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ABSTRACT

Inventing Landscape Assets in Rural Utah Communities:

A Sociocultural Approach

by

Jennifer F. Hale, Master of Landscape Architecture

Utah State University, 2007

Major Professor: Elizabeth Brabec
Department: Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning

A community’s physical environment embodies distinct natural and built elements, which hold meanings and values that are formed through daily social interactions within that environment. Such elements, however, are not often recognized until they are dramatically changed or lost. As amenity-rich rural areas of the Intermountain West steadily attract new residents, consciously identifying these elements prior to rapid growth is critical to their preservation.

Research suggests that strong social capital has the potential to encourage the identification of a place’s visual assets prior to such change. A documentary research approach was used to understand why citizens do not actively participate in community planning and to identify possible solutions from the public participation movement. A framework was built to evaluate existing participation methods and identify specific approaches and practices which could be employed by “citizen planners” to effectively
engage citizenry in identifying the visual, landscape assets while strengthening social relationships.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The complex relationship between people and the physical environment is an area of research common to cultural geographers, sociologists, environmental psychologists, and landscape architects. Theories about the influence of place on human behavior exist along a broad spectrum. At one end, social determinism asserts that human interactions and constructs alone influence human action and, at the other end, environmental determinism cites that humans are a product of their environment. A more tempered argument, which combines facets of both views, the sociocultural paradigm, is most common in today’s research. In fact, environmental psychology views the individual as both “embedded in” the environment and as “actively defining and giving shape to it” (Williams and Patterson 1996, 509). Research regarding people and their environments in general acknowledge that there is an interdependency that exists between social life—human experience, social interactions, and their actions—and their surroundings (Brehm, Eisenhauer, and Krannich 2004; Williams and Patterson 1996; Riley 1992).

The process of becoming “embedded in” the landscape happens gradually—incrementally—over time as one interacts with others within a geographical space. Each community’s physical environment embodies distinct natural and built elements, which hold meanings and values that have been formed through daily social interactions within one’s community landscape. Interestingly, such elements of our physical environments which make it distinctly different from another are not often recognized until they are dramatically changed or lost. Therefore, consciously identifying these elements is critical to their preservation.
This is particularly true in rural areas of the Intermountain West where amenities—such as the agreeable climate, open space, scenic landscapes, proximity to federal lands and wilderness, recreational opportunities, and freedom from the traffic congestion of cities—are attracting large numbers of new residents and, therefore, quickly and dramatically altering their social and physical landscapes (Vias and Carruthers 2005; Rudzitis 1991, 1993; Krannich and Petrzelka 2003). Such change creates an even greater need to pay attention to the social networks and the way they collectively act to define and alter the community space. Krannich and Petrzelka (2003) confirm this need:

Where substantial amenity-based growth does occur or is anticipated, attention needs to be focused on both the social and environmental disturbances that can occur. Growth that exceeds the carrying capacity of the natural landscape, that overwhelms valued traditions, cultures, and interests of established populations, or that displaces residents as a result of cost of living increases certainly does not contribute positively to the well-being of rural people and communities. (197)

Unfortunately, the ways in which people can participate in the development of their community is highly dependent upon (and often limited by) the current planning system with state-mandated, minimum requirements and a long history of not including the public in ways that can effectively identify its valuable physical attributes and visual assets. These limitations are further amplified in rural areas which often lack the planning resources—personnel, funding, and guiding documents—necessary for proactively dealing with growth.

Utah, one of the Intermountain West states as well as one of the five fastest growing states in the United States, is experiencing significant growth not only within its metropolitan counties, but in its nonmetropolitan counties as well (Canham 2006; Havnes
In many rural areas around the State, community planning often falls upon the shoulders of local officials, often volunteers, who have a limited knowledge of planning and its methods. The purpose of this study is to provide insight into ways in which these "citizen planners" can effectively engage citizenry in the identification of their visual assets and, therefore, to assist in proactively preserve places of value prior to substantial growth in their community.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The Interdependency of People and Their Environment

Rural sociologist Kenneth Wilkinson (1991) describes the interdependency between people and their environment in the context of the community. In his interactional approach to the community, he defines a community as comprised of three parts: a locality, a local society, and the process of locality-oriented actions ("the community field"). In this approach, a common locality or territory is a physical location where people live and meet their daily needs. A network of associations, or a local society, exists to express common interests and to work together to meet those needs. The community field is a process of interrelated actions that result from the local society expressing their common interests. According to Wilkinson, the built environment of the community—its defined boundaries, built elements, and general structure—is a product of these social interactions and actions. Although Wilkinson does not dismiss the physical environment as influencing these interactions, he seems to place greater emphasis on the role people have in defining and building the community environment.

While they use the term place instead of community, place theorists also study how social interactions and activities occur within and shape a locality or physical environment (Eisenhauer, Krannich, and Blahna 2000; Brandenburg and Carroll 1995). However, they often direct greater attention on the influence place has upon people,
particularly the "human psychological processes" relating to place (Brandenburg and Carroll 1995).

How People Influence Place

Researchers studying both the physical environment and people and their interactions recognize the influence of social interactions on the physical environment. In fact, some argue that place only exists because people are there to socially "construct" it (Brandenburg and Carroll 1995). This perspective asserts that "spaces" only become significant places when they are viewed and defined through a "special filter of values and beliefs" (Greider and Garkovich 1994, 1). Interestingly, this filter is formed incrementally, over time, as a person lives in, experiences, interacts with others within it, and assigns meaning to that space (Tuan 1977; Brandenburg and Carroll 1995; Eisenhauer, Krannich, and Blahna 2000; Greider and Garkovich 1994). As stated earlier, these social interactions within a place also affect how people define it, its boundaries, and how they shape and structure it.

How Place Influences People

While it is a far less popular ideology, there are many who recognize that the environment also contributes to meanings associated with place. The sociocultural paradigm—one of three major paradigms in the field of environmental psychology—is concerned with how meanings assigned to the physical environment both structure the environment and are structured by the environment (Williams and Patterson 1996). Thus, putting a greater emphasis on the connection people have to features and aspects of
both natural landscapes and built environments. For example, Kemmis (1990) discusses how the open spaces of Montana—where nature still dominates—emanate a power associated with the American Frontier. He asserts that this directly affects the sense of identity of those who live there; prompting the state of Montana to give the natural environment a more central role in the way they approach planning. Similarly, the built environment—although constructed of human built elements, such as roads and buildings—influences patterns and processes and how people move and interact within these human-defined spaces (Wilkinson 1991). In fact, the built environment plays a significant role in the daily lives of its residents as it delineates neighborhoods, dictates ways people can move within their community, where people gather within the community, and even how they spend their time (e.g. in traffic or not).

Considerable attention has been directed to the emotional attachment people form to specific environmental features in both the natural and built environment. The study of place attachment specifically looks at how emotional bonds to specific places are formed through daily interaction with the environment and how that interaction creates personal identity and values contributing to the social meanings and construction of place mentioned earlier (Manzo and Perkins 2006). In fact, these attachments are derived from both social relationships within an environment as well as the features of the environment itself. A study completed by Eisenhauer, Krannich, and Blahna (2000) found that people’s attachment to a specific locale was first because of their social associations within that place (36.9% cited “family/friend related reasons”) and secondly because of
the environmental features of the place (34.2% responded “environmental features/characteristics of place”) (432).

While research may be lacking in how people specifically attach to specific attributes of the landscape (Stedman 2003), it is recognized that destruction or protection of specific attributes of place have the potential to change social relationships within a place. Hester (1993) emphasizes that the removal of highly valued or “sacred” places which play a significant role in the everyday life of citizens—those which “exemplify, typify, reinforce, and perhaps even extol the everyday life patterns and special rituals of community life”—can “reorder or destroy” social processes that affect the entire community (279). Interestingly, meanings, values, and attachment for place are not always consciously recognized by the individuals or groups that hold them. In fact, it is not uncommon for places of value to be recognized as such only after they have been removed or dramatically changed (Krannich and Petrzelka 2003).

The Need for Collective Action

Because valued elements of place are a key component in the structure of a community, the decisions regarding change and development of that place play an important role in how place affects the community’s daily quality of life. As mentioned earlier, social networks and the interactions of those within them produce actions that “shape” the physical environment (Wilkinson 1991). These actions occur both formally and informally. In a more formal forum, publicly elected officials, or those appointed thereby, make decisions with (or often even without) the assistance of hired city planners.
Additionally, public meetings are offered as a medium for groups or individuals to respond to planning ideas and decisions for the community. In another way, informal groups of neighbors or adjacent business owners can generate ideas for changes to a street, block, or neighborhood, through social networks in both informal and formal methods. The “extent and effectiveness” of individuals to form networks and meet the common needs of the community is referred to as social capital (Kemmis 1990; Manzo and Perkins 2006).

How Place Can Foster Social Capital

Regarding place, social capital often involves individuals from divergent groups recognizing and appreciating that multiple meanings exist among the different groups within one place or community (Flora and Flora 1996; Kemmis 1990). In this way, a community’s physical landscape can become “shared connection” between the numerous social networks and a common ground for the diverse voices, meanings, and values which exist within a community. Likewise, attachment to characteristics of the environment can also become common values which help avoid conflict and bring diverse groups together, foster partnerships, and mobilize people to collectively act (Manzo and Perkins 2006; Brehm, Eisenhauer, and Krannich 2004; Flora and Flora 1996; Kemmis 1990). This idea is supported by Flora and Flora (1996) who point out that “by identifying local strengths” or “points of agreement about the enhancement of physical and environmental capital” social capital can be increased (223). In turn, greater social capital can also prompt the investment in physical and environmental capital through the
“creation and preservation of assets related to place and the built environment” (Manzo and Perkins 2006, 342).
development of their community. This included a review of the works of sociologists, such as Putnam (2000), Wilkinson (1991), and Kemmis (1990), to understand how people interact (or don’t interact) in building a community. Researchers from a several fields—planning (Innes and Booher; Lane; Rydin and Pennington) and environmental psychology (Horelli)—as well as planning practitioners (Kumar; Kelly and Becker) offered insight into many of the shortcomings of current planning and its inability to effectively engage the public. A review of literature from cultural geographers (Tuan; Lewis) and landscape architects (Riley) offered insight into how shortcomings of planning are specifically affecting the landscape. Having a better understanding these obstacles, specifically those which affect rural areas, assisted in the identification of aspects of participation to avoid, as well as those which could potentially bring greater success.

Part II: Possible Solutions from the Public Participation Movement

Planners and theorists have labored, in the last several decades, to move past the obstacles of the existing political and planning systems. Because of this participatory approaches have significantly evolved. A review of the results of this work offered potential solutions to the obstacles identified in Part I of this review, as well as objectives to base a method for evaluating participation tools and mechanisms. Many of the researchers who discussed the shortcomings of current planning in the first section also offered possible solutions. Lane (2005), in particular, introduced several theoretical frameworks for more enabling public participation in planning, one of which was John
Friedmann's transactive planning theory. This theory became the foundation of the evaluation framework in the next section.

Part III: Building a Framework for Deciphering Effective Participation Methods

The result of the decades of work to improve participation planning has also produced a large body of participation methods, tools, and techniques, many of which have different goals and purposes to suit the needs of different interests and communities. The focus of this third section was to locate classification systems which delineated participation according to objectives identified in Part II. Three such classifications were used to create a framework which matched the goals of the study, as well as assist in deciphering which methods and tools fit those goals. These classification systems came from several fields: planning (Arnstein 1969), public participation practice (Pretty et al. 1995), and psychology (Rowe and Frewer 2005). Because of this each offered a distinct perspective into public participation.

Part IV: Evaluating and Categorizing Public Participation Methods

The final section of our study covers the results of the evaluation. Twelve participation methods were selected from a larger group of methods through criteria derived from the specific needs of rural communities. Each method was then evaluated according to framework developed in Part III. This evaluation revealed practices and approaches to participation which will not only effectively engage citizens in the
identification of their visual assets but, more importantly, which can be easily employed by the “citizen planners” of rural Utah communities.
CHAPTER IV
AN ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION METHODS
IN COMMUNITY PLANNING

Part I: The Culture of Non-Participation in Community Planning

Why People Aren’t Involved in the Development of their Community

While strong community social networks have the potential to positively influence the built and natural environment and the daily lives of a community’s residents, current research suggests that this potential is not being realized. In fact, Putnam (2000) argues that a decrease in social interaction is affecting the level of engagement in the ways building one’s community environment are allowed; that is, in public events, meetings, and voting. Interestingly, the level of disengagement in development activities is correlated to the amount of participation time required (e.g. voting declining at a lesser rate than other forms of participation because it is an individual exercise and requires the least amount of time) (Putnam 2000).

According to Putnam (2000), the decrease in citizen involvement in place-making is due to four major trends in society. First, people are socially disconnected as greater pressures on finances have led to an increase in the number of two-career families putting greater pressure on people’s time. Second, popular suburban and sprawl patterns of development separate and increase the distance between where people live, shop, and work. The result is that a greater amount of people spending a greater amount of their time commuting and less time associating with neighbors, attending meetings, or being
involved in community projects. Third, suburban areas typically lack communal places where people can get together and socialize (Duany, Plater-Zyberk, and Speck 2000). Fourth, technology has "privatized" entertainment and, along with it, any remaining leisure time (Putnam 2000).

Rural towns—despite being commonly thought of as more cohesive and united than their urban counterparts—are not unaffected by "civic disengagement" (Putnam 2000). Although due to different causes, rural areas are experiencing similar trends to their urban counterparts. For example, national economic restructuring has added the loss of manufacturing jobs in rural areas to decades of decline in the agricultural-based economy (Flora, Flora, and Fey 2004; Falk and Lobao 2003) causing more women to work in the "paid labor market" regardless of whether they live in an actively growing area or not (Tickamyer and Henderson 2003). This restructuring has also caused more rural residents to spend as much or more time commuting to nearby urban centers in search of better employment opportunities (i.e. greater selection, opportunities for advancement, benefits, and so on) (Flora, Flora, and Fey 2004; Falk and Lobao 2003; Tiggess and Fuguit 2003). Furthermore, technology, particularly satellite and the Internet, have connected previously isolated rural areas to a large array of entertainment sources within their homes (Flora, Flora, and Fey 2004). No significant information was found on community gathering places in rural areas.

Why People Are Disconnected from Place

Similarly, transportation, technology, the trends of commuting and working outside of one’s community, as well as the lesser dependence upon the local landscape
for one’s livelihood have caused both urban and rural residents to spend more time outside of their locality (Tigges and Fuguiit 2003). It has also led to the creation and function of social networks beyond geographic location, sometimes more often than within it (Wilkinson 1991; Bonanno and Constance 2003; Flora, Flora, and Fey 2004). As more social activities happen independently of place, particularly extra-locally or through the Internet, some researchers are taking a more social deterministic approach to communities; that is, they claim that communities transcend geographic location, and therefore are “territory-free” and exist as social phenomenon only (Wilkinson 1991; Riley 1992; Luloff & Bridger 2003).

How This Disconnect Affects the Community Landscape

According to cultural geographers, culture, which is defined as the products of the actions of the people of a place, is reflected in the common landscape (Lewis 1979; Tuan 1979; Greider and Garkovich 1994). Cultural geographer Peirce Lewis (1979) puts it this way, “Our human landscape is our unwitting autobiography, reflecting our tastes, our values, our aspirations, and even our fears, in tangible, visible form” (12). Lewis (1979) asserts that these cultural landscapes—though messy because they are continually being written and re-written—can be “read,” giving us clues as to what kind of people we are, were, and are becoming.

Researchers suggest that the influence of computers and specifically the Internet have allowed people to easily transcend locality and share information creating a global culture (Bonanno and Constance 2003). This global culture has contributed to people who act more alike and places which look more alike (Bonanno and Constance 2003).
“Mass landscapes” are a result of these more universal, “mass cultures” and often ubiquitously display the same visual features, styles, and patterns regardless of the geographic locality (Williams and Patterson 1996; Riley 1992). Reproducible and repeatable businesses and building styles (e.g. fast food restaurants, big box stores, etc.), often referred to as “placeless,” dominate over features which have a distinctive, local feel.

Interestingly, the level of engagement from community members in place-making is reflected in the physical landscape. For example, the features of placeless, mass landscapes suggest a culture which is focused on (or at least allows) rapid change, rather than a sense of permanence, and therefore needs less involvement from the residents themselves in building the landscape (Riley 1992). Such landscapes are currently supplanting the more traditional “folk landscapes.” Folk landscapes, on the other hand, emanate “a sense of security, permanence in times of change, even the ability for physical return” (Riley 1992, 27). Such landscapes are a result of the expression of traditions and culture, and the identity of the region which comes from the history, experience, and knowledge of the residents themselves, rather than images and information from the media and global culture. Folk landscapes depend more heavily upon residents providing input and their involvement in their development (Riley 1992).

Planning Perpetuates the Mass Landscape

Many of the afore mentioned mass landscapes are a result of a planning system which does not actively engage citizen input and is largely removed from the locality. In
fact, brief review of planning history reveals that public participation has traditionally not played an integral role.

Traditional planning or “blue print planning,” an apolitical method used until its replacement in the late 1950s and 1960s, focused on designing places that were of “high aesthetic quality” as viewed by the trained professionals or planners (Lane 2005; Horelli 2002). A fixed planning sequence, which used predictions and scientific methods, was completed by planners, and then made into fixed master plans left little room or need for public input. As a result, the public was viewed as a single unified entity with a single, unified interest and public engagement in planning and with the exception of voting for those who hired the planners, public participation was non-existent (Lane 2005).

Even with a change to a more systems-oriented approach (synoptic planning) in the 1960s, the focus of planning was still very rational and held public participation to a minimum (Lane 2005; Horelli 2002). This approach focused primarily on economics and system function, relying heavily on quantitative analysis and the identification of multiple alternatives, which are evaluated according to the cost effectiveness. Public participation was integrated into this systematic process in the form of feedback on the goals of planning, which was moderated by a professional planner. Since then, variations of synoptic planning have recognized that there is more than a single voice and have included multiple stakeholders in meetings which are still principally controlled by planners. Many tenets of synoptic planning are still used in planning today.

By the 1970s, largely due to the recognition that certain groups and voices of the public often went unrepresented in planning, a movement toward more inclusive,
communicative, and collaborative public participation was born (Lane 2005; Kumar 2002). As a result, hundreds of participatory planning tools and methods have surfaced, particularly during the 1980s and 1990s (Rowe and Frewer 2005; Horelli 2002). The benefits and effects of this movement will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

**Major Obstacles to Participation**

According to Kumar (2002), obstacles in three major areas—structural, administrative, and social—keep the current political, planning system from incorporating public involvement in planning decisions which affect their place and, therefore, contribute to the perpetuation of the mass landscape.

*Structural Obstacles.* Large populations (a large number of voices) which occur in many municipalities greatly limit the ability for the voice of every citizen to be heard prior to a community decision (Kemmis 1990; Rydin and Pennington 2000). However, the proposed solution to this problem—a representative democracy—is not without its own problems. Although representative in the sense that the city mayor and council are voted in by the public, the decision-making and community planning typically transpires in a more centralized manner with public input often only occurring in the form and at the frequency of a state-mandated minimum. In Utah, decisions regarding land use are made in two different forums: public meetings and public hearings (Call 2005). The state of Utah requires notices for both types of meetings to be publicly posted and published in the local paper 10 calendar days prior to the meeting (*Utah Code*, Sec. 10-9a-204). Public meetings, where decisions regarding the development of place are being made, are
open to any citizen who wants to attend. However, input from citizens only occurs when solicited. On the other hand, public hearings solicit public “participation” by speaking and are often required by law before local officials can make a decision in a public meeting (Call 2005).

The current structure of the political system falls short of representing public views for several reasons. Kelly and Becker (2000) point out that planning is not the most pressing duty of city council members, nor are planning skills the focus of elections. As a result, this duty—particularly the handling of long-term planning goals—is handed over to non-elected officials. In most states, planning commissions, which are comprised of volunteers who are appointed by the mayor or city council, are charged with the long-term planning goals, most specifically producing the general plan. Even then, because the commission donates their hours, additional special task forces or steering committees, planning staff, or hired consultants are often assigned the task of assisting or producing the general plan. This ultimately puts several layers between the publicly-elected officials, the public, and the creation of the guiding documents of the community (Kelly and Becker 2000).

Rural areas are, because of limited funds, highly dependent upon volunteers, or “citizen officials.” As these citizen officials lack formal training in planning, they often become dependent upon a few people who hold paid management or consulting positions, such as a county planner, for advice and expertise (Flora, Flora, and Fey 2004; Heimlich and Anderson 2001). This situation can be problematic particularly if too much control is given to one or two people (Flora, Flora, and Fey 2004) or too many
municipalities depend upon the services of an overtaxed county planner (Heimlich and Anderson 2001).

While public input is mandated by the state prior to most decisions in the form of public hearing, it doesn’t always occur in a useful manner. In the case of the general plan, public input or feedback is often enlisted after it has been mostly written and is in the fine tuning stage (Kelly and Becker 2000). Furthermore, the physical layout and structure of such meetings does not support a genuine opportunity for individuals to express their vision for their community (Innes and Booher 2004).

**Administrative Obstacles.** Another major obstacle which prevents participation in planning is a planner-controlled structure. As discussed earlier, planning has placed the planner in the central role of expert and incorporated minimal public participation for a long time. In addition, many planners hired by municipalities today approach planning, in order to be efficient (save time and money), systematically and leave little room for residents to contribute to decision-making (Kumar 2002).

Rural areas, which often lack the resources to hire a professional planner, are left with a planner-oriented system and volunteers who often have a limited knowledge of planning and its methods. As a result, planning documents—the general plan, land-use ordinances, and so on—are often outdated (Vias and Carruthers 2005; Heimlich and Anderson 2001) and not suited for growth and preservation of community assets.

**Social Obstacles.** The “top-down, expert-driven, rational-scientific” planning practices mentioned above have also created barriers (both perceived and actual) and perpetuated a lack of interest in public participation (Al-Kodmany 2001). As mentioned
above, the most common forum for public participation—public hearings—support methods of expression which differ dramatically from “ordinary conversation.” Innes and Booher (2004) point out that the physical layout and rules for speaking in most public meetings suggests an “us vs. them” atmosphere. Limitations on speaking time and duration favor one-way communication, put the public participants in the role of reactor, and offer no opportunity for reply to responses made by commission or council members (Innes and Booher 2004). They also often favor the loudest, most well-organized voices of interest groups (Rydin and Pennington 2000) over the more quiet individual voice (Brandenburg and Carroll 1995; Kemmis 1990). Researchers suggest that such obstacles have led people to focus on the expression of their individual interests and have discouraged the expression of information that would lead to collective action, such as attachment to place or meanings and values for place (Rydin and Pennington 2000; Kemmis 1990).

Additionally, Pigg and Bradshaw (2003) point out that many rural communities hold plenty of public meetings, but they often fail to access a broad sample of residents, and, therefore, their varying interests and opinions, because they are held at inconvenient times.

A Single-sided Planning System

In addition to the three obstacles described by Kumar, a synoptic approach to planning, heavily focused on quantitative analyses, efficiency, and economy, is a single-sided approach to the physical environment. A holistic view of the landscape, as Tuan (1979) explains, occurs when people take information from two views—vertical and
side—and combine it within their “mind’s eye.” The vertical view, or the utilitarian view, is objective, calculated, and looks at the landscape in terms of how it provides livelihood. However, the side view is an equally important piece of the way a person views their place. It looks at landscapes as a space within which people act or scenery that one contemplates or enjoys. This more “personal, moral, aesthetic” view comes from experiencing place. Lynch (1960) reaffirms this idea, “Nothing is experienced by itself, but always in relations to its surroundings, the sequence of events leading up to it, the memory of past experiences” (1). While the vertical information that comes from looking at the landscape scientifically—the geography, hydrology, etc.—provides valuable information and is much more easily quantified, it often “abstracts” it or looks at a portion of the issue so specifically that it “decontextualizes” it or loses the side view perspective of how that information relates to place (Williams and Patterson 1996).

Part II: Possible Solutions from the Public Participation Movement

What Effective Public Participation Can Do for Place

Even as extra-local social ties are becoming stronger than local ones, Wilkinson (1991) optimistically states that the physical environment will always be a common element between people. He stresses that residents of a community will still work together within their local settlements to at least meet their daily needs, even if only for such basic services as garbage collection or police protection or to solve an occasional community crisis (Wilkinson 1991).
However, with the addition of collaborative participation into planning, place has the potential to become more than just a weak common element. Luloff and Bridger (2003) suggest that a “conscious attempt” to develop relationships and communication across interest groups can result in a stronger “community field” and a greater ability to collectively act and “manage, utilize, and enhance the resources available to them to address local issues and problems” (211-212). They suggest that focusing on the often neglected social aspects of the community can help find ways to solve problems together and encourages the participation in the “development of community,” or the building of folk landscapes, rather than having development occurring “in” a community, as it does in mass landscapes.

A place—a folk landscape—which is built based on traditions, the local culture, and the regional identity exudes stability and permanence even during times of change and growth. Identifying participatory tools and methods which gives citizens the ability to express often latent meanings and attachments they have specific places, patterns, and elements, as well as the opportunity to incorporate the community’s culture, history, and regional identity can provide a holistic view of the local community landscape. Such active participation in the building of place can also strengthen the attachment residents have for their place. Riley (1992) puts it this way, “A landscape that one has personally made obviously has a different potential for attachment than a landscape built for one by others.” Cordes et al. (2003) explain that as citizens of a community gather together and collectively act the resulting actions, called social-emotional goods, are often embedded
in objects and places. That is, a place’s value changes because of increased investment in it.

The Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) approach to community planning (see Kretzmann and McKnight 1993) suggests that the process of inventorying assets and resources (the skills, talents, etc.) of community members which often go “ignored, unrealized, or dismissed” can lead to the recognition that it is “the capacities of the local people and their associations that build powerful communities” (Mathie and Cunningham 2003, 476). The remainder of this study will focus on building a framework for identifying and evaluating methods and tools which communities can use to identifying places and features of importance—the visual assets of place—which have the potential to simultaneously build upon the social assets of place. The identification of such visual assets, which incidentally also often go ignored, unrealized, or dismissed, is the beginning of place-making process which has the potential to offer stability and permanence, as well as preservation of distinctness of place, to places that face growth and change.

A Theoretical Solution

The search, beginning in the 1970s, for more collaborative, participatory-focused planning methods resulted in multiple new approaches to planning or what Lane (2005) calls theoretical pluralism. While all of these approaches sought to move planning away from synoptic planning through greater public participation, incorporating public participation into planning was the central goal in John Friedmann’s transactive planning theory (Lane 2005).
Friedmann’s transactive planning theory (Figure 1) emphasizes the transaction of knowledge and the exchange information between planning and local officials and citizens and, therefore, offers solutions to the obstacles of the current planning techniques for engaging participation which allows participants to convey the traditions, culture, and experiences which are intimately intertwined with the physical landscape. According to Lane (2005), this theory places participation in a central role not only by decentralizing the role of the planner, but also through the purposeful solicitation of the knowledge and values of citizens in a more conversation-friendly format (i.e. face-to-face contact). In addition, involvement is not viewed as a one-time information extracting event, but rather as a learning process which encourages the exchange of information between participants and their involvement in the entire development process. Because this planning approach views participation as a process, emphasis is put on mutual learning which encourages the building of relationships.

Because the transactive planning theory purposefully creates a more conversational (face-to-face) atmosphere, it encourages the expression of a greater range of community voices from those who are not comfortable expressing themselves in a public meeting or hearing. Furthermore, a less formal forum has a greater ability to tap into the local knowledge—the personal, moral, aesthetic or “side” view of place—which is essential to identifying those visual assets which are so closely tied to the culture and history of the community. Such expression offers a more holistic view of place that can balance out the tendency for planning to favor the “vertical” scientific view.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Suggested Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Make participation integral to planning</td>
<td>face-to-face contact with planning community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Decentralize through giving citizens power to direct and control processes</td>
<td>validate local knowledge and expression of ideas by linking them to action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Encourage active engagement in processes placing planner in less central role (provider of information and feedback)</td>
<td>rely on interpersonal dialogue rather than traditional information-extracting techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Put emphasis on goals, such as building relationships, rather than on a &quot;means&quot; of filling state requirements or duties</td>
<td>emphasize mutual learning and personal and institutional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Objectives of Friedmann's transactive planning theory (Lane 2005).
Additionally, giving community members the opportunity to identify these assets of place together—through the process of mutual learning—can foster greater support (and therefore less conflict) as the community grows and changes (Williams and Patterson 1996; Lewis 1979; Shepherd and Bowler 1997). Innes and Booher (2004) sum up the benefits of engaging participation which espouses the objectives of the transactive planning method:

When an inclusive set of citizens can engage in authentic dialogue where all are equally empowered and informed and where they listen and are heard respectfully and when they are working on a task of interest to all, following their own agendas, everyone is changed. They learn new ideas and they often come to recognize that others’ views are legitimate. They can work through issues and create shared meanings as well as the possibility of joint action. (428)

This process of mutually learning together builds relationships and increases the community’s ability to act collectively. It increases a community’s social capital. This is particularly so when the “task of interest to all” is identifying the community’s physical and environmental assets (Flora and Flora 1996).

**Greater Public Participation Is Still Needed**

Many of the tenets of transactive planning can be found in participatory methods and tools which have evolved in the last several decades. Such methods strive to move beyond the obstacles of the existing political and planning systems and replace traditional, one-way communication methods of the past, e.g. surveys and other feedback methods, with “enabling” tools or techniques “that enhance the transactions and knowledge creation” between participants during the participation process (Horelli 2002, 614).
However, even with such participation methods and techniques available, current literature suggests that planning still does not successfully employ effective and enabling. In fact, many are still calling for better expression of and incorporation of public views (Williams and Patterson 1996; Brehm, Eisenhauer, and Krannich 2004; Brandenburg and Carroll 1995). Additionally, researchers are asking for the inclusion of more historical, spatially-specific, and environmental perspectives (side views) into a system which is favoring economic and geographically-universal perspectives (Williams and Patterson 1996; Brehm, Eisenhauer, and Krannich 2004; Brandenburg and Carroll 1995).

Horelli (2002) proposes that enabling participation methods are not often employed because it has been difficult for many Western nations to incorporate new methods of participatory planning into their expert-led, top-down planning systems which are comprised of complex rules and regulations. She also emphasizes that the extent to which these public participation tools and methods have been applied depends greatly upon the existing planning system of a place—on its “political, economic, and administrative cultures” (609).

The objective of the next section of this study is to identify a framework which will not only effectively identify participation methods and practices which will encourage participants to express the visual assets of place (through engaging the tenets of the transactive planning theory), but which can also be successfully implemented in the political, economic, and administrative culture of rural places throughout the state of Utah.
Part III: Building a Framework for Deciphering Effective Participation Methods

The term public participation is broad and varies greatly in its use. Rowe and Frewer (2005) put it this way:

In some cases, the public may “participate” by being the passive recipients of information from the regulators or governing bodies concerned; in other cases, public input may be sought, as in the solicitation of public opinion through questionnaires; and in still other cases, there may be active participation of public representatives in the decision-making process itself, such as through lay representation on an advisory committee. There are important conceptual differences among these different situations that render it inappropriate to describe them all using a single term—be that public participation, public involvement, or whatever. (254)

Because public participation can occur in so many ways and to many different degrees, it has prompted researchers to more specifically define and classify it. In general, classification systems seek to delineate public participation by defining subtypes along a single “dimension” or according to on particular aspect of participation (Rowe and Frewer 2005).

Perhaps one of the earliest and the most widely cited participation classification systems is Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of citizen participation. It defines participation according to its ability to redistribute power from traditional “power holders,” or local leaders, to those who are not typically heard (“have-nots”). Classification systems developed since then have used Arnstein’s ladder as a framework (see Horelli (2002)), while others have attempted to classify participation according to different dimensions of participation, such as extent of public involvement or exchange of information (Pretty et al. 1995; Rowe and Frewer 2005). Even though each of these classifications emphasize
different dimensions, all of them seek to identify ways to distinguish between different approaches to participation.

In order to identify a body of techniques and methods which promote the participatory planning qualities espoused in Friedmann’s transactive planning theory, three classification systems have been selected for the ability of their “dimensions” to lend insight into major tenets of Friedmann’s approach. The three systems selected—Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation, Pretty et al.’s typology of participation, and Rowe and Frewer’s flow of information typology—both individually, and when compared, give a more comprehensive view of the aspects of participation that separate participation methods that strengthen the community field through the engagement of mutual learning and interpersonal dialogue from those which do not. Building such a framework will, potentially, lead us to those methods which enable members of the community to discover and exchange the often latent meanings and attachments they have specific places, patterns, and elements of the landscape and, therefore, lead citizens to more actively participate in the way their community landscape develops.

Arnstein’s Ladder of Citizen Participation (1969)

Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation (Figure 2) identifies eight levels of participation (manipulation, therapy, informing, consultation, placation, partnership, delegated power, and citizen control). These levels are based on degree of citizen control or how well participation methods redistribute power to the public.

Three general categories overarch the eight rungs which signify the amount of influence or power the citizens have in the decision-making portion of the community
Figure 2. Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of citizen participation.
decision-making process. From bottom to top of the ladder these broader categories—
nonparticipation, tokenism, and citizen power—range from not including citizen
participation to allowing citizens full decision-making power.

The two participatory sections of the ladder—tokenism and citizen power—
illustrate just how broad the spectrum of participation really is. The three rungs within
the tokenism section—informing, consultation, and placation—all seek to include
citizens in some way, however minimal it may be. Informing allows participants to
receive information from decision-makers, but does not give the citizens their own the
citizens, however, only when solicited by decision-makers and the solicitation of input
does not ensure that it will influence the decision to be made. Even placation which is at
the higher end of the tokenism section of the ladder allows citizens to be advisors on
specific issues, yet still leaves the decision-making to the local leaders.

Categories within the citizen power section permit a greater degree of decision-
making on the part of the citizens as one progresses up the ladder. This division begins
with partnership, where citizens are encouraged to “negotiate and engage in trade-offs,”
moves to delegated power, where citizens do majority of decision making, and ends with
citizen control, where full decision-making power is in the hands of the citizens.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Arnstein’s Ladder

Strengths. Arnstein’s ladder offers a beginning point—a basic framework—for
understanding how different participation methods permit a range of levels of
involvement in the development of a community. Arnstein’s work also reminds us of the
importance of including all voices, particularly those of that have not been heard in the
past. The best way of enabling those voices is by providing them with the opportunity to influence and be involved in the development of the community.

Weaknesses. Influence is most clearly seen and felt at the decision-making level. However, encouraging people to build relationships through interpersonal dialogue and mutual learning (elements espoused by Friedmann’s theory) also play an important role in the enabling or empowering of participants. In fact, Innes and Booher (2004) assert that the inclusion of “multi-way interaction in which citizens and other players work and talk in formal and informal ways” influences action and how well power is distributed within the community (429). In this regard, what Arnstein’s ladder only hints at (in the description of the partnership level of the ladder it suggests that negotiation and trade-offs occur) how enabling specifically happens. The brevity, and therefore simplicity, of the ladder makes it difficult to understand how these important aspects of the process, in the stages required prior to the final stage of making a decision, specifically affect decision-making power.

Pretty et al.’s Typology of Participation (1995)

Pretty et al. (1995) developed their typology of participation (Figure 3) in response to a difficulty they found in defining the ways people “interpret” the term participation. They believed that a typology would not only help distinguish between different definitions of participation, but also assist with the identification of what participation methods should be used to achieve one’s desired goal. The seven categories vary from the more commonly-used, passive methods and techniques, such as
Figure 3. Pretty et al.'s (1995) typology of participation.
passive participation (where the public is told what is going to happen by the decision-making body) to more interactive methods and techniques, such as self-mobilization (where citizens join together and initiate the public engagement).

The seven categories delineate participation, as does Arnstein's ladder, according to the level of involvement required by or allowed to the public. This typology, on the other hand, offers a more detailed description and more specific information regarding when and how that involvement occurs. In particular, more information is offered regarding whether or not the participation environment is conducive to the expression of the values and meanings associated with place, such as how early and in how many stages of the community building and decision-making process citizens are involved, how often the participation is required (one-time vs. continuous), and the role of the public versus the role of traditional power holders in determining community issues and decision making.

For example, in the interactive participation description suggests an environment of mutual learning where citizens join together with local officials to conduct an analysis, where as in functional participation (just one step away from the “interactive” end of the list) the facilitators are still heavily controlling, defining, and forming the objectives and composition of the groups of participants.

**Strengths and Weaknesses of Pretty et al.’s Typology**

**Strengths.** Pretty et al.’s (1995) typology not only offers information regarding the level of involvement allowed to citizens, but also more detailed information regarding when and how that involvement takes place. This additional information provides insight
into how different types of participation more effectively espouse tenets of transactive planning. For instance, the decentralization of the current planning structure is encouraged through more extensive involvement of participants throughout the entire development process, from analysis to the development of action plans, in the \textit{interactive participation} category. Participation within the \textit{interactive participation} category also encourages using a variety of methods to encourage dialogue and the expression of different perspectives.

\textit{Weaknesses.} In the description of their typology, Pretty et al. (1995) briefly mention that if citizen-supported, “sustainable” development is desired, methods which fit into the \textit{functional participation} category or higher should be used. While their typology puts forward tenets which create a greater degree of involvement, all of which give more power to the participants, they do not specifically explore how that involvement or how the specific aspects of participation form relationships and lead to actions which are more “sustainable”. For example, while it is clear that early involvement offers an opportunity for participants to share more information and feel as if they are making a greater contribution to the process, what actually happens during the participation—how the information is exchanged and negotiated between participants—greatly affects successful sharing of information and, therefore, influences the development of social networks and actions that are supported by those networks.
A Comparison of Arnstein's and Pretty et al.'s Classification Systems

Aligning common elements between Pretty et al.'s (1995) typology descriptions and Arnstein's (1969) ladder (Figure 4) illustrates how one dimension, the degree of involvement, relates to and influences the level of decision-making power. Adding information from Pretty et al.'s typology to Arnstein's shows that enabling participation involves much more than the level of their involvement in making decisions; that is, it is specifically dependent upon how early and involved citizens are in the process.

Examining Pretty et al.'s (1995) descriptions at the division between Arnstein's (1969) degree of tokenism and degree of citizen power exhibits how the extent of involvement contributes to the empowerment of participants. For example, one aspect which distinguishes tokenism from citizen power is when participation is included. That is, participatory methods which utilize public input in the later stages of planning fall on the tokenistic side, whereas, those which fall on the citizen power side do so from the beginning (analysis) to the end (action plan). Participatory methods that do not include participants in the action send the message that the knowledge they share during the analysis stages, such as the identification of important places and features in the physical environment, is not important enough implemented; that is, the information conveyed is not "validated."

Rowe and Frewer's Information Flow Model of Engagement (2005)

More recently, Rowe and Frewer (2005) have offered a typology (Figure 5) which subdivides participation mechanisms according to the level of information flow that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ladder of Citizen Participation</th>
<th>Degree of Tokenism</th>
<th>Degree of Citizen Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnstein (1969)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension #1: Level of Decision-making Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>Citizens are given information from local officials</td>
<td>Citizens have a voice; lack follow-through power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Citizens have a voice; lack follow-through power</td>
<td>Placation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placation</td>
<td>Citizens can advise local officials, yet do not hold decision making power</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension #2: Level of Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typology of Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty et al. (1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSIVE PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>Citizens informed about projects that are going to happen or that have already happened</td>
<td>Information extracted through questionnaires, surveys, etc.; information gathered typically not shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN INFORMATION GIVING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION BY CONSULTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION FOR MATERIAL INCENTIVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNCTIONAL PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTIVE PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-MOBILIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Comparison of Arnstein’s and Pretty et al.’s classification systems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Engagement</th>
<th>Public Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information exchanged between local officials and citizens; typically in groups with face-to-face contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue exists to varying degrees; representatives present from both citizens and local officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue and negotiation used to transform opinions of both local officials and citizens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Consultation</th>
<th>Public Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information conveyed from local officials to citizens through a process initiated by local officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal dialogue exists between local officials and citizens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information elicited from citizens to represent currently held opinions on specific topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Communication</th>
<th>Public Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information conveyed from local officials of initiative to citizens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way information flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen feedback not sought; no mechanism for citizen input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Rowe and Frewer's (2005) information flow model.
occurs between members of the public and the sponsor (local officials) of the participation exercise. Information flow is divided into three categories: public communication, public consultation, and public participation (Note: Rowe and Frewer use the term public engagement in place of the term public participation, as it has been used in this document; that is, to broadly speak of the involvement of the public in community development processes. In their work, the term public participation refers to a more specific type of public engagement.)

Public communication covers the passive forms of participation that occur when information is passed on from the sponsor (local officials or planners) to the public. This is typically a one-way information flow where no public feedback is sought nor is any means provided to the public to communicate a response.

Rowe and Frewer’s second category, public consultation, also involves the passing of information from local officials to public. However, information is typically relayed as part of a process which also involves the solicitation of information—usually on a specific, current subject—from the public as well. This exchange of information is not in the form of dialogue or two-way communication, with both sides acting as equal partners, but rather is controlled by the local officials or planners.

The final category, public participation, entails the exchange of information between the local leaders and the public. Two-way communication occurs, often in a group setting in which members from both groups participate. Viewpoints are shared and opinions are often transformed through conversing back and forth and negotiating.
Strengths and Weaknesses of Rowe and Frewer's Typology

Strengths. Rowe and Frewer's typology adds several important aspects for consideration when deciphering how participation influences the building of community capacity, particularly regarding the opportunity to exchange information and how the exchange and negotiation of information can transform opinions, as well as influence decision-making. It offers more detailed information regarding the means through which involvement actually occurs. It also reveals how important the exchange of information and the aggregation of knowledge is in the participation process and, more particularly, the importance of the manner in which that information is conveyed or exchanged relates to the public's contribution to making decisions for the community. Such information is particularly valuable when seeking ways to encourage the expression of values and meanings associated with important places and features that are currently not being successfully expressed in participatory exercises. Furthermore, many of the variables and tenets of the public participation category in this model, such as face-to-face interaction and emphasis on information exchange, negotiation, and the transformation of opinions through such processes, closely align with the objectives of transactive planning theory and, therefore, how conducive the participation environment is to the expression of personal and aesthetic views of place.

Weaknesses. While Rowe and Frewer discuss in detail how information is exchanged, they primarily focus on the relationship between sponsor, or local officials, and participant and neglect the aspects of information flow and dialogue between participants, particularly those with divergent views.
A Comparison of the Three Classification Systems

When Rowe and Frewer’s third dimension, the flow of information, is added to the public participation framework along with Arnstein and Pretty et al.’s classifications (Figure 6) convergences between the three dimensions can clearly be seen. Four distinct groups emerge from the combined spectrum. The first group (Passive) consists of the most passive form of tokenistic participation. In general, the public are only recipients of information and do not have any means or influence in the process of development or decision-making. This group will not be discussed in detail as this type of participation does not meet the minimum state requirements of public involvement (allowing response through public hearings).

Perhaps the most noticeable, as it covers the largest portion of the spectrum, is the second group (Consultation). It is interesting, but not surprising, that the largest portion of the spectrum discusses tokenistic approaches. This may be due to the predominant use of such approaches in past planning methods, as well as in many current planning systems. In fact, the shortcomings of current participation discussed previously, such as the “us vs. them” environment (Innes and Booher 2004), planner-controlled process (Kumar 2002; Lane 2005; Horelli 2002), feedback-only role (Innes and Booher 2004), are all reflected within the descriptions and tenets of the Consultation group. Similarly, the state-mandated form of public participation—public hearings—also lies within this group, along with other commonly employed participation methods, such as surveys, questionnaires, and other methods of feedback.
In increasing citizen participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ladder of Citizen Participation</th>
<th>Group 2: Consultation</th>
<th>Sub-section: Group Consultation</th>
<th>Group 3: Partnership</th>
<th>Group 4: Citizen Initiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amstein (1969)</td>
<td>Degree of Tokenism</td>
<td>Placation</td>
<td>Degree of Citizen Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension #1: Level of Decision-making Power</td>
<td></td>
<td>citizens can advise local officials and planners, yet do not hold decision making power</td>
<td>citizens and local officials negotiate and engage in trade-offs</td>
<td>citizens hold the majority of decision-making power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Delegated Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizens are given information from local officials and planners</td>
<td>citizens have a voice; lack follow-through power</td>
<td>citizens can advise local officials and planners, yet do not hold decision making power</td>
<td>citizens hold the majority of decision-making power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typology of Participation Pretty et al. (1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension #2: Level of Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PASSIVE PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN INFORMATION GIVING</td>
<td>FUNCTIONAL PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>INTERACTIVE PARTICIPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizens informed about projects that are going to happen or that have already happened</td>
<td>information extracted through questionnaires, surveys, etc.; information gathered typically not shared</td>
<td>participation takes the form of providing resources (e.g. labor) for material return; no long-term investment by public</td>
<td>joint analysis leads to the development of action plans and formation of or strengthening of local institutions; interdisciplinary methods are used to seek multiple perspectives; citizens have control over local decisions and a stake in maintaining practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTICIPATION BY CONSULTATION</td>
<td>local officials and planners determine problems and solutions; modify solutions after listening to public views</td>
<td>groups are formed for predetermined objectives related to a specific project; groups are typically formed in later stages of planning; facilitators heavily involved</td>
<td>initiatives taken outside of institutions; institutions are contacted for guidance, resources, and technical advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTICIPATION FOR MATERIAL INCENTIVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUNCTIONAL PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Flow Model Rowe &amp; Frewer (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension #3: Flow of Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Communication</td>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information conveyed from local officials to citizens</td>
<td>information conveyed from local officials to citizens through a process initiated by local officials</td>
<td>information exchanged between local officials and citizens</td>
<td>dialogue exists to varying degrees (typically in a group setting with representatives from both local officials and citizens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-way information flow</td>
<td>no formal dialogue exists between local officials and citizens</td>
<td>dialogue and negotiation used to transform opinions in members of both local officials and citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizen feedback not sought; no mechanism for citizen input</td>
<td>information elicited from citizens to represent currently held opinions on specific topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Comparison of the three classification systems.
A clear division exists between the tokenistic approaches of the Consultation group and the knowledge and information sharing approaches of the third group (Partnership). The characteristics of all three dimensions in this group seek to offer an environment which is more conducive to the sharing of the culture of the community and are, therefore, closely aligned to the major objectives and suggested responses in Friedmann’s transactive planning theory (Figure 7). Interestingly, this group is a single column; that is, it does not show the diversity or varying degrees of participation within the group that the Consultation group does. This may be due to the fact that these more transactive, enabling methods have only been focused on in the last few decades (Rowe and Frewer 2005; Horelli 2002).

The descriptions within the Partnership group reveal characteristics of participation that move beyond the tokenistic approaches of the Consultation group through the encouragement of collaborative measures which focus on the process rather than the product. The descriptions are imbued with the sharing of local knowledge, engagement in dialogue, face-to-face environments, and encouragement of the transformation of knowledge between participants. All of which create an environment which more favorably allows the sharing of values and meanings, such as those regarding visual elements of the landscape, and which more promotes the building of stronger social capital.

The fourth group (Citizen Initiated) covers a form of participation which endows full decision-making power to the citizens, therefore putting traditional power-holders in the role of advisor or consultant only. While this approach to participation may be the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactive Planning Theory</th>
<th>Partnership Category</th>
<th>Interactive Participation Category</th>
<th>Public Participation Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td><strong>Suggested Response</strong></td>
<td>Arnstein (1969)</td>
<td>Pretty et al. (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1: Make participation</td>
<td>face-to-face contact with planning community</td>
<td>joint analysis</td>
<td>information exchanged between local officials and citizens; typically in groups with face-to-face contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integral to planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Decentralize through</td>
<td>validate local knowledge and expression of ideas by linking them to action</td>
<td>citizens hold the majority of decision-making power</td>
<td>citizens have control over local decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving citizens power to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development of action plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct and control processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Encourage active</td>
<td>rely on interpersonal dialogue rather than traditional information-extracting techniques</td>
<td>interdisciplinary methods used to seek multiple perspectives</td>
<td>dialogue exists to varying degrees; representatives present from both citizens and local officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement in processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>placing planner in less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>central role (provider of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information and feedback)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Put emphasis on goals,</td>
<td>emphasize mutual learning and personal and institutional development</td>
<td>negotiate and engage in trade-offs</td>
<td>formation of local institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as building relation-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>citizens have a stake in maintaining practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ships, rather than on a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;means&quot; of filling state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements or duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Transactive planning theory characteristics in the three classification systems.
most empowering to the citizens themselves, it has several limitations. As the lack of information from Rowe and Frewer's typology might suggest, placing power holders in the role of consultant promotes a one-way communication flow which does not facilitate negotiation and the transformation of opinions between both groups. In this way, information flow is controlled by one group as it is in the public consultation section of Rowe and Frewer's (2005) typology. Although a reversal of roles exists, this form of participation promotes a development process without a forum for dialogue and where, once again, one group controls the flow or solicits the information (asks for feedback, advice, etc.). Furthermore, integrating citizen-controlled practices into current planning systems could be difficult. As mentioned earlier, many places have difficulty incorporating the more enabling participations methods (from the third group) into current planning systems (Horelli 2002). Striving to engage participation at the full citizen power level into a system that is planner-controlled and politically centralized could prove to be much more difficult.

Part IV: Evaluating and Categorizing Public Participation Methods

A great variety and number of participatory tools, methods, and techniques (referred to methods in the remainder of this document) exist (Rowe and Frewer 2005; Horelli 2002). In fact, even Rowe and Frewer (2005), who compiled a list of over a hundred public participation methods for their research purposes, acknowledge that there are "undoubtedly more" as their list has a bias on "UK and US types that appear in the literature or in technical reports that are known to us" (256). Furthermore, they add that
there are also methods which are “composite processes” which incorporate other methods either completely or in part (Rowe and Frewer 2005). Clearly, with such variety and numbers of participation methods, it is important to find a framework for effectively selecting mechanisms which will meet the specific goals for employing the public participation.

Participatory methods which enable members of the community to actively participate in the way their community landscape develops clearly fall within the Partnership Group of the classification system framework (Figure 6). The need to decipher which methods espouse the tenets of this group is reaffirmed by the fact that approaches in the last subsection of the Consultation group—entitled Group Consultation subsection (Figure 6)—include part of the aspects of the transactive planning theory, such as a face-to-face, group format and a degree of interpersonal dialogue. On the other hand, practices from this subsection are also missing key elements of transactive planning theory which encourage interaction and lead to the transformation of ideas and action. For this reason, it is particularly important to understand the purpose of possible participation methods and to discern which of these two groups they most closely match.

*Deriving Principles for Comparison*

In order to evaluate the various participation methods, common principles (Figure 8) were derived from the three classification systems reviewed earlier. As a result, the principles cover the three dimensions of those systems: the level of decision making power, the level of involvement, and the flow of information. Where principles overlapped between dimensions, they were combined. For example, the description of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification System Descriptions</th>
<th>Principle position</th>
<th>Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Consultation</strong></td>
<td>Are participants given:</td>
<td>#1: Decision-making power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizens can advise local officials, yet do not hold decision making power</td>
<td>no decision making power</td>
<td>OR influence through negotiation or delegated power?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership</strong></td>
<td>citizens hold the majority of decision making power</td>
<td>#2: Holistic approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizens and local officials negotiate and engage in trade-offs</td>
<td>covered below (Rowe and Frewer)</td>
<td>#3: Extent of Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Decision-making Power</strong></td>
<td>Is participant involvement:</td>
<td>#4: Involvement in process development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnstein (1966)</td>
<td>narrowly focused or limited to a specific objective</td>
<td>OR holistically approached using various means to acquire multiple perspectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups are formed for predetermined objectives related to a specific project</td>
<td>joint analysis leads to the development of action plans and formation of or strengthening of local institutions</td>
<td>#5: Long-term involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership</strong></td>
<td>Are participant involved:</td>
<td>#6: Information exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizens have a stake in maintaining practices</td>
<td>in a single stage of the process</td>
<td>OR from the beginning (analysis) to the end (action/implementation)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Involvement</strong></td>
<td>Are issues (and assets):</td>
<td>#7: Consensus-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty et al. (1995)</td>
<td>pre-determined (defined and identified) by experts</td>
<td>OR developed and defined in an open process by the participants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups are typically formed in later stages of planning</td>
<td>joint analysis leads to the development of action plans and formation of or strengthening of local institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitators heavily involved</td>
<td>citizens and local officials negotiate and engage in trade-offs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flow of Information</strong></td>
<td>Does involvement in the process:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowe &amp; Frewer (2005)</td>
<td>end when the activity ends</td>
<td>OR go beyond the activity or include some kind of follow-up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information conveyed from local officials to public through a process initiated by local officials</td>
<td>citizens have control over local decisions</td>
<td>covered above (Arnstein)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information exchanged between local officials and citizens; typically in groups with face-to-face contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no formal dialogue exists between local officials and citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dialogue exists to varying degrees; representatives present from both citizens and local officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information elicited from citizens to represent currently held opinions on specific topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dialogue and negotiation used to transform opinions of both local officials and citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Derivation of evaluation principles.
negotiation and engagement in trade-offs under Arnstein’s dimension is sufficiently covered under the description in Rowe and Frewer’s dimension regarding dialogue, negotiation and the transformation of opinions. The two were, therefore, combined into a single principle, #7: Consensus-building, under Rowe and Frewer’s dimension. Seven principles emerged from this process (Figure 8).

**Narrowing the Methods Pool**

Methods from two main publications were selected: *Where Do We Go from Here?: A Review of Community Participation Methods* (Day, Morris, and Knight 1998) and *The Community Planning Handbook: How People Can Shape Their Cities, Towns and Villages in any Part of the World* (Wates 2000). These publications were selected because they not only covered a large number of methods, seventeen and fifty-three respectively, but also because their selections included methods which seek greater involvement in the planning of the local environment. Day, Morris, and Knight (1998) specifically focuses on community participation methods which “aspire to reach the higher rungs of [Arnstein’s] ladder” and “replace, or work along side methods which Arnstein describes as tokenism” (3). Wates’ (2000) work covers a “wide range of methods of community planning” which incorporate “new ways of people interacting, new types of events, new types of organization, new services and new support frameworks” which have been created, within the last several decades, with the intention of increasing community involvement (2).

The seventy methods combined from these two sources were then further narrowed by eliminating methods according to the following criteria:
Information Gathering Only. Methods which did not at least indicate the characteristics that bridge between the two groups, Group Consultation and Partnership, that is include some kind of face-to-face contact and a degree of interpersonal dialogue between participants, were not included in the evaluation. Methods missing such elements tended to be information gathering methods—such as participatory editing (where participants give feedback on a draft of a community document) or interactive displays (where participants can write comments on community information displayed in a location where community members have access to). Such methods fall within the other categories of the Consultation group, but not within the Group Consultation subsection. Clearly, information gathering methods can, if used in conjunction with other methods that seek to build social connections, provide useful information.

Resource Intensive. Because rural areas are highly dependent upon volunteer, citizen officials and often lack the funding, staff, and technical tools for planning (Heimlich and Anderson 2001; Krannich and Petrzelka 2003), methods that require a lot of resources—particularly in the form of time, money, and/or required extensive planner and expert involvement—were also not included. Resource-intensive methods were often part of large, extensive participation effort which are more appropriate for larger, more urban areas. Also, selecting less time-intensive methods could help encourage greater participation, as both urban and rural citizens are less likely to participate in participation methods which are more time-intensive (Putnam 2000).

Single-issue (narrow) Focus. A number of methods focus primarily on solving specific design problems. While some problem-oriented methods are applicable, many of
them were too narrowly focused to incorporate or be altered to fit an asset-based approach to community planning.

Based on these criteria, the seventy methods were narrowed to twelve methods. They are:

- Citizens’ Juries (CJ)
- Community Planning Forum (CPF)
- Community Profiling (CP)
- Design Workshop (DW)
- Forums (F)
- Open Space Technology (OST)
- Photo Survey (PS)
- Reconnaissance Trip (RT)
- Roundtable/Consensus Building (R/CB)
- Parish Maps (PM)
- Small Group Discussion (SGD)
- Village Design Statements (VDS)

Figure 9 offers the comprehensive list of methods along with criteria for inclusion or exclusion in this method analysis. The twelve methods are described in greater detail in Figure 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Citizens' Juries (CJ)  | - a group of 12-25 citizens represents the general public are selected and given a jury-like role (with decision-making power) about a planning/policy issue;  
- the "jury" hears evidence from "witnesses", cross-examines, receives written evidence, discusses and then reports their agreement and disagreement with the policy or issue |
| Community Planning Forum (CPF) | - an open, multipurpose event which typically lasts several hours; often used at the beginning of the development process  
- consists of three parts:  
  1) participants write comments on information which has been assembled and displayed by activity instigators  
  2) a larger group gathers in an open forum to discuss feedback on displays  
  3) smaller workshop groups work around tables on various pre-selected topics (can be selected in the open forum) |
| Community Profiling (CP) | - uses a range of methods (group-oriented, traditional data collection, and presentation techniques) to collect information about the nature, needs, and resources of the community  
- employs visual methods (such as mapping, surveying, charting, etc.), as well as verbal, to provide an alternative method of expression  
- participation occurs at beginning of process for the purpose of getting information from public |
| Design Workshop (DW)    | - hands-on sessions with small groups (8-10 people) of professionals and non-professionals to develop ideas and plans  
- groups work around a table, drawing and making changes to plans/maps or flexible models; different groups can be assigned different issues or at different scales  
- each group discusses options in a structured format with a facilitator leading the discussion; a note-taker records the discussion |
| Forums (F)              | - regular meeting of a group of representatives of organizations and groups (typically key political, professional, economic and social groups, as well as activist and local interest groups)  
- used to exchange information, facilitate discussion, create networks, develop policies & strategies, and identify potential projects  
- often used for larger, regional issues rather than community-level issues |
| Open Space Technology (OST) | - 1-3 day event open all interested people; stakeholders invited a theme is selected and advertised prior to the event; all participants are gathered in an opening circle and generate topics and session leaders participants sign up for smaller group sessions and discussion issues  
- discussion points are recorded, posted, and reviewed at closing circle meeting |

Figure 9. Brief descriptions of participation methods reviewed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Parish Maps (PM)        | • set of loosely-structured activities encourages participation of citizens with variety of interests to express their positive feelings about their locality while walking through it  
• uses a variety of mediums to map important, valued, and threatened characteristics; final map is displayed in public  
• uses additional community planning activities with local schools and community groups |
| Photo Survey (PS)       | • individuals or teams take photos of the neighborhood or community according to a specified theme (can be general or specific); different groups can be assigned different themes  
• printed photos are combined with written comments, feelings, and evaluations  
• information is presented by groups and used for debate and discussion, analysis, and/or design |
| Reconnaissance Trip (RT) | • teams of 15 or less are comprised of local people and technical experts  
• a route—to be walked or driven—is planned to familiarize citizens with the physical environment by passing by key features and “issues”  
• teams take notes, sketch, and discuss as they move through the tour  
• a debriefing is held at end of trip where information collected by different teams is combined |
| Roundtable/Consensus Building (R/CB) | • a group of experts and practitioners meet to discuss and come to a consensus on a specific issue or problem  
• the group is typically between 16-24 members and is headed by a chair or facilitator  
• decision-making is often by vote |
| Small Group Discussion (SGD) | • small groups used to evade intimidating large, expert-run meetings  
• uses a variety of group-oriented methods (e.g., information exchanges, SWOT analyses, initiative and action planning workshops, and focus groups) to encourage the exchange of information, views, and opinions and to incorporate a wide range of voices from different backgrounds, ages, etc. |
| Village Design Statements (VDS) | • citizens are encouraged to define (through the sharing of ideas, taking photos of important places, etc.) the distinctive character of their place  
• coordinators are selected from locals to create design principles based upon the local character  
• work with local planning officials to incorporate these principles into planning policy, and involve the larger public |

Figure 9 (continued). Brief descriptions of participation methods reviewed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Participation Method</th>
<th>Information Gathering Only</th>
<th>Resource Intensive</th>
<th>Single-Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Expert Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens' Juries</td>
<td>Community appraisals</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community arts</td>
<td>Community planning weekends</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community visioning</td>
<td>Credit unions</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forums</td>
<td>Future search</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local exchange trading systems (LETS)</td>
<td>Open space technology</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish maps</td>
<td>Planning for real</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority search</td>
<td>Questionnaire surveys</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round tables/consensus building</td>
<td>Small group discussions</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village design statements</td>
<td>Action planning event</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity week</td>
<td>Architecture center</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art workshop</td>
<td>Award scheme</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing workshop</td>
<td>Choice catalogue</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community design center</td>
<td>Community planning forum</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community profiling</td>
<td>Design assistance team</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design fest</td>
<td>Design game</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design workshop</td>
<td>Development trust</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagrams*</td>
<td>Similar to parish mapping</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic map</td>
<td>Elevation montage</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = Similar to a method (as noted) described in Day, Morris, and Knight 1998's publication.

Figure 10. Methods excluded and included in evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Participation Method</th>
<th>Information Gathering Only</th>
<th>Resource Intensive</th>
<th>Single-Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Expert Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment shop</td>
<td>Feasibility fund</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field workshop</td>
<td>Future search conference</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaming</td>
<td>Ideas competition</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive display</td>
<td>Local design statement*</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping*</td>
<td>Similar to village design statements</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microplanning workshop</td>
<td>Mobile unit</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models</td>
<td>Neighborhood planning office</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper supplement</td>
<td>Open house event</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space workshop*</td>
<td>Similar to open space technology</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory editing</td>
<td>Photo Survey</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning aid scheme</td>
<td>Planning day</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for real</td>
<td>Planning weekend</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing</td>
<td>Process planning session</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnaissance Trip</td>
<td>Review session</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment</td>
<td>Roadshow</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>Street stall</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table scheme display</td>
<td>Task force</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban design studio</td>
<td>User group*</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video soapbox</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Participation methods included in evaluation.
The Evaluation Process

Participation method descriptions from the two sources described above were used to evaluate whether or not the method matched the Group Consultation group or the Partnership group for each principle (Figure 11).

Each participatory method was then assigned to a group (Figure 12) according to the group it predominately matched on all of the principles. None of the methods matched all seven principle positions in either group. Not surprisingly, several methods were split between the two groups, having either three or four positions in both of the groups. These “split” methods were assigned to a separate category and will be referred as the Group Consultation/Partnership group methods for discussion purposes.

Several methods clearly employed techniques that emphasized inventorying of the visual assets of the community’s physical environment directly. Methods which did so are indicated (Figure 11). Methods which did not specifically emphasize the inventory of visual assets offered significant insight into the exchange of information between participants which could be combined with visual asset-identifying techniques from other methods.

Results of the Evaluation

The following discussion will look at the approaches and practices that can be derived from the methods which matched principles of the Partnership group. Such approaches and practices should offer to ways to encourage interaction and the formation of social networks which can lead to greater participation and influence on the way a community landscape develops. In order to do this, each principle will, first, be reviewed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Consultation (GC)</th>
<th>Group Consultation and Partnership Group (GC/P)</th>
<th>Participation (P)</th>
<th>Village Design Statements (VDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Decision Making Power</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>delegated</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Holistic Approach</td>
<td>narrowly focused (specific objective)</td>
<td>variety of methods/multiple perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Extent of Involvement</td>
<td>single stage of the process</td>
<td>beginning (analysis) to end (action plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Involvement in Process Development</td>
<td>heavily structured and lead by experts</td>
<td>participants help define structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5: Long-term Involvement</td>
<td>end with activity</td>
<td>go beyond activity (follow-up)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6: Information Exchange</td>
<td>information conveyed (one-way)</td>
<td>face-to-face exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7: Consensus Building</td>
<td>exchange limited</td>
<td>negotiation encouraged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUP**

- **GC** = Group Consultation group
- **GC/P** = split between Group Consultation and Partnership group
- **P** = Partnership group
- **VISUAL** = groups comprised of both local officials and citizens

Figure 11. Methods evaluation (alphabetical).
### Decision Making Power

- None
- Delegated power

### Holistic Approach

- Narrowly focused
- Multiple perspectives

### Extent of Involvement

- Single stage of process
- Beginning to end (analysis to action plan)

### Involvement in Process Development

- Structured and lead by experts
- Participants help define structure

### Long-term Involvement

- Ends with activity end
- Goes beyond activity (follow-up)

### Information Exchange

- Information conveyed (one-way)
- Face-to-face exchange

### Consensus Building

- Negotiation limited
- Encouraged

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>GC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- GC = Group Consultation group
- P = Partnership group
- ① = groups comprised both local officials and citizens

Figure 12. Methods evaluation by group.
and comparisons will be made between groups (inter-group) and within each group itself (intra-group). The second part of the discussion will include an assessment of how these methods specifically fall short or successfully employ techniques and approaches which embody the Partnership group principle positions. Finally, a discussion of the how these approaches and practices can lead to more enabling participation will occur.

*Evaluation Discussion: Principles Commonly Not Addressed by Methods*

A principle-by-principle comparison of the twelve methods revealed that the subjects of three of the principles, *Decision-making Power* (#1), *Long-term Involvement* (#5), and *Information Exchange* (#6), were commonly not addressed in the method descriptions. This can be seen in the fairly consistent position stance amongst all the methods on each of these principles. Possible reasons for this lack of information are discussed more specifically under each principle discussion below.

**Principle #1: Decision-making Power**

"Are public participants given influence through negotiation or delegated power?"

*Group Comparison.* Three of the twelve reviewed methods indicated delegating some level of decision making power to participants. Only one of the three fell into the Partnership group while the other two predominately matched the Group Consultation group positions. Neither of latter two had the backup from other important components which would indicate that the decision making power was being entrusted to the participants, such as involvement in the action plan (principle #2), or allowing the participants to identify community issues, topics of discussion, etc. (principle #4).
Discussion. Participation guides, such as Day, Morris, and Knight’s and Wates’, are written to be applicable to broad audiences. As individual communities differ in their “political, economic, and administrative cultures” (Horelli 2002, 609), it is understandable that such guides would not be able to address how or who the decision making power should go to in each community. However, this does not decrease the importance of ensuring that participants know—because of how participation is conducted and incorporated—they have influence on decisions made within their community.

Implementing ideas expressed in any participation exercise into decisions has such a great influence on either encouraging or discouraging future participation. Participation is viewed as futile or not worth the participants’ time if power holders appear to not be “listening” or not integrating public input into decisions (Rydin and Pennington 2000).

Principle #5: Long-term Involvement

"Does involvement in the process go beyond the activity or include some kind of follow-up?"

Group Comparison. Only one of the thirteen methods, Forums, mentions long-term involvement (in the form of regular meetings).

Discussion. As discussed earlier, time-consuming participation activities can discourage participation. However, if involvement stops with one activity, as many of these methods do, relationships which were formed can be weakened. In this sense, Principle #3 (Extent of Participation) the extent of involvement affects long-term
involvement, but also the way in which information is exchanged (Principle #6) and the ability of that process to form long-term relationships and "social institutions" (Principle #7) (Rydin and Pennington 2000). While these social institutions can influence the likelihood of follow up meetings occurring, it is important that mechanisms for future involvement—to make adjustments to and update information which changes over time as the physical environment changes and develops—be incorporated and stated as part of the participation exercise itself. In fact, Rydin and Pennington (2000) emphasize that small communities where individuals "repeatedly communicate and interact in a localized physical setting can build rich social networks" and work to disregard the common belief that one person's participation will not have a large enough impact to make it worth their time (160, emphasis added).

Principle #6: Information Exchange

"Is information exchanged in face-to-face dialogue between power holder and public?"

Group Comparison. Rowe and Frewer’s (2005) typology specifically expresses the importance of exchange between sponsors and public participants in order to build social networks. However, because information exchange between all participants is important, methods were evaluated according to the general exchange between participants. Those methods which specifically encouraged face-to-face information exchange between sponsors and public participants were marked uniquely (see Figure 11). Only three of the twelve methods (Reconnaissance Trip, Design Workshop, and Village Design Statements) mentioned such a group composition. However, of the three, Village Design Statements was the only method which placed in the Partnership group. It
was also the only method to include local officials (as opposed to professionals) in that exchange, as well as the only one of the three to utilize such exchange in a negotiation and consensus-building process (Principle #7).

**Discussion.** The importance of an exchange between citizens and decision makers is reaffirmed by Innes and Booher (2004) who assert that when stakeholders—citizens, members of organized interest groups, planners, and public administration—jointly collect information and learn together, citizens are more likely to trust the information that results from the process. Also, having local officials participate can provide access to a point of view that individual citizens typically do not have access to—one which represents the interests of the larger community (Robinson, Shaw, and Davidson 2005). Furthermore, citizens who work with local officials directly know that their view has been respectfully listened to. Likewise, local officials who have heard and been a part of such an exchange are more likely to implement ideas and plans coming from the exchange. This kind of exchange also has the potential to build “rich social networks” which collectively act and which contribute to the community’s ability to deal with change effectively (Innes and Booher 2004; Rydin and Pennington 2000). Clearly, such an exchange directly influences the consensus-building and negotiation process (Principle #7).

**Evaluation Discussion: Discussion of the Remaining Principles**

The remaining four principles varied more dramatically from method to method, and therefore, offer a much richer discussion and more information regarding how
methods successfully employ techniques and approaches which match the Partnership group characteristics.

Principle #2: Holistic Approach

"Is participant involvement holistically approached using various means to acquire multiple perspectives?"

Group Comparison. Only one (Community Profiling) of the seven methods in the Group Consultation group embodied a holistic approach or the using a variety of methods to incorporate multiple voices (Principle #2). However, those voices were not taken advantage of through the consensus-building/negotiation process (Principle #7). On the other hand, all three of the methods in the Group Consultation/Partnership group employed a variety of ways for participants to express their views. Once again, two of those three methods (Design Workshop and Parish Maps) still did not encourage consensus-building and negotiation (Principle #7).

Common Shortcomings. In general, the methods reviewed often did not define the specific composition of the group. Likewise, some methods are vague about the specific means used to engage participants (F). Those methods which did explain their approach to engaging participants and the makeup of their participation groups fell short of matching the Partnership group position on this principle because they employed a single means of participation which is primarily verbal, such as question/answer (interview-like) format (CJ) or feedback or discussion only format (OST). Groups which did not incorporate a variety of viewpoints were either exclusive in their selection of participants
(purposely comprised of experts and practitioners only (R/CB)) or had a small, expert-selected group representing the entire general public (CJ).

**Potential Approaches and Practices.** Methods which positively incorporated a variety of approaches and means and sought to include a more representative view of community did so in the following ways:

- Combined a variety of methods which included various means of expression and gathering information, such as:
  
  - Used group-oriented and traditional data collection and presentation techniques (CP)
  
  - Employed loosely structured techniques in different locations and discussion formats; for example, discussion was encouraged when in direct contact with landscape (e.g. parish walk), when gathered around maps, or through the presentation, and subsequent discussion, of information) (PM)
  
  - Employed visual methods as an alternative mode of expression—such as taking photographs, mapping, surveying, and charting (CP, PS, VDS)
  
  - Encouraged drawing on and making adjustments to (hands-on work) maps or models of the community around a table; different groups work at different scales or on different issues (DW)
  
  - Utilized a variety of media (notes, photos, sketches, film recordings, or informal interviews) to record impressions, values, needs as group tours
the community landscape (PM, RT); these modes of expression were usually complimented by group discussion as well (RT)

- Encouraged, promoted, or selected participants from a wide-range of participants with a variety of interests
  - Displayed community information, such as historical maps, etc, to peak interest, involved schools, etc. (PM)
  - Distributed newsletters, articles, and put on exhibits, etc. to solicit participation from citizens with a variety of interests (VDS)
  - Held a variety of group-oriented workshops with each targeting a different group of people (open to general public, stakeholders, focus groups according to a common element such as similar backgrounds, ages, etc.) (SGD)
  - Formed participation groups comprised of locals and technical experts (RT)

Discussion. A holistic approach to involvement, which incorporates greater representation of the variety of public values as well as variety of means to voice those opinions, clearly has its advantages. However, if the information expressed is not shared with other interested parties and if there is no attempt to reach a unified action (as occurred in most of these methods), those valuable opinions and expressions—such as those which identify important visual assets—are not utilized to build social networks nor to create communities which are developed from within (folk landscapes).
Interestingly, many of the possible approaches and practices collected from the methods reviewed employed planning activities which were hands-on and/or involved direct contact with the physical landscape. Discussing and planning in the physical environment offers opportunities to directly see and define valuable places and elements (express the personal, moral, aesthetic “side view”). Direct interaction with and within the landscape can also add a three-dimensional perspective that often gets lost or abstracted in traditional planning with two-dimensional maps and scientific data (vertical view).

Principle #3: Extent of Involvement

“Are participants involved from the beginning to the end (involved in the action/implementation)?”

Group Comparison. Interestingly, all methods in the Group Consultation group used the participation exercise as part of a single stage (the beginning or information gathering stage) of the process. Unlike the Group Consultation group, the Group Consultation/Partnership group methods varied in the extent of their involvement. Both the Partnership group methods incorporated participant involvement throughout the process.

Common Shortcomings. Those methods which did not incorporate participation from the beginning to the end of the process, typically only included participation in the beginning stage and as a information-collecting mechanism. The methods that did seek to move beyond collecting information to synthesizing, did so by including debate and discussion of the information and attempting to aggregate the information (most often
through the publication and distribution of results in a report). However, the future of that information was often unspecified and further public involvement and action was never stated or clarified.

**Potential Approaches and Practices.** Methods which successfully integrated participation into the later stages of the process typically focused on gathering and aggregating information during the other stages of the process, as well as using that information in action plans (DW, SGD). Some of the mentioned goals or expected outcomes of these methods were:

- Policies, strategies, or new projects (F)
- Design principles to guide future development (which were implemented by working with local planning officials) (VDS)

**Discussion.** A clear increase in the extent of involvement between groups seems to support Arnstein's argument that meaningful participation is more than just involving participants in the information gathering portions of the process (tokenism). It also suggests the importance of public involvement is in the later, decision making stages of the process. It is not surprising, then, that both methods in the Partnership group (*Forums* and *Village Design Statements*) place emphasis on incorporating participation into the formation of concrete outcomes, such as policies, strategies, and design principles to guide future development, as well as ways to implement such outcomes (e.g. working with local planning officials).

Defining specific ways in which the local knowledge gathered, particularly visual assets, can be implemented is of great importance in rural areas where growth is rapidly
 occurring. If visual assets are to be preserved, such information needs to be incorporated into the vision of the municipality (the general plan) and into land-use ordinances prior to proposals for development. Furthermore, a regular review of and revisions to these documents must also occur as the culture of the community and, therefore, the visual assets of the place, is continually changing and evolving.

Principle #4: Involvement in Process Development

"Are issues (and assets) developed and defined in an open process by the participants?"

Group Comparison. Two of the seven methods (Community Profiling and Open Space Technology) in the Group Consultation group allowed participants to play a more central role in identifying issues important to their community. Interestingly, the two methods which did involve participants fell short of incorporating issues generated to lead to any long-term benefits through not incorporating negotiation and consensus-building techniques (Principle #7). Like Principle #3, a greater percentage (two of the three methods) in the Group Consultation/Partnership group allowed participants to identify important community issues and, once again, these methods did not employ negotiation and consensus-building techniques. Both the Partnership group methods sought to include participants in issue-identification. In particular, the Visual Design Statement method not only called for participants to identify assets, needs, and wishes for their community, but also selected local leaders from the participants to solicit information and guide the participation process. Open Space Technology also included the selection of local leaders, based on their skills and talents, as part of the participation exercise.
Common Shortcomings. Most methods excluded the open creation of issues, topics and/or values, as well as the freedom of the participant to be in charge of parts of the event itself by pre-selecting topics, issues, or problems to discuss (even specific tour routes (RT)), and by controlling who and how information was provided (CJ). While the level of involvement in the development of the participation process does not clearly differentiate between groups as Principle #3 did, it does incrementally increase from the Group Consultation group to the Partnership group. However, most of the methods that employ Principle #4 practices in the Group Consultation group and the Group Consultation/Partnership group, through the extension of greater control of issue and topic selection during the process, did not extend greater power to participants in other ways, such as in the action stages of planning (Principle #3) and negotiation and decision making (Principle #7). This may explain why these methods were not placed in the Partnership group category.

Potential Approaches and Practices. Those methods which focused on allowing a more open expression of values, opportunities, and hopes for the community did so in the following ways:

- Explored the nature, needs, and resources of the locality/community in an open, informal manner using both verbal and visual techniques (CP, PM)
- Held sessions specifically to generate topic ideas or exchange development ideas (OST, F)
- Identified and wrote perceived problems, opportunities, and potential projects on a plan or map (DW)
• Defined the distinctive character of place—both assets and needs—through open dialogue (VDS)

Discussion. Focusing only on one, pre-defined problem (CJ, CPF, R/CB) places the participants in a reactive role, rather than in a role where they can freely express their values or the potential assets and opportunities of the community. In general, those who did match the Partnership group position on this principle sought to not only identify needs and problems within the community, but also identify its opportunities and assets.

Focusing on "needs, deficiencies, and problems," according to Kretzmann and McKnight's (1993) Assets-based Community Development (ABCD) model, channels a community's energy away from looking for solutions from local sources (local citizens with expertise) rather than outside of the community itself. The ABCD model points out that if policies and activities identify and engage the citizens' "capacities, skills, and assets", there is a greater chance those citizens will commit to investing their time and resources in the development of their community (Kretzmann and McKnight 1993, 4). Interestingly, ABCD asserts that focusing on utilizing their citizen's assets and skills will also require them to "constantly build and rebuild relationships between and among local residents, local associations, and local institutions" (Kretzmann and McKnight 1993, 6). This gives some credence to the importance of Principle #5: Long-term Involvement as discussed earlier.

The Village Design Statement method specifically engaged citizen leaders in soliciting information and participation from other citizens. Such a technique has the
potential to facilitate greater feedback and involvement from a larger group of citizens as “neighbors” and can often get other neighbors to respond better than professionals.

Utilizing citizen’s assets and skills is also important to the identification of the visual assets of the community landscape. As discussed in detail earlier, the often latent attachments to place—the visual assets of a community landscape—can be revealed through the involvement of “local community experts” in dialogue regarding place.

As mentioned earlier, identifying the visual assets of the community landscape was emphasized by several of the reviewed methods. They used the following means to encourage the participants to express elements of the “side” view of the physical landscape, the majority of which entailed interacting with the landscape directly.

Participants in these methods:

- Discussed and shared ideas about what makes the participants’ community distinct (makes up character of place) (VDS)

- Took photos of important places according to themes, both general and specific in nature; used photos taken as a discussion tool (PS)

- Made community maps—through a variety of different mediums, such as drawings, photographs, filmed, written, etc.—to “chart” values, needs, and wishes for their community; these maps had different emphases, such as activity, hazards, land use, and resources, and/or mental maps (how one sees their place) (PM)

- Discussed and recorded—through note- and photo-taking, drawing sketches, comparing to land use maps to the physical environment—issues as they took a
"trip" (by car or foot) through the physical environment; informal interviews
could also be included as part of the walk (RT)

• Collected information regarding the nature, needs, and resources of the
community through various visual methods (CP):
  o Activity charts—individuals charted their activities of the day or week
    (showed different perspectives, daily routes, etc.)
  o Building surveys—recorded the state of buildings, particularly historic
    buildings
  o Historical profiles—identified key events, beliefs, and trends of the past
    which are important to the future
  o Seasonal calendars—charted changes throughout the year (including
    where seasonal events, yearly traditions, etc. occur)

• Recorded discussion of ideas as groups work around a table, drawing and making
  changes to plans/maps or flexible models; different groups worked on different
  issues or at different scales (DW).

Principle #7: Consensus-building

"Is information exchange, negotiation, and consensus building encouraged?"

Group Comparison. Surprisingly, half of the methods in the Group Consultation
group and less than half (two of the three methods) in the Group Consultation/Partnership
group encouraged consensus building. As consensus-building is an integral part of the
transactive planning theory, it would seem logical that methods that employ such
techniques should naturally fall into the Group Consultation/Partnership group and/or the
Partnership group. A possible explanation may lie in the fact that all of those methods which encouraged consensus-building and negotiation did not include a well-represented group of public participants, nor did they employ multiple ways for those participants to express their views (Principle #2), involve participants in the creation of action plans (Principle #3), or encourage participants in identify issues, assets, and values during the participation process (Principle #4). This suggests that building community capacity may require more than simply “working together.” It also requires defining issues and assets of the community, deciding upon how to use those assets to solve problems (working toward a decision), and a well-represented population.

Common Shortcomings. As all of the methods in our review included some means of sharing and gathering information within a group setting, each had the opportunity to encourage the transformation of opinions through consensus-building and negotiation. However, such a process is not necessarily easy to prescribe a technique for as it depends heavily upon the members of the group, as well as how the meeting is facilitated. Therefore, most of the methods which fell short of meeting the Partnership group position did so because any discussion that may have happened within the group did not (or it was unclear if its purpose was to) lead to action or a decision (it was purely information-gathering) (CP, RT, DW, PM). Furthermore, they also lacked the forum for a “group” consensus to be met (e.g. the decisions were made in a larger group format where the voices of the group could not all be heard or comfortably expressed (OST)).

Potential Approaches and Practices. Encouragement of consensus-building and negotiation was typically addressed in a general manner, such as through the
encouragement of interaction through the exchange of information, opinions, views, and feedback and encouraging debate (CPF, PS, SGD). Only a couple of these methods mentioned reaching conclusions after such an exchange (CI, VPS). *Forums* specifically mentioned consensus-building and the building of relationships and networks as a goal, but offered little information on how that goal could be reached. *Village Design Statements* was the only method to illustrate how consensus might reach fruition (through the development of the design statement).

**Discussion.** Of the seven principles, consensus-building appears to be the most dependent upon the method’s position on the remaining principles. For example, in order to effectively come to a decision, the power must be given to make such a decision (#1), otherwise such an event is viewed as futile. Such advanced means of expression are also facilitated by creating an environment where people feel comfortable to express themselves. Therefore, small groups where face-to-face interaction can happen (#6) is imperative. Employing various methods which encourage participants to mutually learn together (#2), encouraging the expression of their values and opinions through including participants in all parts of the process (#3), as well as entrusting the development of parts of the participation process to the participants (#4) can only help lead to such expression. Even addressing the issue of long-term involvement, particularly if regular meetings are scheduled and group members are reconvened to follow up, can increase trust and comfort expressing values and beliefs. Building trust is necessary, according to Kretzmann and McKnight (1993), to promote development within the community.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The approaches and practices derived from evaluation of the twelve methods offer alternatives to the prevalent, and often inhibiting, practices of current planning systems that too often restrain the expression of important values and expressions. They clearly support the tenets of the transactive planning theory, which espouse pluralism and the engagement of citizens actively in the development of place, as well as provide opportunities for expression of the values, meanings, and attachments people hold for place. In summary, these approaches and practices fulfill the transactive planning theory objectives as follows:

Objective #1: Participation is integral and should include face-to-face contact with planning community. Encourage participation by creating a comfortable forum for discussion through:

- Small groups where people are expressing themselves in “normal modes of communication” through:
  - Combining small groups into large groups to gain an understanding of the overall, comprehensive viewpoint
  - Using these smaller forums, rather than larger gatherings, when making action and implementation decisions
  - Encouraging sharing of information between multiple smaller groups
- Encourage representative groups which involve local officials, professionals and non-professionals, and individuals with different backgrounds and interests within the community

- Use publicity to foster excitement; involve local institutions, such as local schools

- Have local citizens solicit information and participation

**Objective #2: Decentralize through giving citizens power to express their local knowledge and ideas and giving them power to link their ideas to action.** Involve participants in action plans through:

  - Identifying desired product outcomes and methods of implementation
  - Working with local officials to integrate plans into the existing system
  - Selecting leaders from the group of participants
  - Including follow-up mechanisms; in particular, regular meetings in a local setting

**Objective #3: Encourage active engagement in processes by placing the planner in less central role (provider of information and feedback) and relying on interpersonal dialogue, rather than traditional information-extracting techniques.** Encourage discussion through different modes of expression, such as:

  - Both group discussion and individual response
  - Formal (e.g. presentation of information) and informal (e.g. discussion as walk within locality) activities
Objective #4: Put emphasis on goals, such as building relationships by emphasizing mutual learning and personal and institutional development, rather than on a "means" or filling state requirements. Engage people in gathering information and learning together through:

- All of the approaches and practices listed under Objectives #1, #2, and #3
- Identifying community issues or important areas and assets of the community landscape through direct interaction with the landscape

Further Considerations

The above practices are important to successful participation which engages the public in ways that allow meanings and values regarding the community landscape to be expressed and that have the potential to build social relationships and networks. They are not, however, specific methods, which can be employed, but rather are guidelines for selecting and adjusting methods which employ visual asset analysis. Furthermore, each of the twelve methods reviewed holds promise for incorporating greater engagement. These methods, along with others not reviewed in this study, will need to be combined and adjusted to not only incorporate the above practices, but also to create methods which are appropriate to the needs and the distinct social and political cultures, as well as their unique physical environments, of rural communities throughout the state of Utah.
In addition, while visual assets of place have been the emphasis of this study, there are clearly other elements of community planning that need to be considered. Local citizens and local officials, with their knowledge of the complex social and political histories of their locales, will ultimately need to decide how to best apply this information.

Furthermore, the focus of this study has been on planning at the community level. However, a regional perspective may often be appropriate when considering certain elements of the physical environment. For example, certain natural elements, such as topographical features, as well as built elements, such as road systems, that extend beyond community boundaries and affect the greater region.

And finally, this study has been built on the premise that the identification of a community's visual assets prior to growth is imperative to their preservation. However, if the knowledge gained from identifying visual assets is not appropriately and effectively implemented, it loses its value. For this reason, visual assets, in order to be truly preserved, need to be incorporated into the community's guiding documents. Preservation of these assets must not only be incorporated into the community's vision and goals (i.e., the general plan), but more importantly into the legally binding land-use and zoning ordinances.

Further Research

Further research is needed in order to gain a better understanding of the specific needs of Utah's rural communities, as well as how the current planning system is
addressing those needs. Also, a better understanding of the methods planners, private and public, are currently employing and how effective they are in engaging genuine public participation and expression could add valuable insight if added to the findings of this study.

Furthermore, this study generally focused on reviewing research regarding participation in community planning. However, practitioners in planning and landscape architecture employ approaches to city or neighborhood planning which often combine participation methods with inventory and analysis. A brief perusal of these practitioners' published and posted (Internet) guides for city and neighborhood analysis shows the use of varying degrees of public participation. They fluctuate from more tokenistic participation measures, such as visual surveys, used in conjunction with practitioner-led inventories to guides which encourage citizens to conducting their own neighborhood inventories and analyses. In fact, several employ methods reviewed in our study, such as photo surveys and mapping. Specifically looking at how these methods employ public participation and evaluating their effectiveness according to the framework developed in this study could be valuable. Potentially, such an assessment could provide a better understanding of how these tools could be modified in order to more effectively encourage genuine expression while employing the valuable techniques and planning expertise for identifying visual assets of place.

As with the literature reviewed in this study, the majority of these approaches focus on larger city or neighborhood issues. Therefore, such approaches to inventory and analysis would also need to be modified to incorporate issues which specifically affect
rural communities in Utah. For example, the preservation of amenities of the natural environment (e.g., open space, significant natural features, topography, and so on).

Ultimately, the evaluation and modification of such tools could provide a powerful guide to visual asset inventory and analysis for rural communities throughout the State.
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