is a selfjustifying observation about society. However, despite the validity of this claim with respect to participation en masse, it does not follow that no program of participation is possible. It does follow that the scope of any program of participation will be limited by the level of development of the participants, and the extent to which the program is confronted by authoritarian social institutions.

3. Schumpeter's third point also has some merit. He points out that the diversity of needs and interests among the general population makes mass participation impossible because a clash of values is inevitable. His claim is that the diversity of interests among the general population will make the formation of shared goals and values impossible. Maslow's theory appears to back him up, at least partially. Maslow suggests that the precondition for the development of higher needs is more complex than for that of lower needs (5, 98) Each individual will seek to gratify his need in his own way. The higher the need, the more abstract the need, the more ways of gratifying the need can exist, and the fewer people will seek to gratify a particular need in a particular way. This means that it will be easier to select issues to attract people's interest

when these issues focus around meeting basic needs. Attracting people's interest will be much more difficult when their basic needs have already been met.

Conversely, issues which do not meet basic needs, or which are not perceived as meeting basic needs, or which are introduced in a way which is not sensitive to the level of human development, or which threaten basic needs may discourage rather than encourage participation. These latter points have negative implications for public participation strategies which focus on political issues, planning issues, etc. People who are living in a relative state of deprivation with respect to their basic needs, as well as people who have developed highly individual needs won't respond to participation schemes that fail to address their needs directly.

Thus, there exists the appearance of a paradox. Participation which addresses needs and interests which are higher on Maslow's scale than the most basic needs will have difficulty in attracting large numbers of people for two reasons. People whose basic needs haven't been met won't participate because the focus of participation doesn't address their basic needs. On the other hand, people whose basic needs have been met develop a diversity of ways to meet their higher needs. A single issue focused on a higher level of need will only attract that small interest group whose needs and interests are directly affected by that issue. So whether or not basic needs have been met, finding a single issue which will generate mass appeal will be difficult.

Once again Schumpeter's claims have a measure of credibility. Mass participation strategies planned around issues that only meet the needs of a portion of the populace will fail. However, this does not mean that no strategy of participation will succeed. It does indicate that due to the different levels of development among the general populace mass participation is unlikely to occur. However, strategies of participation geared to meeting the needs of selected portions of the population should be possible. Care must be taken to ensure that the need addressed in the program is that of the group to whom the service is being provided, not the need of the group providing the service.

I think that a society that functioned according to Schumpeter's theory of democracy would lack human growth and would experience widespread apathy among the general populace. Since Schumpeter's theory was based partly on his observation of modern democracy, and partly on his beliefs as to how modern democracy could be bettered, it is not surprising that our society seems to fit his theory quite well. However, from the standpoint of the participatory theory, the situation depicted by Schumpeter can be overcome through participation. Schumpeter's society is a special negative case which can be absorbed into a broader theory of human nature such as the one offered by participatory theorists. Schumpeter's views do point out real and significant barriers to participation. A practical proponent of participation would have to acknowledge that the status quo makes mass participation unlikely to occur. However, this does not mean that participation is impossible. The thrust of Maslow's theory is that people will be strongly motivated to meet their basic needs. It is also true that in order to meet their needs, people have to

acquire the knowledge and skills appropriate to their level of need.

Participatory programs and strategies can be formulated around helping

people to meet their needs by helping them acquire the skills to meet

their needs. It is this drive to meet needs which can explain Rousseau's

perplexing belief that educational programs should be so structured that

the participants would be forced to grow and develop. (6, 26) In

Maslow's terms, people are strongly motivated to meet basic needs.

Educational or participatory programs which both meet people's needs,

and which impart skills that assist in the meeting of needs will foster

the growth and development of both individual and the community.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have tried to provide a theoretical basis for

participation. To do this, two groups of theories were examined. The

first group was termed the participatory theory. This theory claimed

that direct mass participation was needed to foster the growth and

development of the community. The second group was called the represen-

tative theory. This theory claimed that not only was participation

inadvisable, that it might be impossible.

The critical issue dividing these two theories focused on the

question of whether or not social and individual growth could be fostered

by participation. In order to resolve this issue a modern theory of

human motivation was introduced. According to this theory, social growth

and participation will occur in order to meet basic needs. However,

these needs may not be homogeneous throughout the population. This will

create problems for strategies which advocate mass participation. In

addition, in societies in which the social structure prevents or threatens

the meeting of basic needs, additional barriers to participation will have to be overcome. These barriers will take the form of psychological problems in the participants. — *Need a massive paradigm shift!*

By using Maslow's theory of need a middle ground is reached between the lofty ideals of mass participation as stated by the participatory theories, and the discouraging social reality as described by the representative theories. Mass participation is unlikely. Growth and development of individuals can be promoted through participation, albeit *impossible* not without difficulty.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CONTEMPORARY SITUATION

Introduction

In the preceding chapter, I examined a tension between two theoretical positions. Participatory theory stressed the growth and development of the community by means of a process which promoted the formation of shared values and the expansion of self interest. Representative theory insisted that narrow self interest, and authoritarian personalities (i.e. apathetic personalities) would prevent the formation of shared values. This latter theory also claimed that because of these problems, leadership and authority were best exercised by that small group in society who were able to lead and govern. The point was that it was possible for a small group of like minded individuals to govern effectively. It was not possible for a small group of like minded individuals to govern effectively. It was not possible for a large group to govern effectively because of the inevitable clash of values.

The tension or conflict between these two groups of theories was and remains unresolved. I want to use this tension as an analytical device to examine further the issue of citizen participation.

In the present chapter, I want to examine and discuss material that is drawn from a variety of contemporary sources which deal with the issue of citizen participation. The material is based largely on direct experience with citizen participation, and so has an empirical element which was lacking in the previous material.

This material is available because there has been a recent trend toward increased citizen participation. A number of explanations for this trend are offered. "As governments have assumed more centralized authority, involvement has tended away from direct (local) control over the process (by citizens) to an advocacy role by vested interests." (28, 4) This trend has been assisted by the centralization of government and the ascendancy of the bureaucracy which is more amenable to the influence of certain segments of the population than to others by reason of common values and interests. (20, 12) This concentration of government authority brings with it the possibility of an increasing bias or inequality in the distribution of government benefits. Certain groups benefit because they have access to those who control the distribution, while other groups who lack privileged access will not benefit.

Another reason for this increase might be that as governments get larger, their expenditures get larger. Citizens who provide the funds for these expenditures become increasingly interested in how and to whom the funds are disbursed. (20, 2) In addition, persons who are affected by these expenditures are developing a growing interest in how the monies are distributed.

Yet another plausible reason is that our complex society shows people "how to get involved, how to put newly acquired skills or ideas into practice, how to reach out and become part of the larger human community where the old truth that 'no man is an island' translates itself into a deliberate wish to belong, to play a significant role." (20, 3) Involvement...is psychologically fashionable - its value being

recognized not only as a basis of modern citizenship, but even as a therapeutic treatment." (20, 3)

All three of these explanations have a common theme: the group which controls or influences decision making and administration is to become broader and less biased in its operations.

I want to look at the new material under three major headings. These are: 1. The social dynamic of the process, 2. The hierarchical structure of the process, and 3. Power and the process.

The Social Dynamic of the Process

This section can be broken into three areas for the purposes of discussion. These are: A. What reasons or principles explain the increase of participation? B. What conditions are necessary if participation is to achieve its goals? C. What are the barriers which prevent participation from achieving its goals?

A. What reasons or principles explain the increase of participation?

According to the sources, there are three reasons why participation is on the increase. They are: 1. Participation is consistent with the ideal of democracy. 2. Participation fosters the development of the community. 3. Participation aids the purposes of government.

1. Participation is consistent with the ideal of democracy.

That "citizen participation is part of our democratic heritage and (has been) proclaimed (by some) as a means to perfect the democratic process", (9, 287) is widely accepted. The belief in the truth of this proposition has been responsible for the historical movement toward

greater participation. (20, 1) It is clear that the notion of democracy that is embodied in this ideal is consistent with the views of the participatory theorists and in conflict with the ideals of the representative theorists.

2. Participation fosters the development of the community.

Greater citizen participation is seen as a spur to community development. (9, 288-289) The process of participation functions as an exercise in citizenship training for the involved public. The process is educational and develops feelings of adequacy, self esteem, and belonging. The sense of community is strengthened by the development of shared goals and values. In developing these values, destructive feelings of isolation and alienation are overcome. The process produces positive changes in the attitudes and behaviour of the participants. (28, 6-7; 24, 15-16)

Clearly these views support the claims made by participatory theory. Special emphasis is placed on the formation of shared values.

3. Participation aids the purposes of government.

This claim comes as a surprise since representative theory identifies participation as a destablishing factor which is detrimental to strong government. This claim was supported by Schumpeter's argument that social influences are irrational. This view was held in the belief that the only views a man could hold rationally were those he had acquired by his own direct experience. Views acquired from societal sources were indirect, and so were irrational.

This sword can cut both ways. In the introduction to this chapter, it was pointed out that the administration in a system such as ours is susceptible to external influence by those with whom it holds common goals and values. According to representative theory, this would mean that our system of government is irrational. What it really indicates is that all people are susceptible to societal influence both intellectually and emotionally. It is this susceptibility which makes possible the unifying development of shared values through participation.

This susceptibility can be used creatively through participation to reduce citizen resistance to government programs, and to increase the effectiveness of government programs by making the government and the user public more attuned to the needs and interests of each other.

This attunement is necessary because people resent programs which have been forced upon them. They can frustrate the objectives of government when they choose to do so. Local examples of this phenomenon are numerous, e.g. North Logan, North St. Boniface, Sherbrooke-McGregor, etc. On the other hand, people respect programs on which they have been consulted. They identify strongly with projects they have helped to plan, and they perform better in programs whey have helped to set up. (20, 3) The process of development which takes place through citizen participation changes the attitudes and behaviour of all citizens. They become more aware, better informed, and more supportive of local government. (28, 5-6; 9, 288) In this manner, participation tends to reduce conflict and strengthen local government.

In addition, citizen groups that are interested in participating have a commitment and determination not exhibited by paid government employees. Frequently they possess or develop expert skills which can enhance the problem solving ability of planning groups. (28, 5-6; 12, 35)

B. What conditions are necessary if participation is to achieve its goals?

A process of citizen participation is aimed at creating shared goals and values, and at broadening the self interest of individual members of the community. There are a number of conditions which is present permit the process to proceed without ensuring success. If these conditions are not present, the process will not succeed. The conditions are: 1. Education. 2. Two-way communication. 3. Issue orientation. 4. Orientation of leadership/professional resource/bureaucracy.

1. Education

The process must be mutually educational. All participants must learn about the goals and values of other participants. The citizens must learn to understand the problems values and objectives of the administration, and vice versa. Ideally the objectives of the participatory process should be identified within the process. They should not be imposed from without. In particular, the objectives should reflect the needs and values of the user group. It is essential that the participating citizens be able to see their contribution to the process and the product. The leadership must be careful not to impose their own technical values on the process. Once the objectives of the process have been identified, they must be followed through if the confidence of the public is to be maintained. The information facts and data presented to the citizens by the planners will produce a changing awareness in the

citizens, just as exposure to the views of the citizens will change the views of the planners. A process of this type can be a learning experience for everyone. However, care must be taken by the leadership to ensure that the process is not manipulated.

2. Two-way communication

Channels of communication must be kept open and undistorted. Secrecy or deceit are destructive of the process. Communication does not mean merely an exchange of information. Communication presupposes a willingness on the part of the participants to share their views and values and to have these views and values changed through the process. This sort of communication is essential if the needed expansion of interest is to take place. The will, and the openness presupposed by communication of this sort can overcome the initial clash of values.

3. Issue oriented

Efforts at stimulating public participation must be issue oriented. This is consistent with the fact that mass participation is not viable at this stage in our social development. People will respond to and get involved in only those issues which they perceive as addressing their personal needs and interests. There may be more than one group interested in addressing the same issue. All interested parties must be permitted to have input into the process even is their views clash. Experience has shown that participation reduces conflicts through increased understanding of opposing points of view.

4. Leadership/professional resource/bureaucratic roles

The role played by leadership in the process must be laid back.

Leaders must be careful not to intimidate or threaten the participants by acting in a dictatorial manner. Participants should not be expected to absorb technical data or learn technical language or viewpoints. The views of the people will be oriented toward values and criteria. The administration should be sensitive to these values. Enough time should be allowed so that these values may be shared, and so that the group may develop an identity based upon these shared values.

C. What are the barriers which prevent participation from achieving its goals?

There are only two significant barriers to increased citizen participation. Both are interrelated, and both mirror the concerns expressed in representative theory. The first barrier is the resistance to or hostility of bureaucrats and planners to citizen participation. The second is the apathy and suspicion with which efforts to encourage participation are met.

The resistance of the bureaucracy stems from a clash of values. Bureaucratic values are task or achievement oriented. They emphasize technical criterial such as efficiency and rationality, especially with respect to time. (20, 4) Participatory goals are process oriented. They are inefficient with respect to time. A shift from task oriented goals to process oriented goals threatens bureaucrats by depriving them of the power to control and dictate program policy and implementation. Even the lowest and most exploitative form of participation force bureaucrats to go out of their way to accommodate citizens and will provoke resistance.

Because of bureaucratic commitment to so-called technical goals, bureaucrats and planners may lack a serious and sincere commitment to the process of participation. This lack of commitment will produce a tendency toward co-optation and exploitation of the process. In turn, this tendency will create apathy and suspicion on the part of the people toward both the process and the administration.

The substance of the opposition is based on the following beliefs:

1. Bureaucratic goals and values promote rationality and efficiency. Participatory goals do not.

The question of whether or not a goal is rational or promotes rationality is irrelevant. In this context, "rationality" is being used as a buzzword, e.g. "high-tech" or "scientific", and tells us nothing about the point under discussion. In addition, while bureaucratic goals and values may reflect these considerations, bureaucratic performance does not. Bureaucratic actions are famous for poor timing, poor imagination, and poor delivery. It is these latter characteristics which create so much anger and frustration in the community.

2. Bureaucratic operations are task oriented, while participatory programs are not.

Along with the first objection, this is another way of saying that participatory processes cost money, consume time, and don't do anything worthwhile. However, what is it that needs to get done, and why does it need to get done? Presumably the object of any policy or program is to benefit some portion of the public. It is always the case that those who are most affected by a program are those who are most likely to try to influence its outcome. It is safe to assume that if government

programs benefitted that portion of the population who are most affected by the programs, there would be no citizen action. Satisfied people don't complain.

3. The participatory process is time consuming and is costly in dollars.

This is true, but must be weighed against the social and financial cost of not allowing public participation. In addition to the benefits of participation in terms of community development, there is also the benefit of reduced opposition to policies and programs. This can mean real savings in terms of time and money, and in terms of program effectiveness.

This objective does have a hidden merit. Most programs affect a small number of people relative to the population as a whole. The portion of the population who are not involved or interested may resent the excessive expenditures incurred by process oriented planning methods. Thus, government will be caught between the interference of the affected group on the one hand, and the censure of the larger public on the other. In the short run, it is probably easier to settle for less costly levels of participation, and to accept the reduced effectiveness of government programs. In the long run, this will only result in increased citizen resistance. This option has a high long term social and financial cost associated with it, but one which is less obvious because of lower short term cash outlays. One real danger of this sort of thinking is that participation will be treated as a luxury item to be accepted only when the economy is going well.

All of these problems are made worse by the fact that most of us are taught not to participate. We learn at home, at school, and later at work that authoritarian methods are the right methods. It is in part this authoritarian mentality which causes the apathy that many citizens have toward programs of participation. They have learned that citizen participation is undesirable, unnecessary, and futile.

To sum up, the barriers to participation arise because of narrow self interest on the part of most citizens, whether they work for the government or not. They are unwilling to concede to others that which they demand for themselves in terms of political influence, basic material needs, etc. Mass participatory programs of the sort advocated by Cole and Rousseau are intended to overcome problems of this sort. At present, because of the depth to which these problems are entrenched in our society, mass participation is impossible. The social barriers to participation of any kind are real, and will disappear only with a change of attitude on the part of the larger population. Because of these barriers, participation must be tergetted at relatively narrow segments of the population.

The Hierarchical Structure of the Process

The material on the structure of participatory mechanisms has been borrowed from a number of sources, among them Arnstein, Bregha, O'Connor, Burke, and IASP. There are a remarkable number of similarities among them, and the suspicion that there is an incestuous relationship among them is confirmed only in the bibliography of the IASP document. This leads me to believe that there is a fairly natural sequence of events that will take place between government and citizens during participation

programs. This sequence is undoubtedly influenced both by human nature, and cultural values. As examples, I will rely on the Arnstein Ladder, since hers is the grandmother of the group. I will also include the IASP ladder for comparison. Lastly, I will discuss Bregha's ladder since it has a novel aspect not included in any of the others. In discussing the Arnstein/IASP ladders, I will combine them, since this makes for an interesting comparison/contrast.

Arnstein/IASP ladders are as follows:

1. Manipulation/Persuasion

According to Arnstein, at this level citizen involvement is mere tokenism. The government agency, or representative has a plan or program prepared prior to meeting with the public. The public is involved for the purpose of gaining their approval. No input into the project is solicited. The motives behind participation of this sort are usually ulterior.

IASP views this level of participation in a more moderate manner, but allowing for the differences in perspective, there is considerable agreement between the two ladders. The role of the citizen is passive. Vehicles for this type of program range from media information blitzes, to advisory committees.

2. Therapy/Education

Arnstein considers this type of participation to be arrogant and dishonest. The agency involved in this approach assumes that anyone wanting some say in the program is suffering from a form of mental illness. The object of participation is to cure people of their negative attitudes,

rather than addressing any legitimate concerns they might have about the program.

Again, IASP is more moderate in it assessment of this level of participation. The objective is to change people's attitudes about programs through education, not to change the programs themselves. IASP indicates that the activity that takes place at this level may be the basis for future higher levels of involvement.

3. Informing/Feedback

Information about plans and programs is distributed without provision for feedback according to Arnstein. IASP includes provisions for feedback at this level, and also indicates that the program may be modified by the feedback.

4. Consultation/Consultation

According to Arnstein, consultation consists of surveys, meetings and hearings. The administration has the option of modifying the program based upon the input from the citizens.

IASP describes this forum as two way. Government is interested in and responsive to the input from the citizens. There is a visible attempt made by the government to incorporate the views of the citizens.

5. Placation/(no IASP)

Representatives of the public are hand picked to sit on boards, etc. They aren't accountable to any constituency. They aren't in a majority position, so they can always be outvoted. There is no mandate to deal with problems, and no input from citizens need be accepted.

6. Partnership/Joint Planning

Power is redistributed through negotiation. This situation is brought about by citizen pressure. The power to do this is taken not offered. This means that there must be an organized power base in the community.

According to IASP, joint planning ventures are initiated by the government. The important feature of this and higher levels is that no plan is in place prior to the initiation of the process. Thus, using the criteria that were established earlier in this chapter, this is the first stage of citizen participation.

7. Delegated Authority/Delegated Authority

The citizens are granted authority over some area of planning. Usually some funds are contracted to the group.

8. Citizen Control

    a. The citizens determine policy and program

    b. They administer the program

    c. They negotiate changes in this situation.

At this level there is a shift of responsibility from the government to the citizens.

Arnstein's categories were constructed from the case studies of poverty programs in the U.S. The programs were largely unsuccessful due mainly to the attitudes of government officials. The IASP document is a consulting report done for the Saskatchewan government. As far as I know, no case studies were performed. While Arnstein is bitterly

cynical about the role of government in participation programs, IASP is very optimistic. The differences in the descriptions of the various levels of government sponsored participation stem from the differing assessments on the part of the respective authors of the willingness of governments to enter into genuine participation. It is possible that these differences can be traced to ideological differences on the part of the authors. Arnstein clearly supports participatory values. IASP is written by technocrats for a representative government. They could be expected to have more sympathy for representative values. However, this is speculation on my part.

Bregha's Model

Both Arnstein and IASP develop ladders which create static categories for the different levels of participatory programs. Bregha contends that "it is important to see them on a continuum, one building on the foundations of the previous one". (20,18) Thus the lower levels of the Arnstein/IASP ladders, which Arnstein classifies as pseudo-participation when they are considered as static and in isolation from each other, can be considered as the foundation of a larger, flexible, dynamic participatory strategy. There are four levels to Bregha's ladder:

1. Information feedback

This involves a two way exchange of information between the government and interested citizens. It helps to develop community awareness. At this level, the response of the community is essentially reactive. New technology makes programs of this sort possible. All forms of mass media may be used at this level.

2. Consultation

This step follows the first and is based upon the premise that facts as they seem are more important than facts as they are. (20, 20) This step enables the government to assess the views and perceptions of the citizens. Bregha emphasizes the need for flexible attitudes on the part of the government in order to overcome suspicion on the part of the public. In this stage it is also important to let the public see how its input has affected the outcome of the process.

3. Joint planning

Shared roles and responsibilities characterise this stage. The process of interaction which has occurred during the first two stages has led to the development of common goals and objectives. At this stage user groups are involved in the planning and delivery of government programs. The commitment is usually short term, and more than one group may address the same issue. Bregha suggests that for this level to be successful the role of planner must be redefined as that of consultant to the citizens group.

4. Delegated authority

This is an extension of the first three stages. It is applicable to situations where:

a. Community development or self help is involved

b. Wide expertise is available

c. The administration can be entrusted to users

d. The area of service is well defined, small geographically, and can be managed by the users.

Programs of this sort are the highest level of participation. They are objected to on the grounds that they may create dependency on the government (9, 292) or that the program may be subject to manipulation by the government. (20, 26)

There are a couple of points made by Bregha that merit further discussion. For example, he suggests a change of role for officials who take part in the participatory process. The role they should adopt is that of consultant. However, this designation is unclear. The yardstick by which we have been assessing leadership roles was according to whether they were authoritarian or democratic. Is the leader a boss, or is he a facilitator? Is he to exert control, or is he to serve? It is quite possible for a consultant to be as much of a tyrant as anyone else. I suspect that what Bregha really intends is that the bureaucrat subsume his own desires and ideas to those of the public. A role of this sort is consistent with the leadership role as designated by Cole.

Interestingly enough, both Bregha and Burke observe that the highest level of participation is also the least likely to occur. The main reason for this is that participation at this level involves a loss of power. Other reasons are offered. As noted above, concern is expressed that where control of a program is handed over to the people, these people will become dependent on the government, and subject to manipulation by the government.

These are odd objections. We have already identified that the major barrier to increased participation is government resistance, and the tendency by the government to manipulate the process. It is self con-

tradictory to speak of high levels of participation and a manipulative
government in the same breath. With a manipulative government, only the
lowest levels of participation will be possible. The appearance of higher
levels will be at best a facade.

Equally curious is the objection based upon the problem of dependency.
In the case of government services, all citizens depend upon the govern-
ment. I think that the real reason why high levels of participation take
place only rarely is that the government doesn't want to sacrifice its
control over a program which it may someday wish to cancel. Community
oriented programs of the sort suited to citizen control are always the
first items to be cut when budgetary difficulties arise.

The only apparent reason why higher levels of participation are
resisted is because they involve a loss of power to the government and
its administrators. This resistence to high levels of participation has
special significance for the poor. The link between low levels of
participation and low socio-economic status was pointed out in the previous
chapter, especially in Cole's contributions. Increased participation is
seen as a means to overcoming the gap between the wealthy and the poor.
High levels of participation in which power is transferred are necessary
to the achievement of this goal. Even the most optimistic of the
commentators on participation admit that this transfer of power will not
take place. So in order to better understand the phenomenon of partici-
pation the issue of the transfer of power and its relationship to poverty
must be considered.

Power and the Process

The central issue surrounding citizen participation involves power. The major barrier to increased participation has been identified as the resistance of those inpower to share that power. Participation produces growth and development in the participants. As people grow and develop, there is a tendency for them to assert themselves and assume control. This is consistent with Maslow's observation that as people ascend the hierarchy of needs they become more assertive and more independent. There is also an apparent correlation between increased participation, greater awareness, and higher levels of education.

If this correlation is valid, the increased trend toward participation could be in part a byproduct of modern improvements in communications and education. This would mean that opposed to the self reinforcing cycle of alienation and apathy which prevents participation, there is a self reinforcing cycle of growth and development. Obviously, the trick is to change the one into the other. The danger is that the increased awareness that comes with better education is itself a commodity which can be distributed equally or unequally. The growth and development advocated by the participatory theorists could become the property of the few as opposed to the many. Instead of overcoming the inequality with which wealth and power are distributed, this trend could reinforce that inequality. "Technical rationality...excludes by its very nature any significant degree of citizen participation (20, 10) (because) whenever a public official has some discretion (he) can be influenced (20, 12) (since) through its diversified structures...the government tends to mirror the variety of economic and social interests in our community...

(so that) there exists a permanent, mutually advantageous relationship between public bureaucracies and established interests". (20, 9) That is, as Cole argued, the power structure by its very nature shares, reflects, and reinforces the values of the privileged class in society.

On the other hand, successful citizen participation of any sort involves a shift from existing values, and therefore involves a redistribution of power. The resistance to share wealth and power, and to allow their values to be changed is the obvious reason why governments and the segments of society whose interests are protected by governments don't get enthused about the benefits of participation. In turn, this explains why most exercises in participation are not of the sort which permit a significant degree of input from the citizens. (12, 16-17)

So, participation, real participation in which some power is transferred from the government to the citizens is a threat to the power base of the government. The other objections to increased participation stem from this point. In particular, the objections based upon rationality and efficiency are secondary considerations. No decision is made solely on the basis of hard technical data. All decisions are made on the basis of individual and group values.

The question is then, whose values should predominate? One of the documents which discusses participation suggests that, "sometimes (when) there are no clear cut reasons for selecting one alternative over another, the choice must be made on the basis of what is most acceptable to those to be affected". (28, 25) What other basis is there? A view of this sort suggests that there are other reasons for choosing a particular

alternative than the needs and interests of those who are affected. It also suggests that deffering to those affected is only important when there is no clear cut reason to do otherwise. This supports Bregha's contention that there is an entrenched set of values and interests within the bureaucracy which will influence not only how government goodies are distributed, but also to whom. Attitudes and values which are consistent with this point of view are opposed to the goals of participation and would have to change if real participation is to take place. From the standpoint of participatory theory, the only valid source of goals and values is those who will be affected by government action.

So, in a forum designed to encourage interaction between government and citizens for the purpose of changing the values of those involved, "the burden of disciplining one's attitudes will invariably rest with government officials. Their (position) has to be used in a restrained way...and...with self discipline if the group is to establish the basic trust among its members and operate with respect for the principle of reciprocity". (20, 20) In fact, the situation is even more precarious than this because while people will be suspicious of government officials, once these suspicions have been allayed, these same people in whom has been inculcated a respect for and a deference toward expertise and authority. So not only must the expert mitigate the natural suspicion and hostility that will initially be directed toward him, he must also control his own tendencies to exercise his leadership options in an authoritarian manner. The object of the process is to initiate growth and change in the participants through the meeting of their needs. Authoritarian behaviour defeats the formation of group identity and values, and in turn the objectives of the participatory process.

So, the real barrier to participation is that the power in society is vested in a group of persons who have shared values. Their self interest is threatened by a process which would change these values as well as reducing their control and authority. The present inequity in the distribution of power would perhaps not be so problematic if the distribution of basic goods and services didn't mirror the distribution of power. As Cole and others point out, the distribution of power, and social and economic well-being are intimately related. So, the developmental goals of participation become especially important when the process involves the poor. Yet, if the shift of power is an important feature of the process, then the poor are in the ironic position of being those in society who most need to participate and those who are least likely to do so.

Arnstein's paper is based upon her evaluation of the performance of government run participation programs for the poor in the U.S. Judging from her comments, their track record in terms of allowing genuine participation is poor. Her focus in analysing these problems is expressed in terms of the redistribution of power. For Arnstein, citizen participation is citizen power. "It is the redistribution of power that enables the have not citizens (who are) presently (sic) excluded from the political processes to be deliberately included in the future". (8, 216) It is the resistance to this redistribution of power on the part of the bureaucracy which all authors pick out as the single most effective impediment to the development of genuine participation.

Political power is the power to influence the outcome of government decisions. Participation is the attempt to exercise that power. This

power can be de jure power, that is power that can be recognized in law, or it can be de facto power, that is effective power or actual power. It is de facto power which is the most important, and which is the subject of discussion. More and more of the de facto power in our society is controlled by the bureaucracy.   *regulators*

Power is other directed. It seeks to be exercised and to influence. However, human beings have an inner need as well. Self development and growth are needs. These needs are met partly through the gratification of basic needs. The conflict between the need to act and the need to grow is fundamental to participation. Effective social action is a means to gratifying the social needs of self esteem and love. However, the social integration and development which result in shared goals and a broadened level of self interest are required in order for any social group to act in an organized and co-ordinated manner. The need to act brings people together. Before they can act they must be knit into a   *Inst.* collective agent having shared goals and values. Individuals whose basic needs are met have developed skills which enable them to meet these needs. Their interest will be to use these skills to achieve specific ends. They will be task oriented. Individuals whose basic needs aren't met may lack skills. Their interest will be to develop skills which enable them to meet basic needs. They will be process oriented.

Whatever the nature of the situation, any group desiring to achieve group ends must develop shared goals and values. This development will be easier and less time consuming for people whose basic needs have been met because this development is one of the skills that people need to learn.

Problems arise because to permit the development of process oriented
needs is time consuming. The greater the sense of urgency on the part
of the task oriented types, the greater the likelihood that process
oriented goals will be ignored, because task oriented types are in a
better position to assert themselves. Individuals who are involved in
the process partly to develop skills to meet basic personal needs will
be discouraged from participating. This reticence to get involved will
merely encourage unilateral and authoritarian action on the part of the
individuals who assume leadership roles. It is a way of ensuring that
things get done.

This problem is exacerbated "in regard to those who for reasons of
apathy, despair, or alienation do not normally enter the process". (20, 31)
This apathy is often, but not always indicated by socio-economic status.
I don't have a great deal of experience working with "the poor" from a
standpoint of their participation or non-participation. Nonetheless,
there are some general comments that I can make about this situation.

Poor people are a heterogeneous group as is any social grouping.
"Poor" is a label which says very little about the people to whom it is
applied. Some of these people may have physical or medical disabilities,
some may have personal emotional problems, some may be unable to find
decent work, etc. In terms of needs gratification, most of these
individuals will fit in very low on Maslow's hierarchy. Even personal
bodily needs may be a source of daily concern. Problems in gratifying
basic personal needs will prevent the gratification of higher social
needs. Persons who are poor may also become the object of abuse,
disapproval, and rejection from individuals and groups in society who

see in these people fearful and repulsive qualities. Abuse of this sort

has a profound debilitating effect on human development.

Persons whose basic needs are satisfied develop social networks and

groupings which are directed at meeting higher needs. The ability to

form social networks is one of the skills developed in meeting basic needs.

Some of the higher needs may be gratified through political activity. So,

by reason of their socio-economic situation, because their basic needs

have been met, these people have the will to exercise de facto political

power. Persons whose basic needs have not been met will not usually have

an interest in organizing for political purposes. They do not have the

will to exercise de facto political power. Since they will be unable to

exercise do facto political power, their relationship to government agencies

will be largely one of frustrating and anxiety producing dependency.

Because of this fear and anxiety, poor people are inclined to avoid

confrontation with government agencies. This in turn merely reinforces

their dependency on the government.

Obviously, the beginnings of a solution to some of the difficulties

which confront the poor would involve creating in them some sense of

personal or political power. There are several obstacles to achieving

this objective:

1. The bureaucracy frowns upon attempts to appropriate control and power

from them. Human nature being what it is, this would be especially true

if the attempt was made by persons over whom the bureaucracy has direct

social, political and economic power. Poor persons depend on the govern-

ment for support. In this situation of dependency, people are often

afraid that if they stand up to the government, what little they had will be taken from them.

2. People whose basic needs haven't been met will have difficulty maintaining interest in matters which are not related directly to meeting basic needs.

3. There is another problem that is associated with persons of all levels of personal development. All people will be motivated to achieve goals which have material benefits. Very few people will be motivated to achieve goals whose benefits are growth and development. Most people want benefits that have some substance. An interesting conflict arises when, in order to achieve the desired material benefits, some measure of personal growth is required. Growth and development is usually difficult and sometimes painful. Most people will try to avoid the difficulties, but still reap the benefits which will result from growth.

A similar situation exists with respect to the exercising of de facto political power. Political empowerment is really an individual or psychological trait. It is something that must be learned or acquired, but which cannot be taught or given. As Freire points out, there is an oppressor within us who must first be thrown off before we can deal with the oppressor who is outside us. While this sense of empowerment cannot be forced upon anyone, situations can be created in which those attitudes will develop naturally. This is the task of the community development worker. For an interesting perspective on the method, see Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed.

At this point, I should also mention that it is not only the poor who have low levels of participation. Many middle and upper income areas have low levels of participation. However, there is a reason why we should be especially concerned about low rates of participation among the poor. If participation in a middle income area is low one could assume several things. They might be suffering from some unsuspected deprivation of basic needs. What is more likely is that the needs which might be met through participation are being met in some other way. It can be assumed that should the need arise, these persons would be able to organize on a political basis to achieve their desired ends. However, in the case of low income areas, the suspicion is that they are not able to organize on a political basis. Playing a role in a process of public participation may be an option for someone whose basic needs have been met. For someone whose needs haven't been met, playing such a role will be difficult, but may also be a way for that person to improve his situation.

For these reasons, all the warnings against authoritarian behaviour in participatory processes are especially important when the process affects and involves the poor. In this context, the reasons for Arnstein's bitter cynicism are obvious. It is the poor who benefit most from a program of genuine participation. It is also the poor who are least likely to see such a program. Arnstein's experience is with the U.S. government, but the Canadian experience has not shown us to be any more progressive. (12, 13-23)

Conclusion

In the introduction to this chapter I indicated that the material to be discussed could be used to amplify the tension between the partici-

patory and representative theories. Participatory goals and values aim at developing the community by producing shared values. Representative values are oriented ostensibly toward technical goals and values. In reality, representative values are aimed at preserving power for the status quo.

Because participatory values involve a shift or redistribution of the power in society, resistance will be met from two sources. The government will resist sharing its power. The authoritarian attitudes of many citizens will prevent them from asserting the power which is theirs. Authoritarian societal institutions promote apathy among the populace.

In order to overcome this resistance, the "benefits (of participation) must be perceivable, preferably visible and tangible". (20, 7) to all parties who express interest in an issue. However, in order to be perceived as benefits, these benefits must be geared to meet the needs and affect the interests of all those who might be expected to express interest. "There is a universal need for finding a reward either material or spiritual from engagement in participation, and no imbalance in the distribution of benefits". (20, 7) Both citizens and government must see the personal and group benefits to be achieved through participation, and must value them.

For these reasons, the process must be issue oriented, and directed toward the ahievement of some task. The benefits of moral and social development are intangibles. Most people won't be strongly motivated to achieve these benefits. However, in order for a group of

diverse nature to get together on an issue, some degree of growth must take place. The growth and development which consists of developing shared goals and values is a prior and necessary condition if the process is to succeed in performing the designated task. Once the growth has taken place, the group can address the substantive issue as a group.

The process in which individual goals and values are transformed into group values is time consuming. A great deal of give and take is required for peoples' values and attitudes to change. Once the values and attitudes have changed people must be allowed the latitude to exercise their will. That is, they must be allowed the power to do what they want. It is the time consumed in developing people's goals and values, and the demand for power which this development creates which prompts the resistance of the government.

However, despite the resistance of governments, and despite the apathy of the people, I think it is clear that participation can work. The sections in this chapter dealing with the necessary conditions for participation, and the hierarchial organization of participation are based on empirical circumstances.

The necessary but not sufficient conditions are: 1. Mutual learning or education, 2. Two-way communication, 3. Issue orientation, and 4. Leadership styles and roles. The underlying focus of these conditions is if participation is to achieve its goals, good working relations must be established among the participants in a non threatening, non authoritarian manner.

The section on the mechanisms by which participation can be developed shows that it is possible to structure a flexible and dynamic mechanism which will facilitate participation in a way which will respond to the needs and interests of the participants.

These two sections provide a conceptual overview of a process which in reality tends to be messy and confusing. They do not provide the fuel or juice by which the process can be made to happen.

The positive tone of these two sections must be offset by the reality of the opposition in the general community. This opposition arises from groups and individuals who feel that their personal well being and their power base is threatened by increased participation. This opposition can be seen both in and out of the government. In addition, those who stand to gain most from participation, and who most need participation are in the worst possible position to assert a claim to the benefits of participation. Poverty is a real barrier to participation.

All the sources consulted in preparing this chapter agree that the unwillingness of government to share power is the single most serious barrier to higher participation. However, with the exception of Arnstein, the sources assume that the forum will inevitably be one of co-operation between the government and the citizens. The government stands to benefit from reduced opposition to and increased effectiveness of its programs. It stands to lose in terms of power and expenditures. For the government there is a trade off between these costs and benefits. A government agency will try to minimize time and power loss, and maximize program benefits. An attitude of this sort is exploitive, and detrimental to

the process. Citizens who find this attitude offensive may be forced into a position of confrontation. The threat of confrontation has the effect of keeping the government more honest and more interested in consulting its citizens.

There may be exceptions to this latter point. For example the government may perceive itself as having the moral responsibility to protect the rights of certain subgroups of the population who for some reason are unable to protect their own interests. If a process of participation threatens the rights of that group of people, the government may wish to protect their rights by intervening on their behalf.

CHAPTER FOUR

CASE STUDIES I & II

In this chapter and the next, I want to examine primary and secondary source accouts of citizens participation in order to test the utility of the framework that has been developed.

There are two such cases that I want to examine in this chapter. The first took place in Calgary: Inglewood, and the second in Toronto: Riverdale. Both cases took place in the late 1960's and early 1970's in areas of similar physical and social background. Both were initiated from outside the public sector and from within the community.

Case Study I: Calgary: Inglewood

The information about Calgary: Inglewood comes from Long's book Everyman the Planner. Inglewood is the oldest part of Calgary. From an historical perspective, it is to Calgary what Winnipeg's inner city is to Winnipeg. It is marked by "a variety of light and heavy industry, old retail and commercial enterprises, an almost impossible web of railway trackage, and some of the city's first sandstone schools". (4, 3) Bounded by a river, it is also distinguished by trees, parks, and the Calgary Zoo.

As Calgary grew away from Inglewood, the area's physical setting deteriorated in the 1940's. Land was rezoned and converted for industrial use despite the objections of area residents. This conversion hastened the decay of existing residential and retail development. No new

residential and retail development took place. Physical decline of the area accelerated and Inglewood turned into Calgary's slum.

In the 1960's the area was tagged for urban renewal. Transportation corridors and freeways were planned at the same time as schools were being closed.

The author had been a long time resident of Alberta and had extensive experience in community planning. He formed the New Street Group of urban designers and architects and set up shop in Inglewood. His immediate goal was the redevelopment of Inglewood in a manner favourable to the residents of the area. His long term goal was to get the community to plan for itself through participation.

In the preceding chapter, a set of characteristics was introduced. I want to use these characteristics to examine Long's account. To save space, I will not make extensive comparisons between chapters. Also, because I am discussing community based participation rather than government sponsored participation, a discussion of Bregha's strategy is pointless.

The four characteristics introduced in the section headed "The Dynamic of the Process" were: 1. Education, 2. Two-way communication, 3. Orientation of leadership, and 4. Issue orientation.

1. Education

When we speak of education, we are speaking of a process in which the activities of the community become the subject of learning. (20, 3) In an educational experience of this sort, what individuals and communities

learn about is themselves. This sort of education is oriented stongly toward the process.

From Long's account, it is apparent that he is deeply concerned with process goals. He makes the distinction between a community planning process which is static, and the process of creating a community plan which is dynamic, involves a whole community and is ongoing. The objective is to accommodate the values and desires of the entire community by planning with them instead of planning for them.

The focus of the process was the creation of what Long calls a community definiton. Each community is unique, so each community will have to create its own definition. There is no model for this. A definition will consist of the perceptions that the members of the community have of themselves as a community.

There are two senses in which a perception can be shared. The first is implicit. Community members have a common view of something as individuals, but the view isn't discussed or shared socially. The second is explicit. The implicit view is made explicit and changed through interaction. Participation attempts to create perceptions which are shared in this latter sense. In order for this process to be successful, both the process and the information generated by the process will have to have broad appeal. It is important to address the needs and interests of the people at a level that is perceived as meeting these needs and interests. This means that some attempt will have to be made to assess the needs and interests of the community from the community point of view, even if that view is false.

In Long's case, the view of the community cashes out as citizen participation en masse. The value or accuracy of the community definition will depend upon the degree to which the community has become involved in the process. The viewpoint will change constantly as new participants become involved, and as the community grows and develops. This ongoing process is at once the process of community education, and the result of the process. The definition will reflect the shared goals and values of those involved in the process. The community becomes its own curriculum.

2. Two-way communication

The success of the process of definition is dependent upon good communications. First rate communications and feedback mechanisms are essential to reach all members of the community. Long develops a five step criterion by which to judge the effectiveness of his efforts at communication (4, 46) The process is highlighted by a continuing effort to involve all members of the community. The success of the process will be noticeable by the increasing number of persons who are involved, and by the corresponding changes in the community perception. By Long's admission, his goals were unrealistic, and his methods failed.

3. Leadership

Long insists that the leader or planner should act as a guide or engineer and not attempt to control the process. (4, 14) He claims that the authoritarian leader syndrome denies the basic elements of the community, creates mistrust, and perpetuates inequality. (4, 14) A facilitator allows the creativity of others to emerge. He acts as a catalyst to make the community viewpoint work.

There are two views of leadership that Long mentions which are especially interesting. The first is his claim that there needs to be an affinity between leader and community. (4, 14) He claims that this affinity is indeterminate but indispensable. This probably means that the facilitator must be someone with whom the community can identify and feel comfortable. In all likelihood, this means that the leader must accept, respect, or share the goals and values of the community. This affinity is something that some people will have and others won't.

The importance of this affinity in the relation between professional resource people cannot be overvalued. More and more often, people are experiencing clashes of personality between themselves and government representatives. Clashes of this sort make it difficult for people to gain access to public services and resources. One tactic which has been used with some success is to permit user groups to hire their own people to act as agency service or government workers. The affinity of which Long speaker is easier to come by when the person involved is someone known to and accepted by the community.

A second point of interest concerns his views on confrontation. For groups based in the community without direct access to the government, confrontation may be the only way to attract attention. However, Long emphasizes the need for good relations with the bureaucracy as a means of securing needed support. He argues that while the aims and activities of community groups must threaten civic officials in order to gain their attention, that these must also appeal to these people to gain their support. I think Long is saying that community groups should carry a big stick and walk softly.

However, first you have to have the stick. Politeness and good will

succeed only as long as the government is responsive to the needs of the

people in question. Long had good personal connections with Calgary

city hall. This may have influenced relations between civic officials

and the residents of Inglewood. Frequently, civic officials will stone-

wall citizens groups in the belief that doing nothing will make the

people go away. In situations of this sort, I think that Long would have

to agree that a tougher stand would have to be made. The point is that

confrontation should be used as a tactic not as a style.

4. Issue Orientation

Initially Long's focus was exclusively on community development

through mass participation in planning. He discovered that to achieve

his objectives even partially, he had to exploit issues. Consider his

belief about individual motivation in participation. He thinks that

individuals must have: a. the desire to become aware, b. the time to

become aware, c. a high degree of civic responsibility, and d. the

ability to assimilate information.

I think Long misses the point. Very few people if any will be

motivated in the manner he suggests. Many more people will be motivated

to meet basic needs if these needs are not being met in some other way.

Oddly enough, despite his altruistic view of human motivation, Long

acknowledges the egocentric nature of human interest and awareness. He

proposes a theory to describe human consciousness. (4, 42) He claims

that there are levels of awareness which act as limited factors in the

way individuals and groups relate to issues. These levels are: 1.

individual, 2. group, 3. community, 4. urban, 5, regional, and 6. global. (4, 43) These levels of awareness are always active in a self interested manner.

There are two problems with this theory. Firstly, he conflates sefl awareness in terms of personal or social identity with self awareness in terms of physical or geographic setting. Each of these levels shares this ambiguity. Secondly, he fails to mention that there are different sorts of self interest which may correspond to these levels of awareness. For example, I can be interested in a way which excludes the interest of others, I can be interested in a way which includes the interest of others, but in an egocentric way, I can be interested in a way which includes the interest of others in a non-egocentric way, and I can be interested in a way which subsumes my interests to those of others. These are all examples of self interest.

Despite these problems, there are a number of interesting points in Long's views. Long believes that human awareness develops hierarchically. So does Maslow. More interesting is Long's suggestion that the development of human awareness has a physical as well as a social component to it. It may be that in order to interest people in participation we must not only select issues which affect their basic needs, but that we must select issues which affect those needs in a particular social and geographical context. Following Cole's beliefs about the importance of local issues in participation, and Maslow's beliefs about the importance of basic needs to human motivations, I can speculate that most people will fit into Long's scale of awareness, and my scale of self interest at the most basic levels.

Long's strategy was to initiate a process of community planning. He discovered that people weren't interested in planning unless it was focused on specific issues which were of concern to the community. He also discovered that interest in planning for specific issues didn't tranfer to planning in general. Items such as personal growth, community development, and community planning were not issues of interest to the community. Activity in these areas was essential if the community was to deal successfully with issues that were of interest. Long had to adopt an approach which subordinated the ideals of process orientation and community development to more basic issues.

Although there is more to be said about Long, first I want to consider the second case study.

Case Study II: Toronto: Riverdale

Don Keating's book The Power to Make it Happen was written about events that took place in the Toronto area of Riverdale during the early 1970's. Like Inglewood, Riverdale is described as a working class community. It is distinguished by narrow streets, small houses, poor lighting, a high percentage of renters, low income housing, and a broad mix of ethnic groups. The area is broken by rail lines and the encroachment of industrial land use. Like Inglewood, the area became the target of urban renewal schemes. Residents were angered and embittered about the intrusion of urban renewal into their area. City officials were fearful of the kind of violence that was being experienced in the U.S. Community organizers were used to appease the people. Because of their ties to city hall, the organizers were viewed with suspicion. A group of Riverdale churches got together, obtained funds from city hall, and hired Don Keating.

Keating came to Riverdale from the Chicago ghetto where he had

trained as a community development worker. His methods were basic. He

knocked on doors and asked people is they had any concerns. Once he had

identified neighbourhood issues that he thought he could win, neighbour-

hood groups were formed around these issues.

According to Keating, the object of the exercise was to transfer

power from its traditional preserve in bureaucratic and political arenas

to the people. This could be achieved by building an organization around

issues, and winning these issues in a manner which adhered to democratic

principles. These principles are important because "democracy (is)

fundamental to life; without it, individuals and communities are less

than human. It has to do with rights that are at the same time basic

needs, (especially) the need to have control over our own destiny. This

is particularly important for those who are on the outside of things".

(3, viii)

Clearly, Keating identifies participation with human growth, meeting

basic needs (especially needs relating to self esteem or power), and

democracy. Once again, I want to use the four characteristics developed

in the preceding chapter to discuss Keatings views. These characteristics

are: 1. Education, 2. Two-way communication, 3. Leadership, 4. Issue

orientation.

1. Education

Keating sees participation as having value because it meets basic

needs. Through winning on issues that meet basic needs, people learn

that powerlessness and lack of organization leaves them wide open to

exploitation. By confronting government officials over issues which
meet or threaten basic needs, people learn to see themselves as powerful
and in control. Previously they were subject to manipulation and control
of outside authority. Thus their perception of both themselves and their
government is transformed. They learn how to deal with the intimidation
of government representatives without surrendering power to them in the
process. Organizing and initiating actions is seen "as a quick and
effective way to change the way (the people) relate to their professionals".
(3, 30) Through organizing, they learn how to function at meetings and
committees. These are social skills the value of which should not be
underestimated in a society which is run by committees.

"If people are given the opportunity to make decisions about the
direction their lives take, they increase their dignity and self respect.
If they experience a series of victories, they enhance their self
image, and if they build and use the power inherent in every community,
they develop antidotes for the apathy that prevails in most working
class communities." (3, 81) Again, Keating emphasises the relationship
between self esteem and power.

The position I have been working with assumes that through partici-
pation in matters which meet basic needs, people grow and develop as
human beings. Part of this growth is alleged to be a growth in moral
stature. People treat each other as equals. People become less self
centered and more oriented to the needs of their fellows.

All of this has a lofty ring to it. It is difficult to translate
these ideals into common sense language which would spell out their

practical implications. Adding to this difficulty is the as yet
unresolved claim made by Schumpeter that the narrow self interest of most
individuals will prevent this growth and development from taking place.
Long had to sacrifice his ideals to the reality of the community. The
practice of participation is very different from the ideals.

Keating has a very practical approach to organizing. He focuses on
the twin goals of winning and building. (3, 63) This distinction appears
to correspond to the earlier distinction between task orientation and
process orientation. Winning is task oriented. Building is process
oriented. Although Keating maintains that both are essential and in some
ways conflicting, he appears to conflate building with winning.

The whole point of Keating's efforts is to gather people into an
organization which can exploit the power that people have in them by
nature. The way to gather people is through winning actions around
issues which meet basic needs. Action for its own sake won't attract
much interest, but winning actions which meet basic needs will. At the
outset, Keating isn't going to be concerned if he doesn't have a lot of
support, as long as he has an issue he can win, and the support to win
it. Through winning actions, people identify not only with the benefits
the action reaps, but with the process which wins these benefits.

Keating builds by winning. Exercising community power through
community action by community participation is Keating's objective.
Organization builds power by effecting changes in both the internal
situation and the external situation (3, 99) Action achieves changes
in the external situation by winning. It achieves changes in the

internal situation by changing the way people perceive and relate to themselves and their community.

In building power through winning action, Keating does not become preoccupied with the inner situation. He assumes apparently, that whatever inner problems people are having as a result of his efforts to build winning organizations will take care of themselves. He assumes I suppose, that since winning action meets basic needs, as long as people see winning action, and as long as their needs are met by these actions they will keep coming out.

Keating's preoccupation with action may cause needless problems. The process of growth consists of the development of a critical self awareness. Having people learn about themselves and their environment can be a painful process. There are many things we don't want to know about ourselves and about others. (3, 110) "People (will) build to help themselves, and to change the conditions they live in." (3, 111) However, first they have to change themselves. As Keating points out, there is an inner reality to deal with, which he equates with a sense of power. This sense of power is not developed by a simple change of self interest. It must be accompanied by a change in basic consciousness. This change will be reflected in a new attitude toward both the self and others.

This change must be brought about through the process of building the community organization. The process must include more than just an aggregation of people who have a common interest. Participation provides a forum for interaction with others. Through this interaction a group bond and identity are developed. Shared goals and values result.

Keating pays no attention to this aspect of the organization. He calls it maintenance. In his preoccupation with power and winning, he seems to forget that the process itself is supposed to meet basic needs, not just the results of winning actions.

As a result of what Keating terms low organization maintenance, the internal relationship of the organization was marked with wrangling and defections. From a practical point of view it is impossible to create mass organizations which reflect everyone's values and interests, even at a neighbourhood level. People living on the same street can be so far apart on basic values as to make it impossible for them to work together. However, unless some attempt is made to be accommodating, then whatever action takes place in that neighbourhood will not be representative of the neighbourhood.

My question then is, is a political system which excludes without apology the values and interests of a portion of the population any better than the system it purports to replace? On the other hand, if the basic needs of a significant portion of the people are being met through neighbourhood action, should the system which achieves these benefits be criticized if it excludes some people?

Ideally, we want to have a political framework which can meet and serve everyone's interests regardless of differences in basic values. In practice, this never seems to be the case. The distinction between personal values and group values gets blurred, and as long as people allow personal values to override group values, and as long as people differ as to what are group values, these problems will continue.

At any rate, Keating's action orientation leaves him largely unconcerned about problems of this sort. Ironically, this indifference provides him with a means to overcoming one of the barriers to participation. Narrow self interest has been cited as a major barrier to mass participation. Keating organizes a mass organization around neighbourhood groups which respond to local issues and needs. People learn that sticking up for other people's needs can be a good way of sticking up for themselves.

So, while Keating's obsession with power and with winning creates internal problems, these problems do not prevent people from learning and growing through participation.

2. Two-way communication

Keating's organizing style is direct. He makes personal contact door to door to identify issues. He repeats this contact to organize meetings via leaflets. He encourages face to face confrontations when dealing with professionals and bureaucrats. Person to person contact is maximized.

3. Leadership

Keating claims that his system is democratic and participatory. According to our earlier discussions, the leadership in this type of organization is different from traditional forms of leadership which are authoritarian. According to Cole, the leader is to serve the interests of the people not to determine these interests. The leader must not dominate.

In Keating's account the question of leadership styles is dealt with in the conflict between task orientation and process orientation. Should the leader concern himself with process or with action? Using this distinction it appears as if Keating ignores the style of leadership which is compatible with his principles.

The advantage of process orientation is that it builds trust and confidence between the leader and the people. The leader is in one sense a non-leader to the extent that at least part of their attention is directed internally at the individuals within the group. This does not seem to be Keating's style. His relationship with the people was marked by alienation suspicion and mistrust. (3, 53-54) Keating keeps a low profile in public, but it is obvious that he wheels and deals behind the scenes. (3, 68) He describes his struggles with the executive as power struggles. His relationship with the executive is negative because he has structured the organization for action and little attention is paid to personal maintenance.

However, if maintenance and process are so important, how is it that Keating's methods succeed in the apparent absence of such considerations. To maintain my hypothesis, I have to assume that the bonding and the development of group identity occur even if Keating is unaware of it. This would explain both the success of his organizing, and his constantly deteriorating relationship with the people.

Keating identifies the struggle with the group as a power struggle. He justifies this negative relationship as unavoidable because an "Outsider brings an obsession with building an organization (but that)

he (the outsider) is different. He doesn't wholly identify with the problems of the community except to the extent that he can exploit them to build an organization". (3, 112) In other words, he doesn't really concern himself about people of their growth and development even if these are necessary to the success of his efforts.

Because Keating's values differ from those of the community, inevitably as growth takes place, and as the community develops, his presence will become superfluous and even threatening. He defines his role solely in terms of power. Once the community has a sense of its own power, it will no longer need him. Keating believes that a community development worker must be obsessed with building an organization, while the community must be obsessed with values. It might be that a community development worker should be obsessed with building people, or rather with helping people to build themselves.

Although I have identified a source of difficulty in Keating's methods, the problem does not prevent Keating from achieving his goals. So, I still haven't resolved the question as to whether process or task orientation is preferable. I think the answer to this question will depend on the needs of the community. Each community will be different in its need. Some growth will always be necessary. In Freire's case, the basic needs of the community are met through a growth oriented pedagogical process. In Keating's case, needs are met through mass political actions. Each worker will have his own style. His ability to assist the community will determine the success of that style.

The friction that existed between Keating and the community was a mark of his personal style. This style is not essential to community development work. Keating is aware of the problems his personality poses. He points to the difference between good organizing and good personal relations. (3, 145) He also cautions that a leader must not dominate. Building means letting people get involved. (3, 149)

4. Issue orientation

I think the foregoing is sufficient to indicate that Keating believes that issues that meet basic needs are indispensable to successful participation.

Again, there is more to be said about Keating's account, but I will deal with it in the conclusion.

Conclusion

I believe that both Keating and Long confirm and add to the usefulness of the perspective developed in the preceeding chapter. I conclude this chapter by considering the following:

1. Education

Both identify the participatory process as educational. Long identifies this education as community education. As a vehicle for mass participation it fails. While growth and development are essential to the well being of the community, they are not themselves issues which concern the community.

Keating's focus is more narrow and precise. What people learn in a participatory process is that they are powerful. They learn this by

winning actions. Theylearn how to exercise this power, and how others exercise this power by attending meetings and by being involved in winning actions. Part of Keating's strategy is that people acquire the skill or knowledge of how to exercise their innate power through participation.

2. Two-way communication

Long contends that good communication is essential to participation as the medium through which the community is transformed. He used the mass media as the vehicle through which to advertise his process of community definition. The process failed because people weren't interested in planning and development in the abstract, and probably didn't read his newsletter.

Keating believed in door to door, face to face communications as an organizing tactic. Written communications were a follow up.

The contrast in the two approaches poses the question as to whether direct or indirect communication is the best method.

3. Issue Orientation

Long learned the hard way that issues were essential to participation. Growth and development can be facilitated through participation in issues. He suggests that people's self awareness is apparently related both to social groupings and to geographical areas. Following this lead we can speculate that in order to generate interest in participation we need an issue which directly affects people's social or geographical self consciousness. Obviously, issues which affect people at the lowest common level will attract the most interest.

Keating's approach was direct and issue oriented. He assumed that the only way to organize properly was around issues which affected basic needs. He identified issues by asking people if anything was bothering them.

4. Leadership styles

Long's contribution to leadership styles is especially interesting. He emphasizes the need for an affinity between leader and people. This affinity can be cultivated by permitting community groups to choose their own professional resource people. The other side of this coin is that personality clashes between leadership and people will prevent proper development of the process.

Keating apparently had this affinity at the beginning. It seemed to consist of shared values between leader and people. However, as Keating's value differences became apparent, a rift was created between him and the people.

Long and Keating also add to our understanding of the barriers to participation in the following way:

1. The most serious opposition Long encountered was from within the community itself. Division of interest, and entrenched narrow self interest with the community proved to be the most difficult obstacle to surmount. This reminds me of Schumpeter's claims that narrow self interest would make participation impossible. Notice however, that Keating exploits narrow self interest as a tool to further participation. By organizing in small areas around issues which affect the areas locally, he succeeds in building a large organization which will stick up for smaller local interests.

2. Government funds for community based participation will almost always be in short supply and have strings attached. Money is a constant problem.

3. Long observes that a community control program can have the same problem of alienation from the community that government bureaucracy has. This may mean that citizen control is not always desirable.

All this leaves unanswered three related questions.

1. How should the community relate to authorities?

Long emphasizes the need for good relations in order to further the aims of the community. Keating ignores good relations in favour of confrontation. He argues that the real problem the community has is not that they are not powerful, but that they don't perceive themselves as powerful. Good relations will not change the imbalance of power. As Keating shows repeatedly, authorities are patronizing and condescending when they are treated politely. He maintains that democracy works through pressure, and that pressure can be treated either by money or by organization. (3, 96) Keating's problem is perhaps that he is obsessed with power and with winning. At this point at least we have to concede that if confrontation is not acceptable as a style of participation, it has great promise as a tactic.

2. Which style of organization is better?

Style of organizing is only important insofar as it enables people to meet their needs. The criterion of good organizing is not independent from the process. Keating's style and personality may have been abrasive, but he got results. He didn't allow opposition or hostility to defeat

his purpose. On the other hand, Long's aims were frustrated by opposition.

I think the difference lies in their expectations of the people and the process. In an earlier chapter we noted that where participatory theory maintains that growth and development can be fostered through participation, representative theory maintains that narrow self interest will defeat the aims of participation. This apparent contradiction is still unresolved. Worse, it appears as if both theories have some validity. Human nature is schizoid in that it manifests both these seemingly contradictory characteristics.

I think Keating grasps the horns of this apparent dilemma and squirms between them. He recognizes both that people are self interested and jealously concerned with protecting their interests, but also that people can grow and develop through participation. There is a social as well as a personal dimension to power. Social commitments can enhance personal interests. Although I'm certain that Long recongizes this dichotomy at some level, he does not address it head on. None the less, the style of organizing which is best, is that which best meets the needs of the community.

3. What about needs and power?

Maslow calls this his third level of need "self esteem". Self esteem involves a self perception. This perception is drawn partly from the individuals view of himself, and partly from the individual's belief about how he is perceived by others. This need seems to be associated with success. If this is correct then it is apparent that our culture

is preoccupied with meeting this need. Success and power are two sides
of the same coin. A successful person is a powerful person in his own
eyes and in the eyes of the people who set the standard of success.
Perhaps a better label for this need would be "dominance" or "superiority"
or "competence".

Keating clearly associates the meeting of this need with power. It
is also clear that his aim is to meet this need through participation.
Long is probably trying to meet this need although it may not be clear
to him that this is what he is doing. He is certainly concerned with
trying to change people's perception of themselves.

To sum up, the characteristics identified previously provide a useful
framework with which to examine case studies of citizen's participation.
It is becoming apparent that the conflict between representative theory
and participatory theory is based upon a conflict which exists in human
nature. This conflict defeated Long's aims. His aims were mass
community participation in planning. Given the basic conflict, his
expectations were probably unrealistic. Keating attempts to use this
conflict to his advantage. Ultimately the criterion of success resides
in the community. Have the communities' needs been met? Has growth and
development taken place?

CHAPTER FIVE

CASE STUDY III

Public Participation in School Reorganization in Winnipeg

The examples of participation discussed previously were initiated from within the community. As an example of government sponsored participation I want to examine public participation in the reorganization of Winnipeg schools. This will provide both a local flavour, and some primary source material with which to test our perspective on participation.

What is Declining Enrollment?

In the last two or three years, many of Winnipeg's dozen or so school divisions have had to consider whether or not to close schools within their jurisdiction. This situation is brought about by declining enrollment. Declining enrollment is a complex phenomenon which can be traced to three sources. These are: 1. Lower fertility rates, 2. Out migration of school age children from one division to another, 3. Demand for French immersion.

French immersion is a federally funded language program which is intended to reduce friction between Canada's dominant language groups. It is popular with parents in higher income areas. The demand for French services reduces English enrollments and creates pressure to convert unused space in English language schools for French programs.

When a division is having trouble with its enrollments, a review process is initiated. The process is usually called "reorganization"

because the term "closure" is inflammatory, and since it may not be the case that a school is shut down. There are three things that happen to schools that can be described as closure. These are: 1. the program at the school can be changed, e.g. from French to English, 2. the grade level can be changed, 3. the school can be locked up.

Why are Schools Closed?

There are several issues which are directly related to a decision to close or not to close a school:

1. Finances

Here the argument is based on the rational and efficient allocation of funds to and within school divisions. Schools are financed in three ways. These are: a. The provincial education levy based upon the municipal mill rate, b. General provincial revenues, c. The special levy based upon the municipal mill rate and assessed independently by each school division.

The funds are allocated on a per pupil basis according to several provincial formulae which include fixed pupil teacher ratios. A decline in the absolute number of pupils means a decline in the amount of money the division will receive from the province. The problem is that a class of fifteen requires virtually the same amount of resources as a class of thirty, but will receive only about half the funding. There is a built in fixed cost associated with running a school which is relatively inelastic with respect to the student population. The argument is that in principle by closing a school, this fixed cost should be recoverable. In practice, this saving has never been shown to occur,

but the belief that it does occur is widely accepted among school
administrators and trustees.

2. Program quality

Arguments based on program quality are usually cited as being the
most important reason for closing a school. In general, because of the
funding formula, more students in a school means that a more varied pro-
gram can be offered. For example, most specialist teachers (physed,
library, music, French, etc.) are paid out of special levy. As the
enrollment in a school declines, these positions become more expensive on
a per pupil basis and are harder to justify to economy minded administra-
tors and trustees.

Both of these positions are based on the cost effective allocation
of resources. There are a number of subsidiary arguments which bear
directly on these issues:

a. Small schools versus large schools

Program quality is said to be better in large schools. Large schools
justify expenditures on a per pupil basis for special programs and teachers.
There is a conflict among educators as to whether or not the primary role
of public schools is to provide education in the sense of three R's, or
to provide education in the sense of learning social roles and values.
Most people favour the latter view. Because larger schools enhance
opportunities for social interaction in terms of program variety, people
who accept that the learning of social roles and values is the primary
task of education will be more inclined to accept the closure of small
schools. However, a growing number of people, and especially parents who

are faced with the loss of a neighbourhood school, believe that although program is different in small schools, quality is just as good and in some ways better. Both sides have a literature to support their claims. No objective data exists which favours either view.

b. Neighbourhood schools enhance property values

Lots of people believe this, but there is no documented verification of this view. The claim is that a neighbourhood which lacks a school will not be as attractive to people with young children. This will reduce demand for housing in the area, and lower prices. It may be true that a house in an area which has no school may be more difficult to sell because the buyers market is restricted. However demand for housing could still be strong. If so, the price should not be affected. Conversely, if the market is weak, prices will be depressed regardless of whether or not there is a school in the area. A school is not the only factor which affects the housing market. While schools may be a selling point to some people, it is likely that there are other factors which affect the price of housing more drastically than the presence of a school. However, the perception that schools support property values is prevalent and power-ful.

c. Schools mirror society's values

Schools mirror and create the values of the community in which they are located. This view is widely accepted. It is a corollary of the view expressed earlier about the role of socialization in education. These viewpoints support the point made in chapter two that social institutions teach citizens how to behave in social situations. People who value the role of their neighbourhood school will resist strongly any attempt to close that school.

The need to close schools is based on a set of beliefs which predicate cost savings in dollars, and improved program quality. These views are shared by administrators, politicians, and citizens, but they may be false. People resist closure because of anxiety about the well being of their children, the value of their property, the well being of their neighbourhood, etc. These fears may also be false. Because of the unclarity which surrounds these issues, any acceptable solution to school closure will have to be purely political.

The problems surrounding declining enrollment have been evident for years. Most of the provinces have studied the issue. There is a substantial literature dealing with the technical issues. The role of the public in school closure is examined as an afterthought in most cases. In Winnipeg, declining enrollment has been noticeable for the last ten years, and has been a problem for the last three or four.

There are about a dozen school divisions in the City of Winnipeg. I discussed the issue of public participation in school reorganization with six of these divisions. The basis of selection was non-scientific. In all cases, I was referred by people who were knowledgeable about the problem and the methods that were being used to deal with it. The divisions with which I spoke are as follows:

1. Winnipeg #1

WSD #1 is the largest division in the city. It covers the area that was formerly the City of Winnipeg (metropolitan). Enrollments are relatively stable except in the portion of the division known as the inner city where enrollments fluctuate due to a number of causes. Two or three

small schools have been closed with little fuss. More recently, the
division has initiated a process called the South Winnipeg Review to
examine enrollments in the relatively prosperous southern portion of
the division. The administration of the division has been loathe to
discuss the process.

2. St. James #2

SJSD #2 is also a very large division and has experienced a large
decline in enrollment. For this reason they have closed six schools.
Two of these closures were done without consultation. The response in
the community to one of these closures was so acrimonious that the board
decided to implement a policy of public consultation. The first two
closures under this policy also provoked a great deal of resentment. A
subsequent modification of the process resulted in a process which closed
two schools without causing an uproar in the community.

3. Assiniboine-South #3

ASSD #3 (Charleswood-Tuxedo) covers some of the wealthiest areas of
Winnipeg. Because some residential construction is still going on,
ASD #3 has a relatively large and stable population. However, the older
areas of the division have experienced a decline in enrollment. One
school had had its grade level changed. Opposition to this move was
bitter and long lasting. Because of the problems with this process, the
procedure for consultation has been modified in a manner which it is hoped
will prevent further hostilities.

4. St. Boniface #4

SBSD #4 has experienced a severe decline in enrollments. Like St.
James, no new residential construction is taking place in the division,

so the decline is widespread. In a controversial and well publicised move the board closed several schools and adjusted enrollments at several others. So bitter and controversial was this process, that bad feelings still exist. Ethnic tension stemming from the closures may have led to the burning of the headquarters of the Societe Franco Manitobain.

5. Fort Garry #5

FGSD #5 has conducted a task force to reorganize enrollments in the northern part of the division where a large decline in enrollments has occurred. The southern portion of the division is still growing due to residential construction. Fort Garry maintains a number of smaller than usual schools and has converted others to French Immersion without incident.

6. St. Vital #6

The decline in enrollments in SVDS #6 has been mitigated by residential construction in the southern portion of the division. The northern portion has experienced a decline. Enrollments have been adjusted during a lengthy consultation process. The process was relatively polite and peaceful. A number of parents object to parts of the reorganization and are planning to contest board elections in the fall of 1983.

The Process

In all cases, the initiative to include the public is taken by the board. In some cases, this initiative was taken because of bad experiences with angered residents which had occurred previously. In other cases, the divisions were exercising foresight and prudence. All boards were

forthright in admitting that their motives were political. Their major objective was to avoid hostile confrontation with the public, while at the same time making reorganization more acceptable to the public. Little or no consideration was given to community development. Clearly, the boards were not committed to the principles of participation.

On the other hand, the parents entered the process on the defensive. They perceived the possible closure of their neighbourhood school as a threat to their children and to their neighbourhood. The potential for a hostile clash of values is obvious. It should be remembered that the basis in fact for the benefits about closure that are held by both groups is tenuous and for that reason unimportant.

Once again, to help understand the process I will use the categories introduced in the third chapter. These categories are: 1. Education, 2. Two-way communication, 3. Leadership, 4. Issue orientation. The last category can be dispensed with since this is a single issue event. I will forego using Bregha's hierarchy since doing so will add nothing extra to the discussion. I should mention that the staging process advocated by Bregha resembles closely certain aspects of the processes which were used by the school divisions. Frequently, when trouble ensued, an obvious deviation from Bregha's recommended procedure had occurred. To me this indicates two things. Firstly, Bregha has hit upon a description of government community interaction which is applicable on a practical basis to the real thing. Secondly, when his staging procedure isn't followed trouble ensues.

I should also mention that the major difference between genuine participation and pseudo-participation is not whether or not the citizens are granted control. Genuine participation takes place when the government is concerned about meeting the needs of the citizens, when it meets the needs of the people, and when the people are satisfied that their needs have been met. Genuine participation is an attitude and a relationship rather than an institutional arrangement.

1. Education

The developmental objectives of participation are to promote shared goals and values. The process which achieves these objectives also creates a group identity. On the negative side, this process helps to overcome the natural suspicion and narrow mindedness with which most people approach participation which involves government. The process to reorganize schools made use of several tactics designed to overcome suspicion.

For example, one prevalent problem in participation is bureaucratic unwillingness to permit outside consultation. Permitting such consultation is a means to overcoming suspicion. FGSD #5 and ASSD #3 used outside consultation as a catalyst for the process. The situation arose through a challenge by the parents to a piece of data which had been submitted by the administration. The parents demanded and received permission to seek outside consultation. The consultant reports confirmed the original data. This procedure helped to create an atmosphere of trust and confidence. Similar results were obtained in SJSD #2 and in SVSD #6 by other means. In general an accommodating, patient, and supportive attitude on the part of the administration helped to create a feeling of group identity.

Another change which had to take place was to move the parents from suspiciously defending their own territory against the other parents, to defending a territory common to the entire group. When this shift occurs, each person sees the entire affected area as "his". This outlook is shared with all those involved.

This change was brought about in two cases. One of these was in FGSD #5, and the other in SJSD #2. The key seems to be to create a situation in which each individual can transfer his loyalty from the smaller territory that he defends from the start to the larger territory, without feeling as if he is giving up something that nobody else is giving up. In other words, if anyone is perceived as losing in this matter, everyone must be perceived as losing. This shift appears to occur more easily when there is a definite territory which each involved person defends initially, and when there is a focal point which is common to all of the smaller territories, but which does not in the eyes of the participants favour any of them. In the two cases under discussion, the high school provided this focus. By addressing the problem from the perspective of the high school, the people were able to avoid territorial conflicts over junior high and elementary schools. Obviously any procedure which cannot provide a focus of this sort will not be able to overcome the territorial instincts of the participants.

One aspect of the process which is supposed to take place is the mutual learning between participants and bureaucrats. Where successful processes took place everyone agreed on a wide variety of data and issues. Everyone agreed that a deep respect had been developed by the parents for the job done by the administration. However, none of the adminis-

trators was willing to say that he had developed the same respect for the roles of the parents. The parents were aware of this and responded with cynicism. They felt manipulated. I think that this lack of mutual respect reveals a flaw in the process, but I will explore this conjecture later.

So, there are two components to the educational part of the process. The first is the overcoming of the negative, narrow attitudes that many people bring with them to the process. The second is to promote the growth and development of the group. In those processes which failed, the initial suspicions were never dealt with. In general, the processes were aimed at overcoming the hostility without promoting any substantial growth.

2. Two-way communication

. A free flow of information was considered to be essential to the process. Firstly, it was important to overcome suspicion and territorial instincts. Withholding information or creating the suspicion that information is being withheld will prevent both the overcoming of suspicion and the promotion of growth. Some administrators adopted an open door policy which included disclosure of all relevant information. This promoted an atmosphere of trust and friendliness, as well as creating a widespread common view as to what were the facts. Where the process turned out badly, there is widespread suspicion that information was being withheld.

Secondly, two-way communication was important as a means of involving the larger community. For the process to be a success, it was not

sufficient for only those who have participated directly to have shared in the process. The success of the program depends upon the acceptance of the results by the larger community.

ASSD #3 built its committees up from the school to the ward to the district level. After each meeting of the district committee, the ward reps returned to the ward committees and the school reps then returned to their schools. In this manner all relevant information was disseminated to all members of the interested public by someone they knew. A community awareness of the process was created. SJSD #2 and FGSD #5 achieved the same results by slightly different methods. SVSD #6's program was run slightly differently than the others. They traded upon an open door policy and a good public image to create as broad an impression as possible.

In discussing the role of communications both Bregha and Long stress the importance of the mass media. However, the experience with school reorganization indicates that face to face communications is a superior means of disseminating information, and particularly when the speaker is known to the listener. People can get interested and will listen to issues they might otherwise not be interested in when the speaker is known to them.

This suggests several things. For example, mass media are probably not the best way of reaching the larger public. This may place a size limitation on the area that can be accommodated in a program of public participation. In order to exploit efficiently the method adopted by ASSD #3 some limitation would have to be imposed on the number of layers in the pyramid. Involving a large number of schools without some

effective means of disseminating information as happened in WSD #1 and

SBSD #4 is a sure way to create trouble.

3. Leadership: The Orientation of the Bureaucracy

Even in participatory processes which do not involve bureaucrats

directly, a hostile or uncooperative bureaucracy can create problems

since ultimately, the resolution of issues identified by the citizens

must be dealt with by government agencies. In a process sponsored by the

government, the role of the bureaucracy takes on added importance.

In a school division, the legal power and responsibility for division

affairs resides with the trustees. However, because the board members are

usually employed elsewhere, and because they usually lack the administra-

tive skills, much of the real power is the property of the superintendent's

office. The super controls program, budget, and the allocation of human

resources. Their expert opinion on educational matters carries great

weight with the board.

The relationships in the process to reorganize schools were com-

plicated by the variety of interest groups involved in the process. These

are trustees, superintendents, teachers, principals, parents and non-parents.

These groups may be heterogeneous. The values of the first four groups

are oriented towards the rational allocation of resources. The concerns

of the parents are supposed to be opposed to these.

Given this basic difference, some fairly dramatic shifts in values

can be expected to occur. Our categories suggest that the administration

should take the initiative to bridge the gap in values. However, an

interesting problem occurred in school reorganization. All involved

parties complained that a large number of people who turn out at meetings to deal with this problem are professionals, and particularly educational professionals. In addition, there is a tendency among persons who attend these meetings to select as members of review committees persons who have professional and educational backgrounds.

These concerns have a strong emotional component. However, the parents beliefs and values also have certain aspects in common with those of the board and administration. These shared beliefs may include the belief that program quality is better in large schools, that financing is more efficient in large schools, etc. They may also include beliefs about the best way to solve problems i.e. by using rational models, rational methods, etc. However, because these shared beliefs do not include or allow for consideration of the more emotional parental concerns for children and neighbourhood there is a danger that these concerns will be left out during the process. I think that it is natural for people to try and avoid points of conflict, and to establish relationships on the basis of what they share or have in common. I think that it is also natural for people who place great faith in rational methods to place a reduced emphasis on matters which have a significant emotional basis. However, if the process is to be genuinely participatory, if it is to create a genuine consensus of beliefs and values among all participants, including the leadership, special efforts must be made to deal with all relevant beliefs and values. In failing to do this, both the parents and the administration jeopardise the successful outcome of the process.

The important thing was that the administration had to avoid being perceived as hostile to the wishes of the involved community. This was

extremely difficult, but in most cases was done successfully. The
exceptions took place in ASSD #3, SBSD #4, and twice in SJSD #2. In
these cases, either the process was structured in such a way as to
threaten the parents, or it was clear to the parents that the adminis-
tration was proceeding with its own plans for reorganization.

At any rate, the administration usually tried to be non-threatening.
This was achieved in a number of ways, some of which have already been
discussed. One senior official believed that his own views and values
should not be allowed to intrude upon the process. He did not consider
himself to be a leader. A good relationship between the administration
and the community was helpful. Non-voting observer status on the review
committees helped to maintain a non-threatening posture. Once the
relationship was set on a positive basis, the only problem the adminis-
tration had to deal with was the constant tendency of the citizens to
defer to the expertise and authority of the administration.

4. Issue orientation

   A single issue situation such as this does not require discussion.

5. Barriers

   Briefly, some of the major barriers were:

a. lack of written policy establishing structure, procedure, and mandate
of the review committee

b. lack of political commitment at the board level or in the adminis-
tration to the review process.

c. a process structured in such a way that it appears to the parents
that they are being forced to make a decision acceptable to the board

d. indications that the board and/or the administration is proceeding

with its own plan to reorganize schools without consulting the public

e. a process which forces one group of parents to confront another group

of parents

f. failure of board to accept or consider parents views

g. single issue participation has narrow appeal within the larger

community

h. tendency for people to defer to authority figures

i. unreasonable resistance on the part of individuals to develop shared

goals and values.

In addition to the five areas discussed above, there are a number

of factors external to the process which affect the outcome. These are:

1. the financial situation of the division, 2. the size of the division,

3. the nature of the community, 4. the status of the various professional

groups.

1 & 2. The financial status and the size of the division

The financial status is determined partly by its tax base, and

partly by its size. Support for small schools comes from the special

levy assessed by each division, since provincial support for these

schools will be reduced. The board and the super's office have an

intuition as to how much the special levy can be raised without provoking

hostility on the part of taxpayers. This resistance can be provoked in

two ways. Firstly, a certain absolute increase in the special levy will

bring about resistance. Secondly, an increase which falls within the

absolute level may provoke objections from taxpayers who do not live in

the area adjacent to the school which is being supported by the additional

levy. So a relatively small school division will have an easier time selling small schools to its residents than will a larger division. A school division with a strong tax base will have an easier time supporting small schools.

FGSD #5 is relatively small and has a strong tax base. It is better off relatively than the others. ASSD #3 and SVSD #6 compare favourably with Fort Garry in terms of size but have a much weaker tax base. SJSD #2 has a very strong tax base, but is also very large. WSD #1 is huge and has a huge tax base. SBSD #4 is comparable in size to Fort Garry, but has a weak tax base. These viewpoints are largely intuitive. They are based on the responses of trustees in the six divisions. Naturally, the other factor which affects these judgements is the decline in enrollments.

FGSD #5 believes that they can afford to support small schools, hire better personnel, and sell these slightly higher than average expenditures to their taxpayers because of the size and spirit of the division. SJSD #2 can probably afford to do some of these things, but because of the radical decline in enrollments, and because trustees don't believe that they can sell the higher tax increases to taxpayers who live in areas remote from small schools, small schools are closed. ASSD #3 is not concerned about size, but they are concerned about taxes. They believe that they have run out of room to manouever. St. Vital is not concerned. SBSD #4 is really feeling the pinch. They have a decline in enrollments and a weak tax base.

The divisions with stable enrollments, small to medium size, and an adequate tax base also happen to be those divisions which have relatively

good relations with their parents. It appears as if the wealthier

divisions have a better track record in terms of participation, although,

a poorly structured process will create problems anywhere.

3. The nature of the community

In the wealthier and newer areas of the city, ethnic and cultural

factors appear to be less important than economic factors in community

life. So, if wealth is an indicator in most of the processes I have

considered, the community is relatively homogeneous. Education levels

are also significant in these communities since they have a high

concentration of professional people.

In the older areas of Winnipeg, there are a higher percentage of

ethnic groupings. The only situation in which this difference became

apparent was in St. Boniface. Some persons argue that long standing

ethnic tensions in SBSD #4 prevented the development of an orderly

process. Others argue that a well run process could have smoothed over

these tensions rather than exacerbating them. Whatever the truth in

this matter, the situation in SBSD #4 has polarised along ethnic lines.

4. The status of the professional groups

Another factor which affects the outcome of the process is the

relationship between the divisions and their professional staff. Teachers

and principals stand to lose a great deal in these processes. If schools

are closed jobs may be lost. If small schools are supported, teachers

may be asked to teach split grades, double classes, extra subjects, or

to perform other extra duties. Despite this potential conflict, everyone

agreed that the co-operation of teachers and principals was essential to

the success of the process. In order to stabilize the role that these groups play it is important that their special interests by resolved outside the process. If members of these groups felt that their interests were threatened by the process, they might attempt to protect themselves during the process.

Relations in FGSD #5, SVSD #6, and ASSD #3 are excellent. They are strained in SJSD #2. In SBSD #4 there are obvious factions within the professional groups. In WSD #1, the situation is neither here nor there.

Again, the bottom line appears to be money. Divisions whose financial situation is secure have a history of trouble free collective bargaining to fall back on. Their relations with their staff are excellent. Divisions who have felt the pinch have had bargaining problems. Their relations with their staff are less than good.

Conclusion

The importance generated from public participation in school reorganization adds to the perspective on public participation in the following ways:

1. Education

The importance of developing a common viewpoint is stressed. Failure to do this creates hostility. However, mutual learning did not take place. Trustees didn't think that they had learned very much. Parents learned to appreciate the difficulties faced by members of the board and the super's office. This confirms the tendency of the government to exploit the process.

However, it is exploitation of a funny sort. The boards were open
in their refusal to surrender power. This was understood from the outset
and did not in itself pose a problem. However, it is essential that all
values and beliefs relevant to the issue be shared, including those which
create conflict. It is through working out the conflicts that the process
transforms the participants. In the cases under consideration, the
parents shared certain beliefs with the administration, or they allowed
themselves to be convinced that certain of the beliefs held collectively
by the group were more important than others. Because of this, some of
the beliefs and values held by the parents were ignored, dismissed, or
were not dealt with adequately during the process. Because these beliefs
were not dealt with, the feelings of commitment, of bonding, and of
mutual learning were not developed to the maximum. This failure seems
to be one of ignorance rather than of negligence or malice. To the
extent that information, beliefs, and values were shared, bonding and
group identification took place.

The role of territorial considerations introduced by Long was a
prominent factor in successful processes. However, the role played was
to allay fear and suspicion rather than to promote growth and development.

2. Two-way communication

The importance of face to face communications was stressed as the
best way to create a community wide viewpoint on the issue. However, if
face to face communications makes things better when the process is open
and friendly, it makes things worse when relations are bad. The attitudes
of the communicants are important.

Again, the territorial factor played a role. If effective face to face communications are to take place, the size of the involved area must be reduced, or the time allowed for the process has to be extended. Communication via mass media was found to be less effective than direct communication.

3. Leadership

Non-hostile, non-confrontational leadership was essential. Even the most trustworthy and democratic of administrators were viewed with suspicion and hostility by parents. When steps were not taken to overcome this hostility, trouble ensued. Again, the role played by the administration was not so much to promote growth and development as it was to avoid procedural hang ups and outbreaks of hostility. This role is consistent with the objectives of the various boards which were largely to avoid confrontation rather than to promote participatory democracy.

4. Issue Orientation

Single issue participation attracts only those persons who perceive themselves as being directly affected by school reorganization. Because schools have a relatively narrow role in community life, the people who turned out represented a fairly narrow spectrum of society.

5. Barriers

All of the fears expressed by Bregha and others about the problems which can occur in government/community relations were justified in some measure. However, a carefully crafted approach designed to avoid these problems can be successful. The onus is definitely on the board.

At this point, there are a couple of things that I need to work out. My initial position was that human beings possessed an innate potential for growth and development. This growth and development is recognizable on the one hand as a growth of critical consciousness, and on the other hand as personal, social, and technical skills by which groups and individuals can meet their own and others basic needs. Opposed to this potential for growth and development is an entrenched narrowness of self interest which resists and destroys growth and development.

The focal point of this resistance is power. Power is held by most of my sources to be of central importance for participation, especially when the poor are involved. Power makes people feel good about themselves. Power is the ability to meet basic needs. Social or political power derives ultimately from groups who exploit their individual abilities collectively to appropriate economic goods and services for the benefit of those who are plugged into the group. So although power and self esteem needs are third in Maslow's hierarchy, the satisfaction of this need is intimately related to the ability to meet all needs.

One group of people will object to power being granted to another group of people when they perceive that transfer of power to be a threat to their power, and especially if that transfer of power affects them in a way which will reduce their ability to meet more basic needs. In our society, meeting needs and especially meeting needs for power and self esteem is competitive.

There are two aspects to meeting a need if the foregoing is valid. Firstly, a person/group who lack the requisite skills or connections to

meet needs will have to develop these skills. Secondly, a person/group who already has the skills will have to exercise them. Meeting needs is an ongoing proposition. Meeting needs reinforces peoples' sense of power and self esteem.

Having said this the peculiarities of the process to reorganize schools are less troublesome. Most of the process that took place occurred in middle class areas. People's needs are generally well met. They have the skills to meet these needs. Participation is a means of meeting needs in this case, not a means of developing skills to meet needs. Development goals will have little relevance in situations of this sort. Power will have a lot of relevance.

People will perceive school closure as a threat to their well-being. Schools project an image into a neighbourhood. This image affects the way in which the people who live in the neighbourhood see themselves. People will fight to improve their neighbourhood school because it affects their self esteem. They will fight to keep their school from closing because this will reduce their self esteem.

The feeling of being threatened explains the high levels of suspicion with which people approach the process to reorganize schools. The amount of anger and bitterness which occur during the process is inversely related to the degree to which people perceive themselves as having been successful i.e. their power was confirmed. The apparent issues of technical values and of neighbourhood concerns are never verified. The alleged savings have not been shown to occur. The alleged damage to children and property has not been shown to occur. The real issue is

power. The objective of the process is to avoid angry confrontation. The success of the process is dependent upon several factors. However the ultimate difference between a good process and a bad one depends upon the willingness of the board to go along with the wishes of the parents. The difference between the bad experiences in SBSD #4 and ASSD #3 is one of size rather than of kind. The bottom line was money.

So in processes of this kind, process goals are irrelevant. A significant degree of agreement on values already existed. Most individuals believed in the rational allocation of resources given the current fiscal situation. The dominant but unproven perception that closing schools will save money was pervasive.

To sum up, the experience in school reorganization shows the relevance of the four characteristics, the relevance of Bregha's hierarchy, and the importance of power in certain types of situations. It also confirms the barriers that human nature places in the path of participation, and the importance of dealing with these barriers if the process is to succeed. It does not confirm the importance of process goals in participation because in most cases, the people who participate have already developed the skills needed to meet basic needs. If some portion of the affected communities lacked these basic skills they either did not participate, or they weren't elected to the review committees.

CHAPTER SIX

PARTICIPATION: WHAT IS THE BEST STRATEGY?

In this chapter, I want to tie up a number of loose ends that have arisen because of the discussion of the case studies. The conflict between the participatory theories and the representative theories has been shown to represent two conflicting sides of human nature. A skillfully run process can survive and flourish in spite of this potential conflict. However, there are three questions raised by the case studies which need to be answered. These are: 1. Is government sponsored participation to be favoured over community based participation? 2. Is confrontation to be favoured over non-confrontation? 3. Is the real role of participation to assert and to gain power?

In order to answer these questions properly I must first address another problem. Initially, participation was characterised as the attempt by citizens to influence those who have the power to make decisions. Most of the resources that I consulted to prepare the third chapter focus on political power as the only relevant issue in participation. The case studies exhibit a preoccupation with political power. Is the only meaningful sense of the term "participation" the sense in which citizens try to influence politicians? if this is the case, what happens to those citizens who lack the personal and social skills that are necessary to exert political power? There must be a sense of "power" and "political" which does not include necessarily governments and bureaucracies.

As part of my study of school reorganization, I tried to study participation in inner city schools. I was told by persons who are

involved in school reorganization that lower class or working class people do not express the same sort of interest in school related matters as middle class people. WSD #1 and SJSD #2 have both closed schools in low income areas with little opposition. I hoped that if there was a different style of participation to be found in Winnipeg, it would be found in the inner city.

The information in the following discussion is drawn from a number of sources. One important source is the bibliographical material numbered 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 30, 31, 34, 42, 43, and 44. Another important source is personal interviews. I interviewed a number of knowledgeable persons. I have not quoted or made reference to these persons for two reasons. Firstly, I want to respect their privacy. The interviews were confidential. Secondly, the views I have presented in what follows is a synthesis of viewpoints drawn from both the literature and the interviews. The credit for the information which is of value belongs rightly to my sources not to me. However, I must accept responsibility for any distortions or inaccuracies which may have occurred due to my attempt at synthesis.

Participation and Inner City Schools

In earlier chapters I claimed that income and education are directly related to the gratification of basic needs and to the willingness and ability of people to get involved. Although persons from low income areas are less likely to get involved, they have more to gain from participation, since through participation certain basic needs can be met, and skills can be acquired which will assist people to meet basic needs.

Winnipeg is sometimes referred to as a donut city. It consists of a ring of relatively affluent suburbs, and a core area marked physically by decayed buildings and services, and socially by a high proportion of people who have special needs. Relative to the suburbs, the inner city has a high percentage of people who are considered to be disadvantaged. Whatever the overall nature and causes of the problems that inner city residents have, they are frequently accompanied by low income. The demographic characteristics of this area are readily available in a variety of documents published by Stats Canada, Institute of Urban Studies, and Social Planning Council of Winnipeg. For my purposes it is sufficient to point out that among those persons described as having low incomes are a disproportionate number of older people, disabled people, single parents, and native people and other minority groups. The problems of native people are of particular concern since the indicators of social difficulty for native people are the highest for any group.

The tri-level project known as the Core Area Initiative (CAI) was formed initially to deal with these problems and particularly with the problems of native people. Since its inception, the CAI has wandered from its original goals. In addition, Greater Winnipeg Development Plan (Plan Winnipeg) has as one of its major policies, the revitalization of older neighbourhoods. Most of these older areas fall within the boundaries of the CAI as these were defined in the Social Planning Council's document An Analysis of Social Problems, Needs and Trends for Winnipeg.

It is generally acknowledged that schools play a vital role in the life of a neighbourhood. Schools are both a shaper and a mirror of neighbourhood values. They provide public space both inside and outside

the school. For historical reasons, the inner city is short on public space, especially green space. It is odd that neither the CAI nor Plan Winnipeg make any mention of a resource as important as schools in their plans to revitalize the inner city.

Since schools in the inner city are acknowledged as being an important resource, and since the term "revitalization" almost by definition must include people when it is being applied to urban neighbourhoods, it seems to me that schools are an obvious place both to check the vitality of a neighbourhood, and to begin a program of revitalizing a neighbourhood. For these reasons, I wanted to check participation in inner city schools. To a certain extent, my investigation was hampered by the non-co-operation of WSD #1. The material used in this section was gleaned largely from conversations with people who worked in the area.

Inner City Schools

Inner city schools are marked by a number of distinguishing characteristics. Achievement levels are lower, incidence of health related problems is higher, truancy and drop out rates are higher, etc., relative to other parts of the city. A variety of causes can be cited to account for these problems.

WSD #1 has completed a number of studies which document the school related problems of the inner city. (26; 27) Factors which affect school performance include education level of the parents, marital status of the parents, employment status of the parents, and the mobility of the parents.

Relative to the rest of the city, the inner city has low levels of
parental education, a high proportion of single parents, high levels of
unemployment, and high rates of mobility among parents. These factors
influence performance in a number of ways. A parent with a low level of
education may not perceive schools as being important to his child's well
being. Without parental interest and support, a child may lose interest
in school. The child's performance and attendance will suffer. The child
may drop out of school without completing high school.

Parents who have low levels of education are more likely to be
unemployed. This puts a lot of stress on the family. In addition,
unemployed families tend to move frequently. The quality of housing in
the inner city varies widely from neighbourhood to neighbourhood, and
within neighbourhoods. Families who are unemployed may move frequently
in search of decent but cheap accommodation. Frequent moves increase
truancy which in turn will affect performance. One source estimates
that there are more than 2,000 children between the ages of nine and
thirteen who never attend school. Since the education level of the
parents has a direct relationship to both the performance level of the
children and to the employment level of the parents, the situation I
have just described can become viciously self reinforcing.

One way to break through this cycle is to gain the support of the
parents through school community outreach programs. Attempts to reach
the parents through these programs are hampered by a number of factors:

1. Educational level of the parents

Parents with low levels of education don't perceive themselves as
fitting into the school system. This problem can be exacerbated if the

school is staffed by people who don't understand the needs of the community or who reflect values which are inconsistent with the values of the community. It is important for professional resource people to have what Long calls an affinity with the community.

2. Language barriers

Frequently people living in the inner city speak a language other than English. Their children speak English fluently, but often the parents speak little English. Because English is the language spoken in most of the schools, parents who do not speak English may have trouble relating to the school in a positive way. Because of this, they may not express needed interest and support for their children's school activities.

3. Mistrust of government agencies

Families who have a great deal of contact with the government service agencies are often suspicious of the motives of outreach workers. Many bureaucratic social service agencies have an adversary relationship with their clients and with other agencies. This negative relationship provokes mistrust and hostility among the parents which is then transferred to the school system and its representatives.

Almost all government activity which takes place in the inner city has some effect on low income families. The influence of social service agencies is obvious. Less obvious are the effects caused by housing programs for example, or by regulations which affect housing. City building code standards may result in the boarding up of, or demolition of affordable low income housing, forcing families to move. Similarly, construction by MHRC may attract families to an area. (26) Activities

have an effect on residential mobility, school attendance, and school performance.

Community Schools

Many persons living on low incomes are deprived of basic needs. In addition to the social barriers such as bureaucratic harassment, lack of jobs, discrimination, etc., which provide additional obstacles to human development, long term deprivation of basic needs may also produce ingrained personal barriers. These barriers may inhibit personal growth and development even when opportunities are available. These barriers may take the form of alcoholism, depression, lack of self esteem, feelings of powerlessness, etc. which are usually lumped under the heading of alienation and apathy.

It should not be assumed that problems of this sort are the exclusive property of the poor. Anyone who is out of work or is subject to some form of intense stress may be subject to difficulties of this sort. The inability to support oneself can be devestating to self esteem. However, long term inability to support oneself can entrench these problems. This would be especially true if the individual is the object of racial discrimination or other social stigmata.

One strategy which is aimed at helping people meet their basic needs through personal and social development is the community schools program. A community schools program involves school facilities and personnel in school/community outreach and community development. A school should mirror or reflect the life and values of the community in which it is located. The daily activity of the community becomes the curriculum of

the school. The school plant provides a physical location for the
education of the community to take place. This is consistent with
Freire's belief that for an individual to grow and learn, the individual
must learn about himself as an individual, and as a member of his
community. The school program must be sensitive to the needs and values
of the community. As the community grows and changes, so must the
orientation of the schools. In order for this to happen, the involvement
of the community is essential. At this point, the theory of community
schools and of community development becomes indistinguishable from the
theory of participatory democracy.

Community Education in the Inner City

In 1979, WSD #1 adopted a policy on community schools. The division
has been slow to implement the policy, especially those aspects which
would increase use of the school for activities which would not be directly
controlled by school staff.

Both WSD #1 and the provincial government have acknowledged the
special needs of the inner city schools. Grants have been made available
which are earmarked for expenditure in inner city schools. A wide variety
of programs and assistance are available to schools which meet inner city
criteria. (27) These include breakfast and lunch programs, daycare and
seniors programs, volunteer programs, social needs programs. In keeping
with the policy on community schools, these programs are voluntary on
the part of the schools and the community. The programs are subject to
normal budget review.

There is also an organization known as the Community Education Development Agency (CEDA). CEDA trains and supervises community development workers to work in inner city schools. Funding is obtained partly from private sources, and partly from public sources. CEDA attempts to organize the community through the neighbourhood school. CEDA becomes involved in a wide range of issues which are of interest to the community such as anti-sniff programs, volunteer programs, and political activism. (22)

CEDA workers perceive themselves as co-ordinators of and facilitators of community activities. They try to help people meet their needs. Part of CEDA's job is to improve levels of participation in schools. Participation can occur without the direct involvement of the government, and without threatening the power base of the government. The argument that some people mount, that a community school is not a community school unless the program is controlled by the people is not valid. In the same way it is false to claim that unless a program of participation results in citizen control, it is not genuine participation. Like participation, a community school is an attitude and an attempt to meet people's needs, not an institutional arrangement.

The role of a CEDA worker is defined in terms of fostering a community identity and spirit using the school as a community resource. CEDA's efforts meet two basic kinds of resistance. Successful community development using community schools requires a high level of commitment from principals and teachers. Teachers who do not live in the area or do not identify with the needs of the community can obstruct the efforts of the development workers. Students and parents are naturally suspicious

of persons who do not respect their values and culture. Some inner city schools have a hiring committee made up of existing staff and members of the community. Prospective teachers are made aware of the special needs of the community and of the special demands that these needs may place on the staff.

The first barrier is equivalent to the barrier to participation which is posed by the attitudes of the government. The second barrier occurs in the community itself. The inner city is a catchment area for immigrant families of Native, South American, Portuguese and Filipino origin to name a few. Although efforts are being made to meet the needs of these people in a way which respects their language and culture, many people claim that not enough is being done. These linguistic and cultural barriers create natural divisions in the community which must be dealt with if programs of community development are to succeed.

Because of these barriers it is unlikely that a program of participation such as the ones conducted in the suburbs would work in the inner city. Because of the institutional barriers, and because of poverty, inner city schools do not have the interest and support of the parents to the same degree that suburban schools do. School program in the inner city does not reflect accurately the needs and values of the people who live in the inner city. People living in the inner city are likely to be less assertive, and less able to organize because they lack basic skills and basic needs. However, these same people will respond and participate in matters which meet their needs. Participation can take place without direct government involvement. The program of participation must be organized around issues which interest the people, which meet their basic needs, and which develop skills to meet basic needs.

This type of participation is not built around political power, nor is its basic motivation to influence government. It tries to help people grow and develop. Confrontation with the government is not avoided. It takes place as the need arises, and as a tactic of participation rather than as a style.

The Answers to the Three Questions

I can now attempt to answer the three questions that were asked during the introduction to this chapter.

1. Is government sponsored participation to be favoured over community based participation?

a. Government sponsored: pro

The big advantage in dealing directly with the government is the fact that they are the government. They have financial and human resources available. They have the power to delay the implementation of plans until consultation has been completed. They have the power to enforce the outcome of any consultation.

b. Government sponsored: con

There are a number of problems that are associated with government sponsored participation. These problems stem from the fact that governments are an interest group in their own right. They have interests that are distinct from and may conflict with the interests of citizens. Government interests may also be fragmented by conflicts within the bureaucracy.

Ulterior motives are one problem that affects the relationship
between the government and the public. Governments will be interested
in gaining public acceptance and support for their programs. They will
want to influence as many people as possible in as short a time as
possible. Accordingly, they will resist more complex forms of partici-
pation whenever possible. They will not make concerted efforts to
involve the larger public since the greater the number involved, the
greater the likelihood that time consuming conflicts will arise. These
tendencies minimize the likelihood that developmental benefits will
occur. The public's expectations may be frustrated.

A second problem that occurs is that the program of participation
may be run in a manner which does not attract the interest of the public,
or which does not meet their needs. In other words, a program of
participation may suffer from the same problems as other government
programs. It will be structured to meet the needs of those offering the
program before it will meet the needs of those it purports to serve.

c. Community sponsored: pro

Neighbourhood sponsored participation can take an interest in
meeting the needs and respecting the values of the affected community.
Without the limitation of a planning agenda or timetable, they can
afford to be concerned about the growth and development of the people
involved in the process.

d. Community sponsored: con

If the object of the community sponsored process is to exert overall
political pressure on the government, then a number of problems may

arise. The process may be out of touch with those in power, so that the issue may not be resolved satisfactorily. Alternatively, because of urgency to put pressure on the government process goals may be ignored. Also, the government may attempt to enter into an exploitive relationship with the people. Any of these developments would be destructive of a program of participation.

In some cases the problems can be attributed to a negative approach on the part of the government. In other cases the problems originate in the neighbourhood itself. Alienation and division within the affected community can provide problems as difficult to surmount as those which are created by an indifferent approach on the part of the government.

The problems which arise in the neighbourhood can be mitigated by adopting a strategy which emphasizes community development. The aims and effects of a process of this type are at levels more basic than that of overt political action. The skills which are developed during the community development program can be used in the event that political action is needed.

2. Is Confrontation more desirable than non-confrontation?

a. Confrontation: pro

Confrontation can be used as a tactic or style of participation. It enables people to assert the political power inherent in their organization in a direct way. Its motivating energy relies mainly on feelings of being threatened and of territorial anger. It is often the only course of action which is available to citizens' groups who would otherwise be excluded from the decision making process.

b. Confrontation: con

Confrontation may turn some people off, and it may turn the government off. A small minority of people can use the agression inherent in a confrontational style to impose their wishes on a larger but less vocal majority.

c. Non-confrontation: pro

Non-confrontation is a peaceful way of promoting growth and development in the community in a way which can meet the diverse needs of community groups without threatening others.

d. Non-confrontation: con

Occasionally, the only way to protect the interests of the community may be through confrontation. Government represents a group of vested interests. Governments are experts at stalling and ignoring dissatisfied citizens. Confrontations may be the only way to deter them from pursuing their desired course of action.

3. Is the real role of participation to assert and to gain power?

Much of my analysis in the preceding chapters has focused on the question of power. Initially, power was construed to mean the ability to get what is desired through political means. However, there are many things that are desirable which do not require political action to attain. Acquiring the fruits of these desires requires a kind of power too. However, this is a more basic notion of power. This power is the power to meet basic needs. It consists of those personal and social skills which assist the gratification of basic needs. The acquisition of these skills is equivalent to growth and development through participation.

In this sense, power is both an inner attribute, and an outward capacity
to do certain things.

Having said this, it is apparent that when we talk about giving
power to the people, it should not be equated with change in the govern-
ment, or in the institutional arrangements of government. The system of
government that is attacked by the participatory theorists is the system
of representative government as described by Schumpeter. Yet even
Keating's and Cole's functional system is representative. What these
gentlemen are really after is a system of government which meets the needs
of the people, especially the disadvantaged.

Part of the need which must be met is the need to be involved,
because of the beneficial effect involvement has on people. In order for
this to happen, the biggest change that would have to take place would
be a change of attitude. This change would have to occur not only on
the part of the government, but also on the part of those individuals and
groups who share the values of the government, and who benefit because
they share those values. Obviously this change isn't taking place. This
means that if the change is to take place, those people who are denied a
share of this society's abundant material goods are going to have to stand
up and take their share without being invited.

So, the real problem is not so much with the system, as it is with
the people who keep the system going. Any system could meet people's
basic needs in an equitable manner if those in control are disposed to
do so. However, even if people's basic needs are met, it doesn't follow
that there will be no problems. The difficulties that arose during the

reorganization of schools in relatively affluent parts of Winnipeg
attest to this. The desire on the part of the parents to control the
process of reorganization is offset by the values that they share with
school administrators, and by the fact that the parents have surrendered
their authority in the area of public education so that they could pursue
their own interests elsewhere. In this case their choice worked against
their desires. They could not assert control in the absence of the
responsibility that they gave to the trustees and the administration.
However, these people were not deprived of very much by the fact that
they were denied control. In most areas of their lives they are affluent,
well developed people.

The anger and confusion that are so apparent in the case of school
reorganization do not arise primarily because of malice or ulterior
motives on the part of those involved. They arise because of the
limitations that people's values and beliefs place on their ability to
co-operate with one another. However, if these problems are apparent
in areas where basic needs are well met, and where the participants have
similar backgrounds and values, what will happen when the public involved
are predominantly working class, and whose values reflect ethnic, and
cultural influences which may be incompatible with professional values?
I think that a very different approach would be necessary.

The point to remember is that we are talking about a process of
human development. Both the representative and participatory theories
accept the proposition that we learn to behave from interacting within
social institutions. The learning referred to in this case is "know
how" not "know that". Any social institution is an educational

institution whether or not it has a formal curriculum. The curriculum
of "know how" education consists of learning by trial and error what are
the attitudes and behaviour appropriate to given social roles and
situations. These are skills which can be useful in meeting basic needs.
The "schools" in which these lessons are taught are the home, the work-
place, the church, the playground, the supermarket, etc.

Protagoras and Socrates had an argument about this curriculum and
the skill or ability which it imparts. The ability is called "civic
virtue". It is that ability which allows human beings to take part fully
in the conduct of their lives and in the lives of their communities. The
dialogue touches upon two points which are worth mentioning. First, all
people are born with a natural aptitude for civic virtue, but some people
are more gifted than others. Second, the proper exercise of that virtue
has to be learned or developed. This is important because the assumption
that is often made when efforts to stimulate participation fail is that
there is a lack of interest in the community. This may be true. However,
it may also be true that the community lacks the knowledge. They don't
participate because they don't know how.

From this point of view, the task of participation is to teach people
how to participate by exploiting their natural aptitude. This teaching
is affected by approaching people at their level of need according to
their interests. It becomes a virtual tautology to say that a person
who lacks the ability to participate is a person whose basic needs have
not been met. Learning to participate means learning to meet basic needs.

In this sense, participation is a much broader concept than the sense of participation which includes only overt political activity. It is possible for participation to be an ongoing activity within the community and only peripherally to involve the government. However, while participation need not inevitably involve the government, in some cases, this involvement may be desirable. As long as those involved are aware of the limitations of both community and government, the problems can be minimized.

Conclusion

Each of the three questions can be answered "yes" or "no" depending on the context within which the question is being asked. In the case of government sponsored versus community based participation, I think that it is clear that governments could be open and willing to enter into negotiations with the people in the manner set out by Bregha. However, it is obvious that as long as government interests do not extend to meeting the needs of the affected community, conflicts and clashes will occur. Governments are composed of people who have personal needs and interests. These will naturally come into conflict with the needs and interests of others. Since the government cannot be relied upon to meet the needs of persons whose values differ from those of the government, community groups who are directly involved with governments should be ready to part company with and oppose the government if the need arises.

Because of the government tendency to co-opt and abuse the participatory process, it is especially important for community development work to take place at some distance from government agencies.

In the case of confrontation, I think it is useful as a tactic, but not as a style. This is a personal preference. It can be useful in situations where governments are unwilling to consider the interests of its citizens. However, it can also be used by a vocal minority to impose their views on the majority. In addition, it is a tactic which can be used only by those who already possess the individual and group skills necessary to organize and participate. It is not a tool of community development.

In the case of power, power and self esteem are developed through the meeting of basic needs. This sense of power is more basic than that of overt political power. Political power is one natural expression of this more basic power. This basic power grows in people as a result of their ability to meet basic needs. It is in this sense that the focus of participation is power.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

I suspect that in the conclusion to a thesis it is appropriate to address and celebrate briefly the triumphs of the work. However, the material in this thesis which is candidate for inclusion in a conclusion of this sort is somewhat lengthy. At the very least, its presentation would be a repetition of the material from chapter three which would include both the four point analytical perspective and Bregha's hierarchy. In addition, it would have to include any additions to and modifications of these sections necessitated by the information in the case studies as well as some mention of the relevance of power to participation. If it is important to go over this material again, it can be reviewed more effectively on location, in the aforementioned sections. In place of this lengthy review, I want to focus on a subject of some importance which I have touched upon only tangentially. I want to consider the relevance of this thesis for planners and particularly for planning students. Obviously, those sections of the thesis which deal with bureaucrats, leadership, and professional resources are pertinent to this point, but I want to consider its relevance for the planner more closely.

Initially, I became interested in participation while in attendance at the Logan expropriation hearings. I was puzzled by the residents' apparent lack of interest in the expropriation of their homes. As a product of my research, I have been able to provide an answer to this puzzle. I have decided that the answer is that they couldn't or they

didn't know how, or they were afraid to. Participation means that people have some control over the day to day reality of their lives. The having of this control is something that is learned. Confidence to participate comes with successful day to day practice of this control. People who haven't learned how to participate, or who have been prevented from participating for whatever reason won't be able to attend public hearings.

This answer may not be true in any absolute sense, but at the moment it is the best I can do. It is an answer with some practical value, since implicit in it is some idea of what objective must be aimed at in order to alter the situation from the residents' point of view. What puzzles me now is why doesn't the planning staff of the City of Winnipeg know this? I assume that in the answer to this question lies the relevance of this thesis for the student of city planning.

Throughout this thesis I have taken some trouble to acknowledge that side of human nature that is described as narrow and self interested. There are actually two aspects to this characteristic. The first aspect consists of the negative attitudes, prejudices, grudges, fears, and anxieties which most of us experience in some measure. In extreme cases, these attitudes can be incapacitating. At the best of times they create barriers which will obstruct the attempts of groups and individuals to interact.

The second element of narrow self interest is pride, or self esteem, or the power drive. Frequently people who are strongly motivated to participate are hindered from doing so by their own ability to co-operate with others. Our cultural values are oriented strongly

toward individual achievement and reward. People who perceive themselves
as knowledgeable and successful frequently have difficulty in recognizing
the merit of any idea or proposal which is not their own. This happens
because they equate their personal success and self esteem with their
own dominance in competition. They are motivated to participate through
a desire to reassert their own superiority. However, group action requires
a sacrifice of individual dominance if it is to succeed.

Frequently, one person will dominate a group and the group will
reflect that person's personality. Just as frequently, the group will
get bogged down in a protracted power struggle and accomplish nothing.
Group involvement is an individual skill that is not highly prized or
highly developed in our culture. Much of what is called working well in
groups is really just knuckling under to some authority figure.

Professional people are especially liable to be ego bound in this
manner. The entire mythos of professional life is that of individual
achievement and superiority proven in competition. Persons whose values
and attitudes are dedicated solely toward promoting their own prestige
and well being, possibly at the expense of others, have a difficult
time working with others on an equitable basis, especially if they view
their fellow participants as weak, stupid, and lazy, etc.

The type of person that I have been describing acquires respect for
other people grudgingly and slowly. I know of the board of a neighbourhood
group who have been meeting twice a month for almost a year and who have
yet to accomplish anything outside the board room. This group consists
mostly of lawyers, businessmen and senior civil servants. Most of their

meetings are spent fighting for power. There is an aphorism which goes:
a committee is twelve men doing the work of one. In certain instances
this could be amended to read: a committee is twelve men doing the work
of none.

The problems that egotistic professionals may have working co-opera-
tively with each other are only exacerbated when the group includes non-
professionals. A professional can have respect for another professional's
competence and yield however grudgingly to that competence. However,
professionals are used to being treated with deference by non-professionals.
They regard non-professionals as lay persons or latter day peasants.
Such persons are to be guided, directed, and advised, but they are not
to be consulted about matters beyond their limited understanding.
Professionals of this ilk will resent greatly any limitation of their
power over matters of professional concern, especially when that limita-
tion involves having to consult with or seek the approval of non-profes-
sionals.

The professionals I have been describing in this section are stereo-
types. The qualities that have been ascribed to them are applicable to
a large number of persons in our society, not just to professional people,
and certainly not just to city planners. These stereotypes are indicative
of the behaviour which is encouraged by certain of our cultural values
and beliefs, and apply to a wide variety of people. However, city
planners do consider themselves to be professionals. As such, planners
are likely to exhibit the kinds of values and personalities that I have
just described. These values and attitudes are foreign to participatory
values. People who have these values and attitudes will have a great

deal of difficulty accepting or understanding participatory values and processes. It is likely that they won't even be interested.

Since a city planner is liable to have values and attitudes which stress individual achievement, competitive superiority, and personal satisfaction, why should they be interested in participation or in participatory values? There are I think two reasons.

Many of the sources that were consulted in preparing this thesis point out that political participation is on the increase. This increase is evident in Winnipeg. Planners are concerned with land use and land development. It is clear that a further period of protracted suburban growth is unlikely. This means that much of future land development will consist of development of parcels of land which are already being used. If ploughing under cow pasture doesn't affect directly the interest of concerned citizens, ploughing down the house next door to make way for a church, a shopping centre, or an apartment block will. When a plan is made to convert cow pasture into residential development a number of factors have to be considered. One of these factors will be the passive interest of the future residents of the development. When a plan is made to convert the house next door into whatever, an additional factor will have to be considered. This additional factor is the active interest of the neighbours in what happens to the piece of land to be redeveloped. A well prepared planner will have to be prepared to deal with people as a living force to be reckoned with, rather than as a static obstruction which can be planned around. So, even if a planner has no personal interest in participation, it is likely that he has a professional interest. This is the first reason why a planner should be interested in the participatory process.

The second reason is that a planner may want to become professionally involved in participation. He or she may want to develop a professional expertise in participation. This is not a job for everyone. There are certain skills required for the job which possibly can be learned, but there are also certain personality traits which may be innate. For example, a skilled facilitator must be able to hold back his own views and desires on a particular issue so that he can help others bring forth their views. He must be a skilled arbitrator of the competition of egos which threatens groups' interaction. He should be able to take pleasure in the accomplishments of others. He must be perceived as trustworthy by others, etc.

Even if a planner doesn't have these skills and gifts, and isn't personally interested in having them, it is important that their importance to community relations is recognized. A planner who is aware of the needs of the participatory process, may be able to take actions which will benefit his interests. For example, it may be fatal to a process of negotiation between some interest group and the community if the professional resource person is mistrusted by the community. A planner who is aware of this problem could take steps to improve the situation, perhaps by suggesting that the resource person be replaced.

To sum up, participation as community development or as political involvement is on the increase. It is inevitable that planners will have to deal with participation whether directly or indirectly. Because certain values and certain skills are important to the role of the professional person who is involved in participation, it is important that planners become aware of participation, participatory values, and the kind of leadership skills which are compatible with them.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Cole, G.D.H. Guild Socialism Restated. London: Leonard Parsons, 1020.

2. Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Translated by M. B. Ramos. New York: Continuum, 1982.

3. Keating, Don. The Power to Make it Happen. Toronto: Greentree Publications, 1974.

4. Long, Jack. Everyman the Planner. (Master's Thesis, University of Calgary.

5. Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Rowe, 1970.

6. Pateman, Carole. Participation and Democratic Theory. Cambridge at the University Press, 1970.

7. Schumpeter, J. A. Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy. 3rd. ed. London: Allen and Unwin, 1957.

PAPERS AND ARTICLES

8. Arnstein, Sherry R. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." AIP Journal (July 1969): 216-224.

9. Burke, Edmund M. "Citizen Participation Strategies." AIP Journal (September 1968): 287-294.

10. (Lynch, Mary, Executive Director, and Mulhill, Linda, Research Associate.) School Closures: Are They the Solution? Bureau of Municipal Research, (1980).

11. Minzey, Jack D. "Community Education - Another Perception". Community Education Journal (May/June 1974).

12. Plan Canada (March 1979).

13. Prout, Peter F. Community Schools in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Education Research Association, (1977).

14. Report of the Alternative and Community Programs Department. The School and Community Development. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, (1980).

15. Schwartz, Arthur M. with the assistance of McGowan, Patrick.
Declining Enrollment: Implications for British
Columbia's Public School System. Educational Research
Institute of British Columbia, (1977).

16. Shuttleworth, D.E. "The Community School and Social Reconstruction".
Toronto: Ontario Education Research Council. (1968).

17. _____. "Flemington Road Community School: A Process in
Community Development". in Citizen Participation: Canada,
pp. 307-317. Edited by James A. Draper. Toronto: New
Press, 1971.

18. Planning Studies, Consultant Reports, and Government Documents.
Agassiz Drive School and Community Committee. "Annual
Report". Winnipeg: prepared for Fort Garry S.D. #5,
(1981&82).

19. Assiniboine South School Division #3. "Policy Guidelines for a Task
Force to Study and Make Recommendations Respecting the
Reorganization of Schools in the Assiniboine South School
Division Number Three". Winnipeg: (1981).

20. Bregha, Francis J. Public Participation in Planning Policy and
Programme. Prepared for the Community Development Branch,
Community Services Division, Ministry of Community and
Social Services, Ontario, (1973).

21. City of Winnipeg. Plan Winnipeg: The Greater Winnipeg Development
Plan. Winnipeg: (1981).

22. Community Education Development Association. "CEDA Project Documentation".
Winnipeg: (1980).

23. Clatworthy, Stewart. The Demographic Composition and Economic
Circumstances of Winnipeg's Native Population. Winnipeg:
Institute of Urban Studies, 1980.

24. Connor, Desmond M. Handbook on Constructive Citizen Participation.
Prepared from a seminar given by D. M. Connor Development
Services Ltd., Ottawa, (1973).

25. Crane School Program Monitoring Committee, "Annual Report". Winnipeg:
prepared for Fort Garry S.D. #5, (1982).

26. Davies, Bob. "Inner City Criteria in Winnipeg School Division Number
One 1981-1982". Winnipeg: (1981).

27. _____ and Madak, Paul R. "Migrancy Program; 1980-81
School Year". Winnipeg: prepared for Winnipeg S.D. #1,
(1981).

28. Farrel, G.M., Melin, J.P., and Stacey, S.R. _Involvement: A Saskatchewan Perspective_. Saskatchewan: prepared for the Department of Environment, Government of Saskatchewan.

29. Fort Garry School Division Task Force. "Projected Enrollment Program and Cost Implications at Agassiz Drive School". Winnipeg: prepared for Fort Garry S.D. #5, (1980).

30. The Implementation of a Community Schools Policy in the Winnipeg School Division. Winnipeg: prepared for Winnipeg School Division #1, (1979).

31. Johnston, Frank. _Core Area Report: A Reassessment of Conditions in the Inner City of Winnipeg_. Winnipeg: Institute of Urban Studies, 1979.

32. Millier, Roger. "Position Paper: Rationalization of Facilities in St. Boniface". Winnipeg: prepared for St. Boniface S.D. #4, (1981).

33. _____, compiler. "The St. Boniface School Division Story of Rationalization of Schools as Told by the Press". Winnipeg: (1982).

34. Manitoba Department of Education. "Migrancy Studies: Winnipeg School Division #1 Elementary Schools". Winnipeg: (1977).

35. North Fort Garry Declining Enrollment Community Task Force. "Report". 3 vols. Winnipeg: prepared for Fort Garry S.D. #5, (1980).

36. Report of the South Winnipeg Review Committee. 4 vols. Winnipeg: prepared for Winnipeg School Division #1, (1983).

37. St. Boniface Resident Advisory Committee. "Final Report to St. Boniface School Board and Newsletter to all Parents". Winnipeg: (1981).

38. St. James Family Schools Review Committee. _Final Report_. Winnipeg: prepared for St. James School Division #2, 1982.

39. St. James-Assiniboia School Division #2. "Declining Enrollment Schools Review Policy". Winnipeg:

40. St. James School Division #2. _Long Range Plan_. Winnipeg: 1982.

41. St. Vital School Division #6. "Information Concerning the Board's Recommendation to Accommodate Declining Enrollment in the North End Schools and the Growth in the Immersion Programs". Winnipeg: (1982).

42. Social Planning Council of Winnipeg. <u>An Analysis of Social Problems,</u>
     <u>Needs, and Trends for Winnipeg (A Reference Document)</u>.
     Winnipeg: Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, 1980.

43. _____. <u>Plan Winnipeg in Review</u>. Winnipeg: Social Planning
     Council of Winnipeg, 1981.

44. _____. <u>Social Policy and City Planning</u>. Winnipeg: Social
     Planning Council of Winnipeg, 1982.

45. Winnipeg School Division #1. "South Winnipeg Review: A Working
     Paper". Winnipeg: (1981).

Major Errata

page 18, line 5 should read, "... Individuals and the institutions with which they interact."

page 31, lines 11&12. The sentence which reads,"It was not possible for a small group of like minded individuals to govern effectively." should be omitted.

page 51, lines 17-20 should read in part,"...once these suspicions have been allayed, these same people will defer to the official expertise. "e are a society in whom has been inculcated...".

page 97, line 6. Before the paragraph which begins,"These concerns have a strong emotional component.", insert the following:

> In our society, professionals are authority figures, and they are undoubtedly chosen out of respect for their social standing. However, this poses a problem. These parents enter the process on the basis of their concern for their children and their neighbourhood.

Minor Errata

abstract line 2, read 'which' not 'shich'.

page 7,line 16, read,'Ihave not tried...'.

page 9, line 17, read,"...participation in government...".

page 11, line2, read,'has two attributes.".

page 36, line 8, read,'... which if present...'.

page 68, line 5, read,'self awareness...'.

page 70, line 3, read,'...asked people if...'.

page 91, line 10, read,'...the beliefs about closure...'.

page 102, line 2, read,'...interests be resolved...'.

page 51, line 2, read, 'deferring' not 'deffering'.