

APPENDIX B – ANALYTICAL FRAMES

There are a wide variety of possible ways to analyze the relationships between state and non-state actors. This appendix outlines the perspectives that have been most influential in developing the analytical framework of this dissertation.

GOVERNANCE

There are a variety of perspectives on how best to characterize and understand governance, first there is a perspective on governance that draws on the work of Jürgen Habermas, focused on the possibilities held within greater non-state involvement in political decision making and practice. This work describes governance as part of the shift away from government control towards a reinstatement of the public sphere as a key discursive site for decision making (Bang, 2003; Jessop, 2003; Bang, 2009). A second use of governance examines the spatial political economy of governance, focusing on structural questions, and drawing heavily on thinkers such as Henri Lefebvre, Neil Smith and David Harvey. Finally, there is Michael Foucault's portmanteau governmentality, which focuses on modes of governance alongside the rationales that guide them (Lemke, 2000). In work focused on governmentality many of Foucault's regular themes – for example, power, domination, biopower, normalization, and self-government – are mobilized to examine the practices of these new regimes (Rose and Miller, 1992; Flint, 2004; Martin, 2005; Gupta and Sharma, 2006; Huxley, 2006; Legg, 2007; McKee and Cooper, 2008).

Discursive Governance and Political Community

Jürgen Habermas attributes the atrophy of the public sphere, as a site for discursive flows and collective deliberation, to two factors, the rise of mass media and the consolidation of the welfare state with its intrusion into the social spheres. Habermas refers to this second factor as

a condition of *continuous state authority* (Habermas, 1991). Building on this critique, governance is conceptualized in normative terms as a middle way between the anarchy of markets and the iron fist of state authority, a “set of velvet gloves” in the form of consultation, negotiation, subsidiarity and reflexivity (Jessop, 2003), in processes aimed at solving social problems and distributing scarce resources (Bang, 2003).

Henrik Bang centers his work on governance around the idea of political community, defining governance as "a node of political communication between political authors and lay people" (Bang, 2003:9). Bang asserts that a focus on political community helps in the understanding and analysis of input politics or policy-politics, the politics that emerges from the ground up, with a focus on the particular issues and interests that people can experience and understand through their own lives. He defines this in opposition to output politics or politics-policy the undesirable hierarchical forms of government, where policy is simply the result of elite, closed, formal political processes (Bang, 2009). In this understanding, citizen involvement is more than just a courtesy, instead it "serves to give voice to concealed or repressed interests and identities" (Bang, 2009:100), and increases the effectiveness of policy making or collective decision making. Bob Jessop (2003) makes a similar argument, defining governance as a means of collective decision making that includes both state and non-state actors. He asserts that it is a way of correcting government failures that have arisen with the increased complexity of governing puzzles, and the increasing plurality within the polities to be governed.

Rather than trying to shrink government, advocates of this understanding of governance emphasize the need for decentering government authority. They focus on the need for a new type of authority that "does not just command," and is "more interactive, negotiable, dialogic and facilitative" (Bang, 2003:8). The state becomes first among equals, rather than a sovereign

authority. State actors now participate with non-state actors each bringing their unique resources to the deliberations (Jessop, 2003). Governance in this understanding is not simply public consultation – Habermas (1991) already warned against simplistic mobilizations of public opinion as a trope either for, or against, governments – the focus here is on the possibility for building an ongoing dialogue among self-reflexive actors inside and outside of the formal state. The most obvious critiques of this ideal of governance circle around the notion of political community. First there are questions about the ways in which the public sphere, as conceived in this literature, appears locked into a perpetual conversation primarily with the state.

There is also the question of how this definition of governance deals with power in relation to political communities. Similar to kindred work around communicative planning that also takes Habermas as a starting point (Forester, 1999; Innes, 1995), this understanding of governance deals with power primarily from the perspective of micro-politics, which enable Bob Jessop (2003), for example, to declare that those involved in political community "probably won't be power equals," but that is not a problem as "all that is involved in this preliminary definition is the commitment on the part of those involved to reflexive self-organization in the face of complex reciprocal interdependence" (101). Power imbalances are built-in, but seen as something that can be addressed through the processes of discourse. What is missing, and again this is similar to the communicative planning literature, is an understanding of the impact of structural power imbalances, the ways in which states and markets – and indeed societies – may work to explicitly exclude potential participants from political communities. For example, what happens to non-citizen residents who are legally excluded from important aspects of political communities, this is an extreme case, but illustrative of the issue of structural exclusion from political community and membership. A final critique is the under-theorizing of the practices

and institutions of this renewed discursive public sphere. A second approach to governance focused on its spatial political economy addresses the question of structural power, while the governmentality literature addresses the practice question.

Political Economy and Variegated Governance

While the literature on discursive governance is explicit in its normative perspective towards governance, recent work aimed at understanding the spatial political economy of new governance regimes are less upfront, if no less vehement, in their assessment of the move towards greater private involvement in state government. New government regimes are primarily described as a poor bargain with economic elite actors. Contemporary governance is described with modifiers such as advanced capitalist, transnational and liberalizing (Brenner, Peck and Theodore, 2010). While they associate this new public-private governance universally with neoliberalization, these authors are also quite specifically interested in the *variegated* nature of the processes and products of new governance regimes. The focus is on the ways in which new governance regimes develop through existing institutions and so produce national, regional, and to an extent metropolitan, differences in reformed institutions (Peck and Tickell, 2002).

Considering Lefebvre's sharp critique of the state, and particularly of the types of spaces produced through the state (Lefebvre, [1974] 1991), it might seem contradictory that he would be invoked so heavily by a group of authors condemning a move away from statism. In spite of Lefebvre's strong advocacy for radical democracy (*autogestion*), he was in many ways quite pragmatic in terms of the role or utility of the state. In the essay "Theoretical Problems of *Autogestion*," Lefebvre ([1966] 2009) discusses the role of social democratic reform conceding that

...reformism has not been completely wrong. If it made no sense, it would have disappeared. Its permanence is not baseless. An absolute rupture, a leap from necessity into freedom, a total revolution, and a simultaneous end to all human

alienation, this doubtless naïve image can no longer be maintained. ... The transformation of society is initially defined as a set of reforms. (140)

However, he goes on to specify that "the transformation of society is a series of reforms plus the elimination of the bourgeoisie¹ as the class that manages...the means of production" (140).

This political economic analysis of governance is not simply nostalgic for state authority, but instead is concerned with the regressive changes that further entrench the power of capital elite actors. Lefebvre captured the spirit of the concern with his description of early trends towards neoliberalization as "a simulacrum of decentralization" with tasks and problems distributed to the grassroots, while privileges and power continue to be consolidated in the state (Lefebvre, [1979] 2009: 128). As such this literature is interested in better understanding the processes by which the state is not simply withering away, but is instead being rescaled, with institutions reformed through iterative processes of rolling-back and rolling-out (Brenner, 2004). One clear example of this would be social housing in Canada where the federal state has pushed responsibility for the social housing sector on to lower levels of government that are increasingly pressured into focusing on efficiency rather than shelter or community. Provinces, municipalities and non-profit partners involved in social housing are instructed to be creative as they try to adjust to new responsibilities, and meet increased needs with decreased resources (Hackworth and Moriah, 2006; Hackworth, 2008).

This variegated view of advanced capitalist governance provides many useful tools, the most immediate being a way to better understand the impact of structural power and institutional change, however there are still limitations to this framework. While the focus is on the different ways that neoliberalizing processes play out in different places, and at different

1 Lefebvre specifically conceptualize the bourgeoisie not simply as a stand in for the wealthy or the middle class, but instead as a particular group of capitalists: bankers, certain merchants and landlords etc. In fact both Lefebvre and Habermas contrast the bourgeoisie with burghers in their writing.

scales, it is still a regime-based analysis, and so there are preconceived assumptions embedded in this understanding of governance. A simple example is the assumption that any time state actors work with capital elites they are capitulating to these elites. Many of these assumptions arise because the theories are based primarily – although certainly not exclusively – in an understanding of anglo-american political economy.² Here the discourse governance model is valuable as it "makes no prejudgment about the cast of actors involved in shaping the urban political agenda" or their normative directions (Pierre, 2005:452). In this way it becomes easier to look for, identify and analyze contestation taking place at various scales, particularly when emerging at local levels or from non-formal and informal spheres. Governmentality, with its focus on practice, provides another way to deal with the challenge of understanding the varied roles of actors in place and identifying contestation.

Governmentality

Governmentality describes the shift required – particularly in terms of needed technologies and authority – to move towards governing the population, what could also be called the moral governance of the social (Foucault, [1978] 2004 Feb 8: 120). With the population as the new target of the state there is a need for increased surveillance and discipline, technologies that aide in governing at a distance (Rose and Miller, 1992). Importantly, Foucault notes that this is not simply a shift from a sovereign society to a society of discipline, but a move to a triangle of sovereign, disciplinary and governmental management (Foucault, [1978] 2004, Feb 1: 111). Finally, governmentality combines an analysis of the technologies of government with their underlying rationales (Lemke, 2000), allowing an examination of the external aspects of the institutions, functions and objects of governmentality (Foucault, [1978] 2004, Feb 8).

² see Pierre, 2005 for a similar critique of urban regime theory were for example he discusses the limited perspective on state economic elite relationships.

A major contribution of recent work in governmentality is the express attention to the geographies of the technologies and rationalities of social governance. An attention to space, place and scale strengthens understandings of the interactions between state power and self-discipline. Taking an historical approach several authors have examined the spatial and environmental modes through which governmentality is enacted. Examples include Akhil Gupta and Aradhana Shama's (2006) examination of the use of state programs to recondition individual women's notions of citizenship, orienting them towards the goal of autonomy. At an urban scale Stephen Legg's (2007) work covers urbanization in New Delhi, paying particular attention to the use of discipline in productions of spaces of colonialism and liberalism. Margo Huxley (2006) looks at the spatial rationality behind urban regeneration, and particularly focuses on the ways in which various biological logics are operationalized to justify rational planning processes. Finally, Patricia Martin (2005) examines regional questions, with a sub-national comparison of two Mexican states. Her conclusions are that while both states are experiencing neoliberalization the technologies and rationales employed are quite different and related to the specific histories of the places, along with the different concerns of economic elites. These are just a handful of examples, but each has in common the attention to practice, to the mechanisms and actors involved in governmentality.

In terms of housing, governmentality studies of social or low-income housing have helped to identify and critique the rationale behind various schemes claiming to empower residents. These studies identify the ways in which empowerment is increasingly defined as residents taking on greater personal risk with little additional power in terms of the regulation and production of their homes. These studies also examine the technologies and authorities involved in disciplining tenants around these ideals (Flint, 2004; McKee and Cooper, 2008). However, one important

critique of the use of this framework is the tendency to mute the tension held within Foucault's triangle of governmentality – sovereignty, discipline and government – in favor of a return to the Rousseau's binary of discipline versus sovereignty (Mckee, 2011).

Governmentality offers two additional ways to examine the question of relationships between state and non-state actors. The focus on practice is a critical link between the micro-political point of view dominant in the discussion of discursive governance, and the political economy perspective of research on variegated governance. This helps us to identify resistance as well as understanding the processes of governance. By examining practice we can better identify moments of counter-discourse, practices contrary to or in conflict with sovereign understandings (Legg, 2007). The second aspect of governmentality is the focus on the rationality of governance. However, while there is a utility to understanding the underlying frames of actions there is also, a perhaps too strong, reliance in governmentality literature on what amounts to motives. In this area the literature on discursive governance does similar work, in terms of getting at the 'why' question, but does so through an understanding of the performative and poetic aspects of discourse, rather than through recourse to individual psychology or assigning conscious agency to the state.

Taken together these three ways of understanding state/non-state interactions suggest the need to examine the interactions between different spheres and scales including examinations of discourse, variegated political economies, and practice; along with the intertwined aspects of micro, structural, and bio powers. This provides an opportunity to move past simplistic arguments about whether more or less state is good or bad, and to focus on material outcomes and access to negotiations, to an assessment of which arrangements support equity and democracy.

Three perspectives on governance:

- 1) Communicative governance – normative starting point that there is positive potential held within a decentering of the state moving towards a coordination role. Examining frames and discourses to test this ideal.
- 2) Variegated governance – a need to attend to the structures involved and the ways in which institutions are recreated.
- 3) Governmentality – the ways in which the balance between sovereignty, disciplinary and government management are implemented and performed.

POLICY FEEDBACK

The aim of this study is to think about the full political circle linking policy, governance arrangements and spatial practice. In this study I further operationalize these connections through ideas drawn from policy feedback frameworks paying special attention to the role of local housing NGOs/non-profit organizations.

Policy feedback frameworks expressly examine the effects of ongoing interactions between government policies and programs, and mass political behavior (Skocpol, 1992; Pierson, 1993; Campbell, 2003; Mettler and Soss, 2004). Two types of effects are particularly salient: resource and interpretive (Skocpol, 1992; Pierson, 1993). Resource effects are the spoils and incentives created through policies, including changes in administrative capacities, organizing niches, and financing. Examining resource allocations helps to build an understanding of “the costs and benefits associated with particular political strategies” (Pierson, 1993, p. 596). Interpretive effects are the ways in which policies act as “sources of information and meaning” (Pierson, 1993, p. 596), which influence the “goals, and capabilities of groups that subsequently struggle or ally in politics” (Skocpol, 1992, p. 58, see also Mettler and Soss, 2004). Finally, the visibility and traceability of government actions also play an important role in how these actions are interpreted (Mettler, 2005). Skocpol identifies these feedbacks as a key means of evaluating policies arguing that “a policy is 'successful' if it enhances the kinds of state capacities that can

promote its future development, and especially if it stimulates groups and political alliances to defend the policy's continuation and expansion” (Skocpol, 1992, p. 59). In this study I am particularly interested in the institutions shaping and conditioning mass political behavior of immigrant residents, the opportunities for membership and participation especially in terms of spatial negotiation over housing and community development. I specifically examine the role of community development organizations in these feedbacks the ways in which they filter resources and interpretive effects, translating policy into everyday experiences.

While a policy feedback framework does the important work of highlighting the potential links between government actions and political behavior, and suggesting ways in which to measure those links, there are still important gaps in the ways that the framework is deployed related to questions around which actions and actors, and at which scales political behavior is defined within the framework. Studies examining political feedback tend to focus on formal political participation, behaviors such as voting or running for political office. Some non-formal participation, such as membership in social organizations and volunteer work, are increasingly recognized (Mettler, 2005), but even here the focus is on how these types of participation tie directly back into formal processes. This focus neglects informal and everyday political participation. Especially in terms of more intimate scales such as neighborhoods and homes, the networks and spatial negotiations that occur outside of engagements with formal state politics are aspects of political behavior that need to be taken into consideration (Nagar et al., 2002; Martin, 2003; DeVerteuil and Marr, 2009; Staeheli, 2010). In this study I extend the definition of political behavior to align with Bang's (2003) notion of input politics or policy-politics, attentive to the role of everyday negotiations in politics. Again this is the definition of membership used in this study the ability to use, produce and reproduce space, to engage in political community and scene

making, and to be able to act and create partnerships to produce the places one needs and wants.

SPATIAL USE AND PRODUCTION

The idea of spatial use and productions does the work of connecting formal political behavior with the informal, vernacular or everyday. In *The Production of Space* Henri Lefebvre ([1974] 1991) focuses on the distinctions between use and exchange value advocating for the importance of use and the primary users of space as the animators of that space. Lefebvre critiques productions of space first for capital and the state, that he describes as focused on visual fetishization and sanitation. Out of this exploration Lefebvre introduces his triangle of spatial production, first he describes the notion of spatial practice, the daily uses, and networks created while we travel in and through space. Next he presents two descriptions of abstracting space: representations of space and representational space. The first he describes as the space of scientists, technocrats and planners, flattened into two dimensions, conceived and represented as a “conceptualized space” (Lefebvre, [1974] 1991:39). Representational space he accredits to the users of space, where the “non-verbal symbols and signs” (Lefebvre, [1974] 1991:39) are drawn from perception, experience and from interaction with space in all of its dimensions. In vivid language he animates this contrast saying:

Architecture produces living bodies, each with its own distinctive traits. The animating principle of such a body, its presence, is neither visible nor legible as such, nor is it the object of any discourse, for it reproduces itself within those who *use* the space in question, within their lived experience. Of that experience the tourist, the passive spectator, can grasp but a pale shadow. (Lefebvre [1974] 1991, 137; emphasis in original)

Lefebvre's assertion was that much modernist planning was driven by professions who could at best be described as tourists in place.

Lefebvre's hope, then, was that production driven by users could build spaces animated by

a plurality of material, tactile and emotional needs and desires. This was his ideal for contradictory space. This focus on use, daily practices and representational space also helps to identify the importance of the everyday and the vernacular, the political aspects of actions that might fall outside of participation within formal political spheres (Lefebvre [1974] 1991; Martin, 2004; Kudva, 2009). This focus on spatial use also relates to notions of everyday citizenship focused on acts of care, scene making, and quietude (Staeheli, 2010). Explicitly examining residents' spatial use as well as the collaborations and conflicts of scene-making, and trying to understand the ways in which institutions and organizations variously condition, facilitate and impinge on these uses helps to build a stronger understanding of everyday citizenship. In particular this is a useful tool in attempts to analyze the everyday and the vernacular as explicitly political, and not just the precursor to larger or more legible political actions and engagements with the state, but the acts that produce the very necessary geographies (Mann, 2008) for those actions. This engagement at various scales, and in various spheres is at the core of the normative ideal for spaces of incorporation and membership used in this project with a focus on the importance of people being able to engage in the negotiations to produce the places that they need and want.