Planners' Notions of Power

Analysis of Practice Stories About Participatory Planning in Latin America

Theresa Wessels

Master Thesis • 30 credits
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, SLU
Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development
Environmental Communication and Management - Master's Programme
Uppsala 2022

Planners' Notions of Power – Analysis of Practice Stories About Participatory Planning in Latin America

Theresa Wessels

Supervisor:	Camilo Calderon, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Urban and Rural Development
Examiner:	Martin Westin, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Urban and Rural Development
Assistant examiner:	Sara Holmgren, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Urban and Rural Development

Credits:	30 credits
Level:	Second cycle, A2E
Course title:	Master thesis in Environmental science, A2E
Course code:	EX0897
Programme/education:	Environmental Communication and Management - Master's Programme
Course coordinating dept:	Department of Aquatic Sciences and Assessment
Place of publication:	Uppsala
Year of publication:	2022
Online publication:	https://stud.epsilon.slu.se
Keywords:	Power, Participation, Planning, Planner, First Dimension of Power, Second Dimension of Power, Third Dimension of Power, Latin America, Global South

Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development
Division of Environmental Communication

Abstract

Participatory processes are becoming widely established in areas such as policy and planning. They promise to achieve more inclusive, sustainable, and democratic outcomes. However, this is often only an ideal that is not achieved in reality due to dynamic power relations that shape planning practice in various forms. Moreover, planning contexts differ between countries, producing different power dynamics that affect participatory processes. Planners have an essential role in identifying and facilitating different power relations, so their role is often linked to guiding participatory planning processes towards more balanced outcomes. Yet, the issue of power is insufficiently addressed and analyzed in the planning literature of the Global North and the Global South.

To contribute to the discussion on power in participatory planning in the Global South and beyond, this study investigated how planners understand and experience power in Latin America. Therefore, interviews with planners from Argentina, Bolivia, and Colombia were conducted. Their practice stories were analyzed by drawing on the framework of the three dimensions of power. After being introduced to the three dimensions of power, they could relate to the second and third dimensions of power to varying degrees through their practical experience.

The planners' practice stories illustrate how power can be exercised differently in the three dimensions and in the interplay of these dimensions in participatory planning processes. The practice stories make less visible power exercises in the second and third dimensions in planning practice more visible. Thus, they provide practical examples for planners that can promote reflection and understanding of how power works in practice. Furthermore, the findings point to the importance of looking beyond the formal, invited spaces of participatory planning processes and considering exercises of power that take place outside of planning processes. Therefore, the value of this work is that it provides valuable insights that can stimulate reflection and contribute to the development of a discussion on power in participatory planning in the Global South and beyond.

Keywords: Power, Participation, Planning, Planner, First Dimension of Power, Second Dimension of Power, Third Dimension of Power, Latin America, Global South

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

CELAC	Central and Latin American Countries
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Problem Formulation

Participation has become a centerpiece in policy, decision-making, and planning. Participatory processes have been widely established in planning practices on various levels, from local to global (Kamaci 2014). Areas such as environmental governance, natural resource management, or urban planning require a growing involvement of citizen participation (Möckel 2020; Zafra-Calvo et al. 2020). These citizen participation processes are often led by state or government organizations enabling participatory decision-making to solve sustainable development issues, for instance, rapid urbanization, pollution, or increasing social inequalities in the case of urban planning (Amado et al. 2010; Kuddus et al. 2020). Whereby participatory decision-making describes processes that encourage the active involvement and influence of citizens in planning and decision-making as a way to address complex problems (Irvin & Stansburry 2004). While participatory processes promise to achieve more inclusive, sustainable, and democratic outcomes (Innes & Booher 2004; Westin 2021), this is often only an ideal that the reality fails to meet (Calderon 2020; Franzén et al. 2016 see Westin et al. 2021). Pointing to these shortcomings, Ridder and Pahl-Wostl (2005:190) argue that: *"it's no longer a question to carry out participation, but how to carry it out."*

Various scholars consider the reason for these shortcomings to be associated with power (Flyvbjerg & Richardson 2002; Friedmann 1998; Hore et al. 2020). Participatory processes have been criticized for not holding the promise of empowerment of the power- and voiceless but instead being misused to replicate and legitimize the existing power relations (Cooke & Kothari 2001; Williams 2004). Idealized images of participation have depoliticized the concept of participation by falsely assuming that these spaces are balanced in power and that the methods used are neutral (Cornwall 2004; Hore et al. 2020). There has also been little recognition of power struggles, which are fights for control that end with 'winners' and 'losers', as in disputes with a zero-sum nature, one actor's gains are another actor's loss (Flyvbjerg 2004). It has also been neglected that participation is essentially about power and control (Arnstein 1969).

Power is inevitably intertwined with participatory planning practice as dynamic power relations in various forms imbue the planning practice (Albrechts 2003; Hacking & Flynn 2017). Since participatory subspaces are located in wider circles of power, the existing power relations perpetuate these participatory spaces (Hore et al. 2020). For example, the power relations in a region or city are embedded in the societal structures, -alliances, -conflicts, interests, and agendas of the immediate communities they take place in (Cornwall 2004; Hore et al. 2020). Therefore, these power relationships cannot be dropped when entering a participatory planning process, but "the traces of these relationships, and of previous experiences in other spaces, continue to exert an influence on what is said, and what is sayable, within any given space" (Cornwall 2004:80). Moreover, the existing power relationships also determine who and how different groups can enter, act and operate in participatory spaces (Hore et al. 2020). Thus, inside a participatory planning process and outside in the communities' certain groups or actors are privileged, while others are marginalized (Hore et al. 2020).

Participation cannot be free from power since power is everywhere, in societal and institutional structures, cultural norms and values, social relationships, decisions and non-decisions, and daily practices. In this line, Foucault (1980:39) has postulated that "power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes, and everyday lives." The inevitable ubiquity of power and power relations in and around participatory planning processes, whether productive and/or destructive forms, cannot be escaped (Flyvbjerg & Richardson 2002; Westin 2019; Westin et al. 2021). Therefore, "there can be no adequate understanding of planning without placing the analysis of planning within the context of power" (Flyvbjerg 2004:293). Yet the planning literature has been criticized for insufficient treatment of power issues (Griffin 2012; Hacking & Flynn 2017).

This study focuses on planners' notions of power due to their essential role in identifying and facilitating the various power relations (Brownill & Carpenter 2007). In other words, planners operate at the crucial nexus of power relations in participatory planning processes (Brownill & Carpenter 2007). Moreover, the way planners think about and understand power directly influences their subsequent actions regarding power relations in planning (Westin 2019). Therefore, the planner's role is often associated with guiding (conflictual) debates and unequal power relations towards more balanced outcomes (Fox-Rogers & Murphy 2016).

It is important to note that the discussions mentioned above on the relevance of power in participatory planning practices have mainly been conducted in the context of the Global North. Yet, the critique of planning theory and practice in the Global North to be 'generally weak' in the analysis and treatment of power

(Hacking & Flynn 2017) has also been confirmed for planning contexts in the Global South (Mukhopadhyay et al. 2021).

Although studies acknowledge the importance of power for participatory planning, few to no studies focus exclusively on power.[1]For example, a special issue on Latin America dealing with key planning issues from Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Uruguay, and Peru, the issue of power was only briefly mentioned as redistributing power within the institutional framework or influencing decision-making through activities outside the planning process, such as social mobilization (Ortiz 2018). Also, power was mentioned briefly as the political power or planning power of local governments (Elinbaum 2018; Fernández Maldonado 2018; Galland 2018). And lastly, power was shortly elaborated on concerning the transfer of power to local actors in decision-making, implementation, and evaluation (Garcia Ferrari 2018).

Some studies have engaged more deeply with power in terms of hegemonic power. That is the normalization of state-citizen relations, with the state exerting and gaining control over society. However, in response to these unequal state-citizen relationships, citizens in the Global South are creating new spaces in counter-hegemonic movements such as insurgent planning practices to assert their rights and exercise power (Miraftab 2009). Thus, while planning studies engage with the issue of power, there is a lack of studies that focus directly and substantively on the various forms of power in participatory planning. This thesis addresses this gap by focusing on actor- and structure-related exercises of power in participatory planning processes (see section 2).

Conducting studies with a direct focus on power in the Global South is important, given that context plays a vital role in how participatory planning is implemented (Calderon & Westin 2019; Connelly 2010), including how power operates and is exercised (e.g., Connelly 2009). Participatory processes in the Global South are implemented in contexts quite different from the Global North (Cooke & Kothari 2001; de Satge' & Watson 2018). These contexts are characterized in various forms and degrees by "deep and irresolvable conflict, weak and fractured civil society, circumvented regulatory frameworks or weak institutional capacity" (Calderon & Ledo unpublished:5); as well as paternalism, corruption, and political patronage (Calderon & Westin 2019; Cooke & Kothari 2001; de Satgé & Watson 2018). This potentially leads to different power dynamics, including different ways that planners experience, are challenged by and deal with power when facilitating participatory planning processes. In accordance with this Connelly (2010) points out the decisive role planners play in the contexts of the

[1] This claim is based on a review of planning literature focusing on planning in the Global South. It should be noted that the review focused only on studies written in English. Studies with an exclusive focus on power in the Global South may exist in other languages.

Global South as their actions can make the difference between a tyrannous or a transformative participation process.

Given the vital and interrelated nature of power dynamics and situated contexts in participatory planning, it is essential to explore how planners understand and experience power, particularly in the Global South.

1.2 Research Purpose and Research Questions

This thesis is located in the discussions about participatory planning, power, and facilitation, focusing on the Global South and particularly Latin America. This exploratory study aims to investigate planners' notions of power in relation to a three-dimensional power framework (see section 2.2). This will be done by focusing on planners' "practice stories as windows onto the world of planning" (Forester 1999:7) in different planning contexts in Latin America. In addition, the study focuses on identifying which situations and experiences planners refer to when talking about power in their work generally and more explicitly wherein their work, they see the power dimensions.

With this study, I hope to shed more light on how planners in participatory planning practice understand notions of power in relation to their contexts and employ their practice stories as rich insightful accounts to learn from. In other words, "not to talk about "power" rhetorically but to explore power relations practically" (Wagenaar 2011 see Forester 2013:11).

The following research questions guide my work to achieve the aim of this study:

I. *Which notions of power in relation to the three-dimensional power framework do the studied planners have?*

II. *Which practice stories illustrate how their notions of power are experienced in their specific contexts?*

III. *How do the identified power notions of planners and their respective practice stories relate to more general discussions about power in participatory planning in the Global South and beyond?*

Planners[2] were randomly selected to cover different contexts of Latin America, including Argentina, Bolivia, and Colombia. The particular countries were selected

[2] A brief clarification of the terms notions and planner is necessary, as I will mention these terms throughout this thesis. I will refer to the term notion as an individual's conception of something not based on a particular theory but rather grounded in the individual's experience and perceptions. This is in line with the definition of

based on access to two contacts from my supervisor and the resulting contacts generated from the snowball sampling approach. Accordingly, this work does not intend to generalize planners in Latin America or the Global South. However, it uses these different contexts to explore and obtain a richer and more diverse picture of notions and experiences of power in participatory planning. Thus, this thesis attempts to contribute valuable insights that can provoke reflection, challenge assumptions and contribute to the development of a discussion on power in participatory planning in the Global South and beyond.

notion as "an individual's conception or impression of something known, experienced, or imagined" (Merriam Webster n.d.). The term planner is used in this thesis to refer to the interviewees collectively. Although they have different professions (see appendix 1), I only focussed on aspects of their work related to designing and conducting participatory planning processes, resembling tasks of planning practitioners.

2. Literature Review

In this chapter, I draw on power theory to outline power relations present in and around participatory planning processes. Drawing on this, the theoretical framework used in this study is then described.

2.1 Participatory Planning and Power

Participatory planning involves various groups of a community; planners, politicians, citizens, private sector (Westin 2021) and their needs and expectations in the preparation and/or implementation phases (Healey 1998 see Kamaci 2014). As such, participation follows the principle of inclusivity by incorporating previously excluded or marginalized groups to include all relevant stakeholders (Arnstein 1969; Calderon 2013). Further, decision-making processes in participatory planning are based on the ideals of deliberative democracy and communicative rationality (Calderon 2013). Thus, participation is also based on consensus building, which means achieving consensual decisions through dialogue and deliberation. (Calderon 2013; Calderon 2020). Participation is defined as "a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources which affect them" (World Bank 1996:3). The literature on participatory planning often normatively refers to power when it comes to creating equal forms of participation or balancing the powers of different participants. Accordingly, participatory planning processes aim to "shift the power balances to benefit civil society and marginalised communities in order to democratise planning processes from the bottom up" (Watson 2002 see Westin 2019:33). Therefore, another principle of participation is power balance, "giving participants equal say and influence" (Calderon 2020:50; Innes 1998).

However, the above-mentioned normative ideals of participation are challenged by the fact that participatory planning is an intrinsically power-laden practice in which power operates in many different ways in and around planning processes. In order to illustrate what I mean by power-laden practice, I will draw on power theories to support and structure the analysis of the different forms of power that can influence planning.

Societies in which participatory planning takes place are imbued with power systems to uphold social order and keep the system running (Haugaard 2003). As

part of this system, certain actors' have roles, such as politicians, planners or citizens, which give them agency to act within these structures, that is, to exercise power (Haugaard 2003). As such, actors' roles in society can enable powerful elites such as bureaucrats, politicians, or experts to make decisions 'behind closed doors' about a planning process in spaces closed to the broader public (Gaventa 2006). So, despite the ideals of participation, there are actors who have more power, agency, and influence than others. These forms of power are referred to as 'power to' in the power literature. 'Power to' refers to the "ability to act derived from social order" (Westin 2019:85).

Planning processes can be considered as spaces or arenas in society in which power relations are performed (Westin 2019). A sub-from of 'power to' is 'power with', which means "actors engage in concerted action towards shared goals" (Westin 2019:85). This is an essential and underlying idea connected to the practice of participatory planning in defined spaces. A *space* is understood as "the locations, moments and situations where planning actors come together to communicate" (Westin 2019:27), potentially affecting policies, debates or decisions related to their lives (Gaventa 2006). Participatory spaces to which the public is invited by authorities (government, companies) to participate in formalized and regularized structures are referred to as *invited spaces* (Gaventa 2006*)*. To exemplify 'power with' could be seen in the shared effort of invited citizens to design a public green space in a participatory planning process organized by a local authority.

Power relations operate within and between different spaces (Gaventa 2006). As such, 'power with' can also be present in spaces invented outside a formal planning process. *Invented spaces* are ascribed as "self-determined oppositional citizen practices that constitute and claim urban spaces, directly confronting the authorities and the status quo" (Ledo 2021:34). These invented spaces outside the formalized participatory process are strategies of citizens to influence the planning culture, assert their rights and take control of their needs. In Southern planning context, these strategies of exercising power can be regarded as "meaningful mechanisms of balancing power" (Ledo 2021:34). Planning theory often only considers *invited spaces* as participatory practices, overlooking the capacities of *invented spaces* to influence planning processes (Miraftab 2004 see Ledo 2021).

As outlined above, invited planning spaces inevitably require choices about who is included and who is excluded, along with their "knowledge, values, visions and ideas" (Westin 2019:27). These choices are in themselves exercises of power and are associated with another sub-form of 'power to', namely 'power over'. This power tradition is based on ideas of scholars such as Weber, Dahl, Lukes, and others. Their conceptual understanding of power is characterized by "domination, zero-sum

game relationships between the Agents coupled with (potential or actual) resistance and conflict" *(*Ledyaev 2021:74). Whereby zero-sum means that what some actors win, another actor will lose (Westin 2019).

'Power over' can take different forms, some more visible than other more subtle forms (Koglin & Petterson 2017; Lukes 2005). More visible forms of 'power over' encompass direct power of one actor influencing less powerful actors to comply with their interests (Dahl 1957). Less visible or hidden forms of power could be setting the stage and pre-selecting who will (and who will not) be invited to the process and which topics will (and which will not) be discussed (Westin et al. 2021). Lastly, systemic and psychological power are subtle forms of 'power over' below the conscious level, attempting to influence perceptions, cognitions, and preferences aligning with the current social order (Lukes 2005).

In summary, participatory planning processes are embedded in the immediate society in which they take place. These societies are permeated by social order and social power relations. Within social structures, social actors can exercise power to varying degrees depending on their role and position, thus constituting power relations that affect planning processes. Finally, power relations determine, shape, and fill different spaces in and around planning processes.

Normative approaches inherent in planning theory, which focus on 'what should be done', have been criticized for not looking at the planning realities which challenge these normative ideals (Flyvbjerg & Richardson 2002). Therefore, a 'what is actually done' focus on power relations and conflict was proposed, including a more realistic approach to develop more critical thinking and reflexivity in planning practice (Flyvbjerg & Richardson 2002).

Therefore, in this study, I will take a descriptive perspective on participatory planning that unpacks power by investigating 'what is actually done'. Studies with a focus on how power operates in and shapes participatory planning processes usually use a 'power over' perspective (Hoominfar & Radel 2020; Mäntysalo & Saglie 2010; Westin et al. 2021). This power perspective can be found in concepts such as Gaventa's (2006) power cube or the three dimensions of power (Lukes 2005). In the following, I will briefly justify why I have chosen the framework of the three dimensions of power.

As highlighted in this section, participatory planning is an intrinsically power-laden practice, and it is impossible to create a participatory space devoid of power influences. Power works differently, and "there are different dimensions of power relations, which have to be seen in the complexity of planning and should not be limited by choosing to focus either on the structures or the stakeholders" (Koglin &

Petterson 2017:3). Koglin and Petterson (2017) therefore, suggest a broad focus that includes both actors and structures in planning in order to capture them and gain a deeper understanding of existing power relations. Lukes (2005) 'three dimensions of power' framework, which has been further developed and used in the field of power and planning (e.g., Mäntysalo & Saglie 2010; Schmidt-Thomé & Mäntysalo 2014; Westin et al. 2021), enables a view of power that encompasses both structural and inter-actor aspects of power (Schmidt-Thomé & Mäntysalo 2014). The first two dimensions focus on actors, especially their decision-making and non-decision-making behaviour, and the third dimension considers structural or systemic power.

2.2 Three Dimensions of Power

In the following, I will outline the three dimensions of power, the main theoretical framework for this thesis. The framework is based on general understandings and conceptualization of power following scholars such as Dahl (1957) or Lukes (2005). I follow the application of the three dimensions as in Westin and colleagues (2021), who have similarly used the framework to analyze planners' practice stories and understand their notions of power. Also, the dimensions will be explained based on different practice examples from planning research and natural resource management that illustrate these dimensions. The practice cases were selected based on applying the three dimensions to analyze own cases or those of other authors and give an overview of the different forms the dimensions can take in practice. The allocation of an exercise of power to a respective dimension was made by the authors and not by me. Allowing me to compare and contrast the practical examples of the interviewed planners with the practical examples from the literature in other planning contexts.

2.2.1 First Dimension – Visible Processes of Power

The first dimension "visible exercises of power" (Westin et al. 2021) refers to power practices where actor A influences another actor B to do something that is against B's interest and that B would not have done otherwise (Dahl 1957). Lukes (2005) specifies the focus on decision-making behaviour over conflictual issues. The following section is based on a literature review trying to find different practice examples of the dimensions. Four examples were revealed, showing different ways the first dimension can be exercised in planning practice.

First, power of the first dimension was exercised by referring to the authority or position held by an actor that supposedly gives him/her the right to make that decision. In other words, actor A's command is perceived as legitimate and/or

reasonable by another actor, or the position of actor A was achieved through a reasonable and/or legitimate process (Bachrach & Baratz 1970 see Lukes 2005). In a planning context, this could translate to the planner's authority making other actors comply with the planners' interest, as the command or process behind the command is likely to be seen as reasonable or legitimate by other actors (Mäntysalo & Saglie 2010). This way of exercising the first dimension of power was depicted in the context of the Khutsong township resettlement in South Africa (Mupambwa & Zaaiman 2020). In the exemplifying case, the politicians overruled the town planners' interest in a resettlement plan for the entire township as they had a political authority position and the financially backed decision-making capabilities on the project. Thus, by exercising direct power of the first dimensions, politicians redefined the plan from a resettlement project to a housing project, which was in their interest (Mupambwa & Zaaiman 2020).

Another example depicted first-dimensional power being exercised by stipulating conditions related to funding a project for a specific purpose or activity that aligned with the interests of the donating actors. This visible form of power of the first dimension was demonstrated in the case study situated in landscape planning by Warren (2002 see Calderon & Butler 2020). In the planning case, private interests set conditions to the fund for landscape development targeting the specific activity of ski facilities in Scotland (Warren 2002 see Calderon & Butler 2020). Thus, possibly overruling the interest of other actors in the landscape development project, who might have had other interests and plans for the region.

Thirdly, first-dimensional power was exercised in a planning practice by powerful actors presenting their preferred option as serving the common good, thus making it impossible for participating actors to oppose it. This form of first-dimensional power was illustrated in urban planning cases from Norway and Finland by Mäntysalo and Saglie (2010). In both cases, authorities aimed to raise support for the development plans by pointing out the common good such as upgrading a football field in Norway. While in Finland, the increased tax income for the municipality through work migrants was advertised (Mäntysalo & Saglie 2010).

A final example of how the first dimension can be exercised is the use of force by coercing weaker actors to comply with the wishes of the powerful actors. A practice example from natural resource management that illustrates this visible form of first-dimensional power is a case of forced relocation of local communities (Raik et al. 2008). In Botswana, locals living in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve were moved to areas outside the reserves to create a protected area (Hitchcock 2002 see Raik et al. 2008).

2.2.2 Second Dimension – Hidden Processes of Power

The second dimension is also called "hidden power processes" (Westin et al. 2021). It refers to the fact that some actors (e.g., planners) control and/or manipulate the information available to other actors in a participatory planning process (Mäntysalo & Saglie 2010). Thus, influencing and/or limiting the scope of the decision-making process (Barach & Baratz 2012 see Calderon & Butler 2020). In other words, these hidden power processes influence "who gets into participatory processes and what gets on the agenda" (Westin et al. 2021:117). This dimension is sometimes also referred to as nondecision-making since power is exercised to guarantee the inaction of a particular actor (Raik et al. 2008). The literature review revealed three examples showing different ways the second dimension can be exercised.

One way of exercising second-dimensional power was agenda-setting, which is the manipulation of participants' knowledge about alternative planning options or the manipulation of consent by excluding opposing actors from the decision-making process. Examples of how this form of power can be exercised were seen in Mäntysalo and Saglie's (2010) housing planning cases in Norway and Finland. In the Norwegian case, the chosen housing option was presented as conforming to the existing densification policy, although other development options would also have been in line with this policy. In this case, the municipality attempted to manipulate participants' knowledge about alternative housing options, which would be in line with the existing densification policy. In the Finnish case, the municipality manipulated consent to a housing plan, trying to exclude the local environmental organization in anticipation of their objections to obtain a consensus on the development plan.

Another example of power aligning with the second dimension was seen in actors framing important or controversial terms or issues that will be discussed in the participatory process, thus closing or hiding alternative perspectives or options. An example illustrating this form of second-dimensional power comes from the field of natural resource management. For instance, in deer management, the deer manager limited the possible measures focusing on deer population reduction instead of alternative actions such as deer-vehicle accident reduction (Raik & Wilson 2006 see Raik et al. 2008).

Finally, another example of how hidden power in the second dimension can also be exercised is through inaction. An actor in a critical, superior position does nothing, withholds information and necessary bureaucratic permits. A case exemplifying this second-dimensional power exercise unfolded during the construction of four dams in Iran and the affected communities. The authorities did not communicate any plans for resettlement or compensation to the affected communities for many years. At the same time, the communities were unable to obtain permission to establish new businesses or build within the villages. In this

way, the state exercised hidden power over the communities and forced them to leave their land on the state's terms by withholding any action or decision and refraining from sharing plans with them (Hoominfar & Radel 2020).

2.2.3 Third Dimension – Invisible Processes of Power

The last dimension of power is also known as "invisible power processes" (Westin et al. 2021). This dimension deals with structural or systemic forces that are often difficult to perceive and operate in the psychological and ideological spheres (Westin et al. 2021). These structural power processes result in subtle inequalities in the power relations between individuals and social groups of a society that privilege some groups and discriminate against others. These inequalities are collectively maintained through daily practices and cultural habits (Sager 1994 see Mäntysalo & Saglie 2010). Or in Lukes words, power in this dimension operates "by shaping (…) perceptions, cognitions and preferences in such a way (…) [to accept the] role in the existing order of things" (Lukes 2005:11). The literature review revealed three examples showing different ways the third dimension can be exercised in participatory planning.

First, it has been shown that power of the third dimension can be exercised through discourse. Powerful actors can try to tap into this discourse and thus make people accept the interests of the powerful actors as their own by influencing people's perceptions and beliefs according to the position conveyed in the discourse (Lukes 2005 see Hoominfar & Radel 2020). The example of exercising third-dimensional power was demonstrated in the case of dam constructions in different parts of Iran, illustrating how the government attempted to tap into a discourse around dams' national and local benefits (Hoominfar & Radel 2020). Thereby invisibly getting the affected communities to submit to the construction of the dams.

Secondly, the power of the third dimension was seen to operate in systemic inequalities or knowledge-based inequalities, such that citizens are unaware of their rights to participate. A planning case exemplifying this invisible form of third-dimensional power was set around the transformation of a district in the city of Uppsala (Westin et al. 2021). Planners pointed to unequal opportunities to participate in planning processes unless invited by planning authorities. Also, people's ignorance about participatory planning processes or their lack of opportunities to participate in decision-making processes was outlined. Demonstrating how invisible systemic power prevents citizens from engaging in participatory processes (Westin et al. 2021).

Thirdly, third-dimensional power was seen to be embedded in deeper legal and structural frameworks that privilege certain actors over others. This form of power was exemplified in the housing cases in Norway and Finland, which uncovered

deeper frameworks in planning cultures and planning laws. These gave private developers a privileged position and the "possibility for preliminary partnership planning before the initial initiation of the participatory planning process" (Mäntysalo & Saglie 2010:335). Thus, these invisible structures favoured developers and private interests over public interests.

After describing the three dimensions, it has to be pointed out that the focus has been on *'power over',* which is only one form of power (Lukes 2005). Moreover, 'power over' is usually viewed negatively as domination or repressive, which is seen as problematic (Gaventa & Cornwall 2008; Westin 2019). Viewing 'power over' as negative and dominating risks being reductionist and potentially trying to escape all forms of power hastily, thereby missing the opportunity for critical reflection on different forms of power (Westin 2019). As power is not necessarily negative but can also be constructive and a necessity for constituting and maintaining the conditions for democracy (Haugaard 2015 see Westin et al. 2021; Westin 2019). Accordingly, Haugaard (2012) has investigated how the same processes which Lukes described in the three dimensions have the potential to be 'emancipating'. Thus, underlining that the "enabling emancipatory power just has to cope with coercive power as domination in order to be effective" (Schmidt-Thomé & Mäntysalo 2014:118).

In line with this Westin (2019) has distinguished between two forms of 'power over'. *'Illegitimate power over'* refers to "actors get other actors to do what they otherwise would not have done, in a manner that is seen as unacceptable" (Westin 2019:85), and *'legitimate power over'* is understood as "actors get other actors to do what they otherwise would not have done, in a manner that is seen as acceptable "(Westin 2019:85). This highlights the contested normative and contextual character of power, as different actors can perceive it as either legitimate or illegitimate. Furthermore, the distinction between different forms of 'power over' can avoid the attempt to illusively get rid of all forms of power over but instead invites critical reflection (Westin 2019).

Regarding the theoretical framework I chose, it has to be noted that a fourth dimension of power exists, which deals with "the social construction of social subjects, with particular predispositions" (Haugaard 2021:168). In other words, it concerns the power to create social subjects (Haugaard 2020). I did not include the fourth dimension for two reasons. First, this dimension is a social construction that is unlikely to lend itself to an investigation by the approach and methodology I have chosen, such as conducting interviews. Also, this dimension is beyond the conscious level and would require much subjective interpretation from my side about a society or culture that I have never visited. Secondly, the fourth dimension was also not included in similar studies analyzing power in planning (see above).

3. Research Design and Methods

This chapter is structured as follows. First, I will outline the chosen research framework and how the philosophical worldview interrelates with the interpretative approach and the data collection method. Furthermore, I will explain how the theoretical framework for analyzing the collected qualitative data was applied. Finally, the chapter will be concluded with a brief methodological reflection.

3.1 Research Approach and Logic of Inquiry

The term philosophical worldview means "a basic set of beliefs that guide action" (Guba 1990:17 see Creswell & Creswell 2018). A constructivist worldview assumes that in social interactions, humans construct meaning based on which they engage with the world (Creswell & Creswell 2018). Thus, according to this worldview, there exists a multitude of perceptions of the world (Creswell & Creswell 2018; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow 2011). These meaning constructions are context and place-dependent and are reflected in the culture of a community (Creswell & Creswell 2018). These philosophical assumptions guide what and how to do research. In line with this, I decided on an interpretative research approach as it is compatible with the constructivist worldview, accentuating the existence of plural, intersubjectively constructed, and experienced realities (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow 2011). Moreover, interpretative research addresses context-specific "meaning-making practices of actors" (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow 2011:1). The interpretative approach and the constructivist worldview are in concert with the aim of this thesis to explore planners' meaning-making, particularly regarding their notions of power in participatory processes.

I choose an abductive logic of inquiry to accompany the interpretative research. The process of abduction point of departure is a puzzle. In the following' puzzling-out process', the researcher moves iteratively (back and forth) between the collected data and the theories and concepts from literature (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow 2011; Westin 2019). This means to begin with the puzzle (see section 1.1 problem formulation) and then proceed in cycles between the interviews and power theory (see section 2), until I believe to have established a substantial connection between the interview materials and the power theory (Möckel 2020; Westin 2019).

In order to identify and elicit the notions of power in participatory processes from the planners' practice stories (see below), I draw from my theoretical framework of the three dimensions of power (see section 2.2). The three dimensions of power were considered a suitable framework as it guides the analysis process with a power focus. Next, the data collection process will be outlined.

3.2 Data Collection Procedure

In this master thesis research, I am investigating planners' notions of power in relation to the three-dimensional power framework. Thus, other perspectives that are also important in participatory planning, such as citizens, public and private sector, NGOs, or politicians, were not included. As a data collection method, I interviewed nine planners (six men, three women) working (mainly) within urban planning. All interviewees are active in the field of planning and have previous experience with the role of a planner. Beginning with initial contacts, I made new contacts using the snowballing method (Parker et al. 2019). Due to confidentiality reasons, the interviewees are anonymously presented in an overview (see appendix 1).

Following Forrester's and colleagues (2005) method of gathering practitioner profiles, I seek to explore planners' notions of power through interviews about personal practice stories in participatory planning. The interview method was chosen because it is considered a useful method to approach planners' lifeworlds (Kvale 2007 see Westin 2019) and is suitable to extract individual meaning-making (Creswell & Creswell 2018). In addition, I hoped to find rich narratives from the practice stories that would make the often subliminal notions of power more accessible (Westin 2019). This disclosure of underlying notions is to be accomplished by an abductive approach between the interviews and the theoretical framework of the three dimensions.

As a first step, I created a semi-structured interview guide with open-ended explorative questions (see appendix 2). The interview guide was inspired by the Profiles of Practitioners website by Forester and colleagues (2005). The underlying rationale is that by asking planners about their practical experiences, one learns about their perceptions, behaviour, and reasoning based on what actually happens in planning practice. Consequently, a more accurate picture of the analytical concept (in my case, planners' notions of power) in which one is interested is obtained. This corresponds to my focus on "what is actually done" in planning practice (Flyvbjerg & Richardson 2002) highlighted in the previous chapter.

The interview consisted of four parts (see appendix 2). In the second part of the interview, I generally inquired about their role, the processes, and the context of the participatory processes in their country. The third part asked them to describe a

situation in their work as planners that they associate with power. Previously, I had not given them a specific definition or dimension of power but merely informed them in email contact before the interview that I would ask them to describe situations in their work that they considered relevant to the issue of power. In the last part, I introduced the three-dimensional power framework to the interviewees and asked them if they could relate to the power dimensions through their practical experience. This last part intended to determine if the planners could understand and relate to the dimensions of power they had not mentioned before.

The interview guide was a general orientation, during the interviewees, I aimed to be as flexible as possible, allowing me to respond to the interviewee's stories and thoughts. Thus, sometimes questions were skipped, added, or asked in a different order depending on the interview situation. All interviewees were conducted via Zoom and lasted between 60 and 75 minutes. Three of the nine interviews were conducted in Spanish and simultaneously translated into English for me by a native speaker.

The interviews were recorded and transcribed into written text. For this, I used the transcription software otter.ai and then, in a second step, listened to each interview again and corrected the transcripts the software created. As part of my manual transcription and to ensure consistent transcripts, I employed my own transcription rules. These incorporated, for instance, to shape the transcripts into a formal written text (verbatim), leaving out word fillers such as 'um' and the like. This choice was motivated by my aim and my analysis method, for which I do not require verbal utterances.

In the next step, the transcripts were analyzed based on the theoretical framework of the three dimensions of power. Considering the interview guide, I first looked at the stories that the planners told when asked to describe a situation in their work that they would associate with power and identified which dimensions of power were included in these stories. This part was designed to explore the planners' notions of power without influencing them by defining power. Finally, the practice stories they told after being introduced to the three dimensions of power were analyzed. I determined whether the person interviewed could not only understand the dimension conceptually but also relate to it through a practical experience. If the person could refer to a dimension that they had not mentioned in the previous part, it was assumed that these ideas of power were also present in that planner, although perhaps less pronounced since they were provided with a tool (three dimensions of power framework) to support their reflection. Next, I will reflect on my methodological choices.

3.3 Methodological Reflections

A first issue that has to be regarded about the data collection is my sample size, which is not representative of planners in Latin America. Therefore, the results are not generalizable. However, the diversity of contexts I covered could be considered a strength, offering an in-depth view of different perspectives on power or, in other words, "new insights but no universal truth" (Koglin & Petterson 2017:3). This is in accordance with my research aim (see section 1.2). Further, I hope to provide insightful accounts of practice stories to contribute to the discussion on power in participatory planning in the Global South and beyond.

Another aspect is that my data collection was constrained by the need to conduct the interviews via Zoom and the sometimes uncontrollable internet connection, which once in a while resulted in delays and the consequent loss of words or sentences. In most of these cases, I could infer the meaning of what had been lost from the context of what had been said. In two cases, I decided to email the interviewees to ask if they could clarify a particular point again.

A final aspect of the data collection that should be reflected is that three of the interviews were conducted in Spanish, and the use of a translator constrained the communication flow of the interview and possibly influenced the wording. However, I am not interested in the linguistic choice of words but in the notions of power that I was able to derive and uncover from the transcripts.

Regarding the analysis, it has to be reflected that as a researcher, I am the main instrument of data generation and interpreting the meaning-making of the planners' (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow 2011). Every researcher has a hard to overcoming bias. I attempted to counter this bias by being reflective, transparent, and considerate about my positionality (Schwarz-Shea & Yanow 2013 see Boesten 2021). I was very aware of the circumstance that I have been educated in the Global North, and the theories I draw on also come from the Global North, while I try to analyze situations and stories from Southern contexts. For this reason, I critically reviewed my assumptions and, for instance, asked clarifying questions in the interviews. To avoid, for example, filling what 'normal gender issues' are with my assumptions or conceptions.

4. Results

The following chapter answers the first two research questions. Concerning the first research question, the planners' notions of power are outlined in relation to the three dimensions of power. Further, answering the second research question, practice stories that illustrate planners' notions of power will be presented. The practice stories are presented with an indication of which part of the interview they were mentioned. Considering the interview design, a first step was to explore what planners in general associate with power in their work. Then, they were introduced to the three dimensions and asked to relate them to their practical experiences (see section 3).

Due to the importance of context (see section 1.1), I decided to group planners according to the country they work in. Planners' understanding of the legal and institutional contexts in which participatory planning occurs in their respective countries will be outlined before focusing on the planners' notions of power from their practice stories. Since the focus of this paper is on the notions of power, the specifics of the normative context will not be explored further, apart from the interviewees' reports.

In order not to give an exhaustive account of every situation every interviewed planner mentioned, the results are presented more as an overview of meaningful situations and experiences of planners that illustrate their notions of power. By meaningful, I mean that I have selected stories that illustrate the planner's notions of power, succinctly capture the planner's view, and are either representative of what other planners have reported from this context or are distinctive from other planners' notions and examples (similar to Lingard's 2019 principles of authenticity).

4.1 Argentina

The legal and institutional setting for participation in Argentina was presented as follows. It was estimated that the existing law on participation is relatively unknown (interviewee 6). Moreover, while legal regulations stipulate that citizens should be given the opportunity to express their opinion on a planned project, it is not legally binding to implement the citizens' decision (interviewee 7). Nevertheless, the municipality recommends that participatory methods be included

in the planning, although the form and extent of participation may vary from project to project (interviewees 6, 7). An overview of meaningful situations and experiences that exemplify Argentinian planners' held notions of power will be outlined in the following.

4.1.1 First Dimension of Power

The practice stories of the Argentinean planners showed that visible power, as understood in the first dimension (see section 2.2), can be expressed in different forms and by different actors.

Visible power was seen to be manifested in a public hearing over a planned project in the city. Interviewee 7 reported that an affected community was given the opportunity to express its opinion on a planned project, as required by the legal requirements for consultation of the population. However, the same regulation includes that decisions made through participation or consultation procedures are not legally binding. The final decision is, in fact, a political decision. When asked about situations they associate with power, Interviewee 7 explained the following planning activity:

> "Like a public hearing, everyone that wants can sign up, speak against or in favour the project. (…) The people's hearings lasted two months. Person after person after person. And like mainly 98% of the people that talked, talked against the project. The project ended up being voted yes. That's the power structure." (Interviewee 7)

In the above-described practice story, the visible power of the city government was enabled through regulations about participation in planning. However, in another practice story, Interviewee 7 highlighted how in a different project, in a different part of the city the same powerful actor, the city government, was not able to use the power given to them by regulations. Interviewee 7's second practice story referred to a case where the government administration planned a public park in an informal community. During the participatory planning process, a local representative demanded that a football pitch be included in the public space, but this was rejected by the government administration. As a result, the local community boycotted all construction work related to this public park. It was only when the government agreed to include a football pitch that construction work resumed. This is how interviewee 7 described the use of power after being introduced to the first dimension of power:

> "But one [actor] came strongly and said to have a soccer court in the part and the administration first said no, then these social actors started to like paralysing the construction. Not letting people work or going to work. So, the administration like gave him what he wanted, which was like soccer court, a small one in the park. Then the works, the construction started again." (Interviewee 7)

As in the first practice story, it also becomes clear in this story that the first dimension of power operated outside the participatory process itself. The difference between the two stories lies in the actors who exercise power in response to decisions made in participatory planning processes that went against their interests. Likewise, the practice story told by interviewee 6 emphasized the idea that visible power is exercised outside the participatory planning process to influence a decision within the process. She reported that a community had opted for a path in a park through a participatory process, but their wish was overruled by the architect during the implementation phase. When asked about situations interviewee 6 associates with power, she described the following practice story:

> "The people (…) they wanted a path in one part of the park and the architect didn't want to materialize it, because he didn't think it was necessary. And then it was necessary. The neighbourhood made it themselves (…)." (Interviewee 6)

This example involved two separate exercises of power outside the participatory process. First, on the part of the architect, and secondly, it showed how citizens move outside the actual participatory process when they exercise power to assert their interests. In summary, the practice show how power relations between actors are embedded in and influenced by the larger context. For example, through institutional regulations, but also how visible power is used by actors based on strategies outside the participatory planning process to achieve their interests.

4.1.2 Second Dimension of Power

One practice story shared by an Argentinian planner about situations she associates with power focused on ways she as planner exercised power in her work when designing and managing the participatory processes. She referred to her use of power when identifying and inviting stakeholders, deciding on the topics of meetings, and taking and giving voice to participants (Interviewee 6). These power exercises are in line with second-dimensional power (see section 2.2). Additionally, both planners stated that sometimes their agenda is reviewed by political actors telling them to change the wording of a certain issue or do not raise particular topics (Interviewee 6, 7). These are power exercises of the first dimension, as planners have to comply with the politicians' demands.

The following practice story showed the exercise of both dimensions of power and was told after the planner had been introduced to the second dimension of power. When describing a proposed project, the planner wanted to use the word 'wetlands' to describe the area where the development project should be implemented. However, she was censured by the government administration for her choice of words.

> "I want to use the word wetlands and they [the city administration] don't allow me to use the word wetlands, because if you say wetlands, it's like, oh, we have to really preserve this." (Interviewee 6)

The city administration perceived the initially intended term 'wetland' as potentially causing a pro-environmental uproar, so the planner was advised to use another, less awareness-raising term instead. Power of the first dimension was exercised through the censorship of the city administration. It affected the planner's use of second dimension power in shaping the agenda and showed that first dimension power can be exercised on the exercise of second dimension power. Therefore, the story also illustrates the interrelationship between the first and second dimensions.

4.1.3 Third Dimension of Power

A practice example that was narrated after being introduced to the third dimension of power reflected upon the culturally determined norms regarding the role of women. The planner highlighted that in Argentinian culture, women are in a subordinate position, which makes them voiceless, as culturally men are in more powerful positions (interviewee 6). Accordingly, the planner described the following situation, illustrating her notions of gender-based power in a particular planning context.

> "The only public spaces in those neighborhoods are football fields used by men and when we were designing this new public space, this park there was a meeting with a lot of men and they wanted a football field in that new public space (…) And there was a girl, this was shocking. (…) This girl was standing up; she was my age. And she said: 'I'm training hockey for girls. We never have a space. I really need that in the park.' She was very brave to do that. I wouldn't ever do that in that context. It was a very vulnerable neighborhood. Not safe to be (…) And the girl stands up and says that I was afraid for her. And (…) the moderator heard her voice (…) and said okay. You know, again, the image of a boy, a male saying well okay, yes, she may have the right to have a place." (Interviewee 6)

The practice story of the female planner (interviewee 6) presented above differed from the male perspective of interviewee 7, who spoke more in general terms of society opening up to the gender equality discourse and then referred to their goals of including various social actors, for example by offering childcare to mothers during the participation events or by providing a sign language interpreter. This points out an interesting aspect. While both planners understood the third dimension conceptually, the female planner was able to relate to a practical situation she had experienced. In contrast, interviewee 7 understood the dimension conceptually but could not relate with a practical experience (at least not within the time of the interview). This difference illustrates the essence of third-dimensional power. Because third-dimensional power operates at an unconscious level, it is difficult and challenging to unpack how power affects oneself or others unless, like the

female planner, one has experienced it personally and is therefore more receptive to recognizing it in other situations.

In summary the practice stories of Argentinian planners depict the following. Both associated power in their work with situations related to the first dimension of power exercised by the city administration and citizens. Additionally, interviewee 6 associated power in her work with second-dimensional power exercised by planners over the participatory design and process. This underlines that their notions of power related to the first dimension, and for interviewee 6 also, the second dimension of power was more present and therefore highlighted in this part of the interview.

After being introduced to the three dimensions of power, both planners understood the dimensions, and while interviewee 6 managed to relate to the third dimension of power through a practice story, interviewee 7 could relate to the second and to certain degrees to the third dimension. This illustrates that interviewee 6 also holds notions of power regarding the third dimension of power, which she can reflect upon with the help of the definition of the third dimension of power. Next, Bolivian planners' notions of power and their practice stories will be outlined.

4.2 Bolivia

The legal context for planning processes in Bolivia was described by planners as strongly recommending public consultation, ranging from providing information to citizens and seeking their opinions on matters of common interest to working with social actors. However, it was also indicated that citizens' opinions and suggestions are not binding but should be considered by authorities (Interviewee 1).

4.2.1 First Dimension of Power

The Bolivian practice stories, like the Argentinians, also illustrated how visible power was exercised outside of participatory planning processes. Some practical examples involved political actors exercising power in the first dimension outside the planning process, making decisions that suited their interests and overriding the interests and preferences of other actors inside a planning process (Interviewee 3, 8). For instance, when asked about a situation he associates with power, interviewee 3 referred to the following situation where a political actor's visible power aligns with his political interests.

> "a major (…) is reluctant to coordinate and to arrange projects in the metropolitan regions. He is only trying to implement his projects, but without thinking about the impacts in the region." (Interviewee 3)

Another practice example displays how communities exercised first-dimensional power. Unlike in the Argentinian case above where a community boycotted the planning process, in the Bolivian case, the communities exercised visible power within the participatory planning process. The participatory process took place at a sports arena (coliseum) between different stakeholders involving indigenous communities, a technical team, government representatives and representatives of a mining company and revolved around an environmental impact assessment (audit) for mining activity. Interviewee 1 described the use of power as follows:

> "In this meeting the community representatives turned upset because they believed that the audit results would be favourable to the concessionaires (mining companies), then all the community became against the government (environmental authority) officers. At that moment members of the community closed the coliseum and asked to talk directly to the Environmental Minister in person, while they kept inside all the technical team, concessionaires and government representatives." (Interviewee 1)[3]

After negotiations and a commitment to an objective and impartial environmental impact assessment, the communities reopened the coliseum (Interviewee 1). This incident showed how communities expressed their dissatisfaction with the process and challenged the way power was exercised over them.

In summary, the practice stories of interviewed Bolivian planners illustrate visible exercises of power, inside and outside of the participatory planning processes.

4.2.2 Second Dimension of Power

Second-dimensional power was expressed in the Bolivian practice examples by setting agendas with the aim of controlling the information available to citizens and limiting the participatory decision-making process. In one case, the hidden power of local authorities over the public was demonstrated when a contentious issue was excluded from the agenda. Agenda-setting was perceived as a means to maintain the popularity and political power of the local mayor. A planner described the following situation after being introduced to the second dimension of power:

> "We have a conflict now (…) because we have a museum in an old house (…) and the mayor says that they are going to remove the museum and take it to another place. And well we have a national law that protects the museum (…). So, they tried to leave out this issue in the planning agenda because many institutions said that it's not a good idea to move the museum, but the mayor he wants to build a convention center there. (…) People see opposite to this idea. And the major (…) has a very good image, he is very popular, but with this issue he is losing popularity. That's why they try. I think that the government of the city and its functionaries, they try to avoid this." (Interviewee 1)

[3] Mentioned when asked about purposes of participatory processes.

In this case, the issue of relocating a museum to build a large convention center was removed from the agenda because it would raise many objections from the public. The removal of an issue by local authorities can be seen as an attempt to manipulate consent of the public. Two other planners reported similar situations of political actors changing or manipulating an agenda, for instance, regarding changes to land policies that would increase taxes, to limit citizens' decision-making capacities, and create the illusion of consent to a plan (Interview 2, 3).

In summary, second-dimensional power, according to the planners' practice stories, appears to be exercised by political actors to influence the agenda of participatory planning processes and manipulate citizens' consent to plans.

4.2.3 Third Dimension of Power

Bolivian planners saw third-dimensional power to be working through social-economic, cultural aspects and through gender roles. A practice story which a planner associated with power, illustrates how power relations between company and a community outside a planning process influenced decisions within participatory planning processes. One planner elaborated on how mining companies imbue the social life of the immediate communities.

> "They have programs to interact with the local communities. (…) they have almost all the local communities employed, mostly they are employed in the mine, and they have educational programs, health programs, some environmental programs as well." (Interviewee 1)

This closely tied social and economic relationship between the communities and the companies outside of participatory processes was estimated to influence decision-making processes within participation, "I think they [the mining companies] can influence the decision, even in democratic elections" (Interviewee 1). The invisible power is thus exercised in the form of economic and social capital outside of participatory processes influencing participatory decisions of communities.

The issue of power based on cultural aspects was brought up by all Bolivian planners, referring to challenges regarding the multi-ethnic composition of their society. Power was also associated in their work with racism against specific phenotypes that identify someone as having an indigenous origin (Interviewee 5). This, in turn, was seen to cause inequalities in access to education, resulting in language barriers and systemic disadvantages for indigenous actors. For instance, in the participatory planning processes held in Spanish, the language barrier might place actors who only speak indigenous languages in a disadvantaged position, linguistically and academically (interviewees 1, 2, 5), even though planners emphasized providing translators.

Moreover, after being introduced to the third dimension of power, one planner also saw invisible power in gender and culturally associated norms and roles. The

implications of a 'machista' culture were seen in the fact that the presence of men is more evident in events or situations with greater visibility and/or importance, 'on stage', while the presence of women is in the background. This was illustrated by referring to a project, "there were activities where there were only women, the men were not in a lot of workshops (….) Then when we are getting ready to implement the project and when the result (..)a big project (....) that is important (…) then it was only when men [pushed in] (…) But that is the system machista." (Interviewee 2).

Thus, Bolivian planners understood the third dimension conceptually and were able to relate it through practice stories about systemic cultural issues. Only one planner was able to relate to gender-based power of the third dimension through a practical experience. This illustrates that the ability to grasp how the third dimension works in practice can vary from topic to topic.

To conclude, Bolivian planners associated power in their work with different forms of first-dimensional power exercised outside of participatory planning, mainly by political actors. Interviewee 5 mentioned power being exercised in the third dimension operating in the discrimination of specific social actors. Their practice stories underline that for most planners' notions of first-dimensional power were more present.

In the last part of the interview, after being introduced to the three dimensions of power and asked to relate to them with a practice story, all planners understood the dimensions and were able to relate to the second and third dimension.

4.3 Colombia

The legal framework for participation in Colombia is presented using sources, as I was unable to obtain sufficient information from the interviews. In the Colombian Constitution, the guiding principles are participatory democracy or democracy with popular participation (O'Brien 1995) including legal mechanisms such as referendums, popular consultations where an issue is presented to the people, or open local assemblies to discuss matters of common interest (O'Brien 1995). Furthermore, programs that aim to make the government more inclusive and participatory promote citizen participation through channels for public consultation and facilitate transparency and access to information through online platforms (OECD 2015).

4.3.1 First Dimension of Power

The practice stories of the Colombian planners showed how visible power of the first dimension can be exercised between government authorities and communities in different ways.

Whereas in other practice stories legal regulations enabled authorities to exercise visible power, in a Colombian practice story regulations were an influential means of giving power to communities. According to interviewee 9, describing a situation she associated with power, current law states that the municipality needs the communities' approval before implementing any plans. Consequently, a community has been rejecting a plan advocated by the municipality for 10 years (Interviewee 9). The communities' right of refusal can be seen as exercising visible power. Moreover, this kind of visible power by the communities appears to be exercised within the planning process and not like in other practice stories outside of it.

Interviewee 4 referred to a practice situation after being introduced to the first dimension of power, where government actors exercised visible power over citizens inside a participatory planning process. The citizens wanted a bridge issue to be addressed and solved during the planning process, but the planning authorities did not consider it their responsibility and thus, those issues were not addressed.

In summary, Colombian practice examples highlight visible exercises of power, inside as well as outside of the planning process. Demonstrating how regulations can empower citizens to exercise visible power.

4.3.2 Second Dimension of Power

The Colombian practice examples extended the stories of other planners on the exercise of second-dimensional power by showing how participants themselves can exercise hidden power within the participatory planning process. This contrasts with the other practice examples where planners or political actors exercised second dimension power outside of the planning process. Interviewee 9 described the following exercise of hidden power, after being introduced to the second dimension, as excluding other participants from the discussion using technical terms as follows:

> "(…) a meeting with actors that have different levels of education. If you don't give the right information so that people can participate in the same way, the technical team can push the discussion to one side, their interest (…) because they have the information, and the other people don't have the same knowledge that they have." (Interviewee 9)

While the exclusion of participants' possibilities to engage in the discussion can be seen as an exercise of power of the second dimension, this exercise of power is linked to third-dimensional power as it makes use of the knowledge disparities between the participants, which could be related to systemic inequalities.

Interviewee 4 described a similar situation where one group introduced a new term "nature-based solutions" that the other group was not familiar with, putting them "in the position of a new learner (...) with less experience" (Interviewee 4). This created a hierarchy between the more knowledgeable and less knowledgeable

group based on structural knowledge discrepancies, thus incorporating the third dimension of power.

In summary, both practice stories depict how second-dimensional power is exercised by deciding which topics and how they are discussed, which is coupled with the exercise of the third dimension of power through structurally related knowledge differences.

4.3.3 Third Dimension of Power

Matters of culture, knowledge, and gender were brought into connection with the expressions of power in the third dimension. Interviewee 4 referred to power structures between cultures and implied a larger social order, a macro-order between cultures, as an exercise of power aligning with the third dimension. She explained the following case as an exercise of power she associates with power in her work. In international cooperations between different organizations and institutions, the power relations resulting from cultural differences were perceived in the sense that people from different cultures have certain attributes and characteristics, i.e., "culturally European people are more organized, more punctual, more knowledgeable" (Interviewee 4) these perceptions create an implicit hierarchy. The planner mentioned that this can affect the interaction in a planning process. For instance, Colombian city officials are "not so confident sometimes to express what they are doing, which is good and adapted to their own context." (Interviewee 4) She went on to elaborate that these implicit representations cause a replication of the existing power relations so that involuntarily both cultures contribute to the maintenance of the social order.

In another practice story, structural power processes based on educational differences were perceived between actors in the Colombian community. Educational differences between the planning team and the participants were perceived as provoking social class differences, which hindered the motivation of the participants to engage. Interviewee 9 described the following case after being introduced to the third dimension:

> "Most people [of the planning team] are doctors or magister, we go to the communities and present us (…) we would say I am (name), I am a magister(...) and the people say I don't have anything to say, because I am a farmer. So, we try to not refer to this kind of educational level of the technical team because that can affect the participatory process, because they feel like I don't have anything to say, if you are a doctor or expert in that issue." (Interviewee 9)

Finally, invisible power processes based on gender were also associated with power in the work of interviewee 4. Reference was made to the pervasiveness of social power relations and their subsequent presence and replication in participatory processes. Accordingly, one Colombian planner described gender relations in participatory processes as the "normal ones that are in society" (Interviewee 4).

Implying that men are outside and inside participatory processes in more powerful positions (Interviewee 4).

The practice stories of Colombian planners illustrated how third-dimensional power is working between cultures and through educational differences between social actors and through gender roles, which are replicated inside participatory planning processes.

To summarize, in the first part of the interview about situations they associate with power in their work, each of the Colombian planners mentioned one dimension of power. While interviewee 4 mentioned invisible power processes based on culture and gender, interviewee 9 talked about visible power between government agencies and communities. In the last part of the interview, when the planners were introduced to the three dimensions of power, both understood and could relate to all three dimensions with practice experiences.

5. Discussion

Coming back to my research aim to investigate planners' notions of power in relation to the three dimensions of power framework. This section will answer the last research question: *What are general insights from interviewed planners about power in participatory planning in Latin America and the Global South?* This will be done by first connecting to the interview design and outlining which dimensions of power planners mentioned in which parts of the interview. Then, planners' notions of the three dimensions of power will be discussed.

5.1 Planners' Notions of Power

In the first part of the interview, when planners were asked to speak freely about power, most planners associated power with situations related to the first dimension of power in their work. One planner also associated power with the second dimension (interviewee 6) and two planners (interviewees 4 & 5) associated power with the third dimension of power.

After introducing the three dimensions during the interview, all interviewed planners understood them and were able to relate to the second dimension through a practice story. However, they were to varying degrees able to relate the third dimension to their practical experiences. This illustrates two aspects. First, planners' notions are often associated with one way in which power operates, namely visible power of the first dimension. However, planners can also identify other ways in which power operates in their experiences if they are provided with the conceptual tools to do so. In this case, the three-dimensional framework of power. This is consistent with Westin's (2019) argument that planners are aware that power plays a role in their work but often lack the conceptual tools to reflect upon how this happens in detail. Secondly, the findings show that some planners could conceptually understand the third dimension when they were provided with the framework but had difficulty linking it to their experiences. The ability to relate to the third dimension may vary depending on which exercise of third-dimensional power they are trying to relate their experiences to. The differences in the Argentinean responses, the female planner could relate to gender-based power, unlike the male planner, would initially imply that it is easier to uncover invisible power relations if one is negatively affected by them oneself. However, the Bolivian

practice stories seemed to contradict this reasoning. The Bolivian planners were able to refer to the third dimension exercised through ethnic-based power relations, and a male Bolivian planner was also able to refer to gender-based power. This could mean that Bolivian planners are aware of this invisible exercise of power but more in terms of how these structural power imbalances benefit them and puts them in a more powerful position. It could also be that the discussion on gender and ethnic imbalances is more active in Bolivia than in Argentina. This could be related to the recent government in Bolivia, which has put ethnic issues at the centre of policy debates (Calderon & Ledo unpublished). Further research could thus investigate what increases or decreases the ability to reveal invisible power relations.

In summary, planners predominantly associated power in their work with the visible power of the first dimension. However, after introducing the three dimensions of power, the planners showed that they also hold notions of power in the second dimension and, to varying degrees, in the third dimension of power.

5.2 Planners' Notions of Power of the Three Dimensions

The practice stories illustrating the exercise of power in the three dimensions revealed similarities and differences. The general findings are discussed below.

Practice stories related to the first dimension of power illustrated the visible characteristics of this dimension, such as in the Argentinian case of the public hearing, where citizens spoke out against a planned project for two months. However, the project was voted 'yes' by the city government in the end. This way of exercising power is visible, which means that the actors over whom power is exercised, in this case, the citizens, are also aware of the exercise of power.

In two stories, government authorities performed first-dimensional power exercises outside of the participatory planning processes. Concerning the above example of the public hearing, an Argentinian planner explained that government authorities' visible exercises of power are in accordance with planning regulations. In contrast, in the case of the Bolivian politician exercising visible power outside the planning process to implement projects aligning with his interests, the planner did not state that this was in line with planning regulations. However, it fits with how Bolivian planners described the legal context of participatory planning in their countries, that citizens' opinions should be considered but are not binding. Thus, visible power is mainly described as operating outside the participatory process in the practice examples, and this seems to be linked to and supported by legislation. In the cases mentioned above, the respective legislations favour politicians and authorities. However, a Colombian story also showed an alternative to the above

cases. Colombian communities had a legally embedded right to object to proposed planning processes in one example. Thus, their exercise of visible power was also linked and supported by legislation. This highlights how laws or planning regulations can empower citizens and counter participation processes that extend state control over communities. Also, it takes a step toward the normative ideals of democratizing participation by shifting the power balance towards citizens (Watson 2002 see Westin 2019).

These findings can be linked to other scholars, who have regarded planning regulations and laws that favour certain actors (i.e., private developers) as invisible power exercises of the third dimension that "act as potential platforms for the use of Dimension I and II power" (Mäntysalo & Saglie 2010:331). Hence, indicating an interrelation between third-dimensional power and power of the first dimension.

A commonality between the practice stories about the first dimension of power is that they seem to address a conflict of interest between government and citizens about their respective power to influence planning processes. This finding confirms Mäntysalo and Saglies' (2010) observation about a binary division between the cooperation of government agencies and developers on the one hand and the public interests of citizens on the other hand about their power in planning processes.

The planners' practice stories showed how different actors exercise the second dimension of power in different ways. For example, politicians exercised visible power and instructed planners not to use wetlands in their plans, which resulted in planners exercising hidden power over participants in the process as they set the agenda for it. In this way, the information available to citizens was manipulated so that they may not have known that the development project was to be built in a wetland or how hidden power was being exercised to influence them. This is in line with the definition of the second dimension that second-dimensional power is hidden and less visible to the participants. This exercise of power is similar to an example from the planning literature in which hidden power was exercised by framing a term to be discussed and closing the discussion to alternative options or perspectives (Raik et al. 2008).

The Bolivian example, in which a political actor removed a contentious issue of relocating a museum from the agenda, represented a case of manipulation of public content. Yet it was not possible to conclude from the practice story whether the public was deceived or whether they were aware of it.

A Colombian practice stories presented a different way of exercising power in the second dimension. It has been shown that participants can also exercise hidden power within a participatory process. In the story, participants in a participatory process exercised hidden power by using technical language that closed the discussion to less knowledgeable participants. It was not apparent whether the other participants were aware of this hidden exercise of power. Furthermore, this story

also illustrated the interconnectedness of the dimensions, as the third dimension of power is contained in the structural imbalances resulting from the participants' unequal levels of knowledge.

Taken together, these practice stories point to the fact that some planners' notions of second-dimensional power related to actions or decisions belonging to only one dimension, the second dimension. In contrast, other planners' notions of power showed an interrelation with another dimension.

This can be considered as another general finding from the interviews that the practice stories illustrated the interrelation between the different dimensions of power. This underlines the complexity of power dynamics in planning processes. These findings also suggest that there may be more situations where two or even all three dimensions interact, but planners were unaware of this. From a methodological point of view, this finding confirms the choice of the three dimensions of power framework for reflection and understanding of how power works (Westin et al. 2021). In the examples from the planning literature where other scholars have applied the three dimensions to planning cases (see section 2), an interrelation between the dimensions was mentioned by some (Mäntysalo & Saglie 2010; Westin et al. 2021) but was not addressed by others (Hoominfar & Radel 2020; Mupambwa & Zaaiman 2020). Therefore, the interview planners' practice stories highlighting the interrelation between the dimensions of power confirm some of the literature (and extend other) planning literature dealing with issues of power and, in particular, with the three dimensions of power.

The practice stories referring to the third dimension of power extend the literature by making direct links between ways power of the third dimension can be exercised and some specificities of the studied planning contexts. Invisible power was exercised through the norms and roles of the cultures operating in participatory planning processes. This was illustrated in the practice stories of planners from Argentina, Bolivia, and Colombia, referring to gender-based power. Planners stated that women are placed in an inferior and unequal position to men, which is reflected in the fact that women do not have a voice in participatory processes or are pushed into the background. Thus, confirming Cornwall's (2004) reasoning that existing power relationships also operate and influence the interactions in participatory planning processes. In Bolivia, the third dimension of power was found to operate through ethnic-based power relations, disadvantaging the indigenous population linguistically and academically, as systemic discrimination against people of indigenous origin was perceived to be linked to poorer access to education. These two examples of invisible power illustrate that contexts matters, as argued by Calderon and Westin (2019) or Connelly (2010) and that these culturally different contexts influence planning practice and how power operates in participatory planning processes compared to other contexts.

In addition, invisible power has been found to be exercised through educational differences linked to social class divisions, giving more knowledgeable or educated individuals a more powerful position and silencing less knowledgeable participants. In the above-mentioned examples of invisible power, it was not inferable from the planners' answers if the affected participants themselves would have been able to grasp how power influenced their participation. However, in a practice story provided by Interviewee 9, the participants were aware of the invisible power and made them explicit when saying, "I don't have anything to say because I am a farmer." This would confirm and expand the above findings that planners and, in this case, participants can identify exercises of invisible power if they are directly affected by structural power imbalances.

Finally, invisible power was seen to be exercised in the attributed perceptions and stereotypes of people of different cultures, creating a macro-hierarchy between the cultures, which is exercising power and is maintained through collective practices by representatives of both cultures.

To conclude, planners' practice stories showed similarities and differences in how power across the three dimensions can be exercised in participatory planning processes. Furthermore, their practice stories illustrated how the different dimensions of power interact in planning practice. These findings contribute to making less visible power exercises of the second and third dimensions in planning practice more visible by providing examples. These can be useful for planners working in planning practice as they can be used as a tool to illustrate the more abstract theoretical definitions of the three dimensions of power and promote reflection and understanding of how power works in practice.

5.3 Power Exercises Outside of the Planning Process

The practice stories confirmed that participatory planning processes are inherently power-laden spaces that often do not conform to ideals of participation such as inclusivity, democracy, and empowerment (Cooke & Kothari 2001; Flyvbjerg 2004). However, it was shown that citizens and communities exercise power inside and outside planning processes, challenging the unequal power relations in participatory processes, hence, illustrating Miraftab's (2009) ideas about invited and invented spaces in planning practice.

The practical examples showed several ways in which different actors exercised power outside of the participatory planning processes. First, political actors often exercised visible power outside the process to change or overrule decisions made within participatory planning. An example of this is the Argentinean case with the public hearing, where politicians exercised visible power and overruled citizens' decisions made in the planning process. Further, economic actors such as the mining companies in one Bolivian practice story influenced the communities'

decision-making within participatory planning processes through their economic and social power relationship with the communities outside of the planning process. This story shows similarities with an example of first-dimensional power identified in the planning literature (see section 2.2), where a private actor set conditions for funding a project for a particular activity that aligned with the donating actors' interests (Warren 2002 see Calderon & Butler 2020). Thus, highlighting that economic means employed directly or indirectly can be an effective way of steering decisions

5.3.1 Invented Spaces as Strategies to Counter Formal Invited Planning Processes

Lastly, citizens and communities exercised power outside of planning processes. An example of this is the case of the informal community, which boycotted the construction and implementation of the planning process until their previously rejected request for a football pitch in the public park was accepted. The forced inaction of the construction challenged the unequal power relation of the planning authority over the citizens inside the participatory planning process. This example shares the element of inaction with the planning example from literature (see section 2.2) when the Iranian government withheld any action to share plans or information with affected communities (Hoominfar & Radel 2020). In the Argentinian case, communities forced visible inaction. In the Iranian example, the government refused to take any action, which Hoominfar and Radel (2020) classified as a hidden exercise of power. Both cases underline how inaction can be a strategy for exercising power outside of planning processes.

In another practice example, a community exercised power outside the planning process by implementing their interests (construction of a pedestrian path in a park) which the implementing architect ignored in the park's final design. Interestingly, this example depicted that the citizens exercised visible power after the end of the planning process, and by doing so, they overruled the final planning decision. This element of temporally delayed exercise of power could contribute to and expand the insights into invented spaces and insurgent planning practices.

The power exercises of citizens outside of the planning process are in line with ideas in planning literature in the Global South, which describe these practices as 'invented spaces' through which citizens claim their rights to the city and its public spaces and attempt to balance unequal power relations inside planning processes (Miraftab 2006 see Ay & Miraftab 2016; Miraftab 2009). These insurgent strategies of citizens in the planners' practice stories can be characterized as counter-hegemonic, that is, "they destabilize the normalized order of things" (Miraftab 2009:46). Moreover, these practice examples display characteristics of 'power with', as citizens acted in concert to achieve shared goals (Westin 2019).

A practice story that falls between exercises of power outside the planning process and exercises of power inside the planning process is the Bolivian practice story about indigenous communities exercising visible power within the process by closing down the participatory space and re-inventing it on their terms. As the exercise of power by the indigenous communities is intended to balance the power within the planning process, it could be considered an insurgent practice, normally situated in invented spaces outside the formal process (Miraftab 2009). Thus, this story could potentially expand the literature on invented spaces (e.g., Ay & Miraftab 2016) by illustrating how insurgent practices attempting to balance power of a planning process can also occur inside a planning process.

The planners' practice stories confirmed that participatory planning processes are interwoven with the society in which they occur. Planners' notions of power revealed that they are aware of the power dynamics within and outside the participatory planning process. Their stories showed how the exercise of power outside the participatory planning process could affect what happens within. This demonstrates that planners are aware of the interconnectedness of spaces and power dynamics between participatory planning and wider circles of power in a society (Cornwall 2004; Hore et al. 2020).

To sum up, these findings contribute to the discussion on power in planning in the Global South and beyond by highlighting that planning literature dealing with the workings of power should look beyond the formal, invited spaces of participatory planning processes (Ay & Miraftab 2016; Miraftab 2009). And to consider exercises of power outside of what is typically considered a planning process. Otherwise, there is a risk of neglecting power exercises that take place outside and in opposition to (participatory) planning decisions and activities. The findings provide planning examples of different ways in which power is exercised by different actors outside the planning process, which can be useful for future power analysis in planning practice. Thus, to have a more holistic and comprehensive understanding of power in planning, planning theory and practice should therefore focus on the dimensions of power exercised by different actors in and around planning processes.

5.4 Conclusion

To conclude, this explorative study investigated planners' notions of power in relation to the three dimensions of power. Their practice stories were analyzed on where in their work they see power generally and where explicitly they identify the three dimensions of power. After introducing the three dimensions of power, all planners understood the second dimension of power and could relate to it through a practice story. However, for the third dimension, differences emerged between

planners in the extent to which they could relate to invisible power through a practice story. This indicates that notions of power may be less pronounced concerning the third dimension. Further research is needed to determine the factors that increase the ability to uncover invisible exercises of power.

The practice stories of the planners have illustrated how power can be exercised differently in the three dimensions and in the interplay of these dimensions in participatory planning processes. Thus, this thesis contributes two aspects to the discussion on power in participatory planning in the Global South and beyond. The findings illustrate less visible exercises of power of the second and third dimensions in planning practice, which can serve as a tool for planners working in planning practice to engage with different dimensions of power and promote reflection and understanding of how power works in practice. Additionally, the findings confirm and highlight that planning theory focusing on power should widen its gaze beyond formal, invited spaces of participatory planning processes (Miraftab 2009) and take exercises of power into account, which are working inside and outside the planning processes.

Further research focusing on planners' notions of power in planning could investigate whether planners distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable forms of 'power over'. Moreover, planners' notions of 'power to' and 'power with' could be explored (Westin 2019).

References

Albrechts, L. (2003). Planning and power: towards an emancipatory planning approach. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 21(6), 905-924.

Amado, M. P., Santos, C. V., Moura, E. B., & Silva, V. G. (2010). Public participation in sustainable urban planning. *International journal of human and social sciences*, 5(2), 102-108.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of planners*, 35(4), 216-224.

Ay, D., & Miraftab, F. (2016). Invented spaces of activism: Gezi Park and performative practices of citizenship. In: Grugel, Jean & Hammett, Daniel (eds) *The palgrave handbook of international development*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 555-574.

Boesten, I. (2021). *Neutrality: a cornerstone of facilitation practice? Analysing the Use of Neutrality within Facilitation of Sustainability Dialogue through Identity Construction.* Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, SLU. Department of Urban and Rural Development, Environmental Communication and Management.

Brownill, S., & Carpenter, J. (2007). Participation and planning: Dichotomies, rationalities and strategies for power. *The town planning review*, 78(4), 401-428.

Calderon, C. (2013). *Politicising participation. Towards a new theoretical approach to participation in the planning and design of public spaces.* Diss. Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences. Uppsala.

Calderon, C. (2020). Unearthing the political: differences, conflicts and power in participatory urban design. *Journal of Urban Design*, 25(1), 50-64.

Calderon, C., & Butler, A. (2019). Politicising the landscape: a theoretical contribution towards the development of participation in landscape planning. *Landscape Research*, 45(2), 152-163.

Calderon, C., & Westin, M. (2019). Understanding context and its influence on collaborative planning processes: a contribution to communicative planning theory. *International planning studies*, 26(1), 14-27.

Calderon, C. & Ledo, P. (n.d.). Participatory planning in the global South: the case of Sacaba, Bolivia.[unpublished manuscript/currently under review] *Journal of Planning Theory and Practice*.

Connelly, S. (2009). Deliberation in the face of power: Stakeholder planning in Egypt. *Policy and Society*, 28(3), 185-195.

Connelly, S. (2010). Participation in a hostile state: how do planners act to shape public engagement in politically difficult environments?. *Planning Practice & Research*, 25(3), 333-351.

Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (eds.). (2001). *Participation: The new tyranny?*. London, New York: Zed books.

Cornwall, A. (2004). Spaces for transformation? Reflections on issues of power and difference in participation in development. *Participation: From tyranny to transformation? Exploring new approaches to participation in development*, 75-91.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 5th Edn, Los Angeles: Sage publications.

Dahl, R.A. (1957). The concept of power. *Behavioral Science* 2(3), 201–215.

De Satgé, R., & Watson, V. (2018). *Urban planning in the global south: Conflicting rationalities in contested urban space*. Springer.

Elinbaum, P. (2018). Argentina. *disP - The Planning Review*, 54(1), 25-27. DOI: 10.1080/02513625.2018.1454668

Fernández Maldonado, A. M. (2018). Peru. *disP - The Planning Review*, 54(1), 42-44. DOI: 10.1080/02513625.2018.1454692

Flyvbjerg, B. & Richardson, T. (2002). Planning and Foucault. In: Allmendinger, P. & Tewdwr-Jones, M. *Planning futures: New directions for planning theory*, London and New York: Routledge, 44-63.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2004). Phronetic planning research: Theoretical and methodological reflections. *Planning theory & practice*, 5(3), 283-306.

Forester, J. (1999). *The deliberative practitioner*: Encouraging participatory planning processes. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Forester, J. (2013). On the theory and practice of critical pragmatism: Deliberative practice and creative negotiations. *Planning theory*, *12*(1), 5-22.

Forester, J., Peters, S., & Hittleman, M. (2005). Creating profiles: Interviewing - creating questions. Available at: https://courses2.cit.cornell.edu/fit117/CP.htm

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon.

Fox-Rogers, L., & Murphy, E. (2016). Self-perceptions of the role of the planner. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, *43*(1), 74-92.

Friedmann, J. (1998). Planning theory revisited. *European Planning Studies*, *6*(3), 245-253.

Galland, D. (2018). Mexico. *disP - The Planning Review*, 54(1), 38-41. DOI: 10.1080/02513625.2018.1454691

Garcia Ferrari, M.S. (2018). Uruguay. *disP - The Planning Review*, 54(1), 45-47. DOI: 10.1080/02513625.2018.1454693

Gaventa, J. (2006). Finding the Spaces for Change: A Power Analysis. *IDS Bulletin*, 37 (6), 23–33.

Gaventa, J., & Cornwall, A. (2008). Power and knowledge. *The Sage handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice*, *2*, 172-189.

Griffin, L. (2012). Where is power in governance? Why geography matters in the theory of governance. *Political studies review*, 10(2), 208-220.

Hacking, N., & Flynn, A. (2017). Networks, power and knowledge in the planning system: A case study of energy from waste. *Progress in Planning*, 113, 1-37.

Haugaard, M. (2003). Reflections on seven ways of creating power. *European journal of social theory*, *6*(1), 87-113.

Haugaard, M. (2012). Rethinking the four dimensions of power: domination and empowerment. *Journal of Political Power*, *5*(1), 33-54.

Haugaard, M. (2020). The four dimensions of power: understanding domination, empowerment and democracy. In: The four dimensions of power. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Haugaard, M. (2021). The four dimensions of power: conflict and democracy. *Journal of Political Power*, 14(1), 153-175. DOI: 10.1080/2158379X.2021.1878411

Hoominfar, E., & Radel, C. (2020). Contested Dam Development in Iran: A Case Study of the Exercise of State Power over Local People. *Sustainability*, *12*(13), 5476.

Hore, K., Gaillard, J. C., Davies, T., & Kearns, R. (2020). People's Participation in Disaster-Risk Reduction: Recentering Power. *Natural hazards review*, *21*(2), 04020009.

Innes, J. E. (1998). Information in communicative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *64*(1), 52-63.

Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2004). Reframing public participation: strategies for the 21st century. *Planning theory & practice*, *5*(4), 419-436.

Irvin, R. A., & Stansbury, J. (2004). Citizen participation in decision making: is it worth the effort?. *Public administration review*, *64*(1), 55-65.

Kamaci, E. (2014). A novel discussion on urban planning practice: citizen participation. *ICONARP International Journal of Architecture and Planning*, *2*(1), 1-19.

Koglin, T., & Pettersson, F. (2017). Changes, problems, and challenges in Swedish spatial planning—An analysis of power dynamics. *Sustainability*, *9*(10), 1836.

Kuddus, M. A., Tynan, E., & McBryde, E. (2020). Urbanization: a problem for the rich and the poor?. *Public health reviews*, *41*(1), 1-4.

Ledo, P. (2021). A southern perspective: Northern and indigenous influences on the establishment of a hybrid culture of participatory planning, the story of Sacaba (No. 2021: 44). Diss. Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences. Uppsala.

Ledyaev, V. (2021). Conceptual analysis of power: basic trends. *Journal of Political Power*, *14*(1), 72-84.

Lingard, L. (2019). Beyond the default colon: Effective use of quotes in qualitative research. *Perspectives on medical education*, *8*(6), 360-364.

Lukes, S. (2005). *Power. A Radical View*. 2nd Edn, Basingstoke: Palgrave Mcmillan.

Mäntysalo, R., & Saglie, I. L. (2010). Private influence preceding public involvement: Strategies for legitimizing preliminary partnership arrangements in urban housing planning in Norway and Finland. *Planning Theory & Practice*, *11*(3), 317-338.

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Notion. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved May 3, 2022, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/notio

Miraftab, F. (2009). Insurgent planning: Situating radical planning in the global south. *Planning theory*, *8*(1), 32-50.

Möckel, F. (2020). *The crucial role of the facilitator. Analysing Identity Construction and Dilemmas*. Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, SLU. Department of Urban and Rural Development, Environmental Communication and Management.

Mukhopadhyay, C., Hammami, F., & Watson, V. (2021). Introduction: Planning theories from 'southern turn' to 'deeply rooted/situated in the South/context': A project in the making. *plaNext–Next Generation Planning*, *11*, 9-25.

Mupambwa, G., & Zaaiman, J. (2020). The Khutsong housing project and power relationships: an application of Lukes' three dimensions of power. *South African Review of Sociology*, *51*(2), 16-32.

O'Brien, P. J. (1995). Participation and sustainable development in Colombia. *Revista Europea De Estudios Latinoamericanos Y Del Caribe/European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 59, 7-35.

OECD (2015). Colombia. Policy priorities for inclusive development.

Ortiz, C. (2018). Colombia. *disP - The Planning Review*, 54(1), 35-37. DOI: 10.1080/02513625.2018.1454689

Parker, C., Scott, S., & Geddes, A. (2019). Snowball Sampling. In: Atkinson, P., Delamont, S., Cernat, A., Sakshaug, J.W., & Williams, R.A. (eds), SAGE Research Methods
Foundations. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036831710

Raik, D. B., Wilson, A. L., & Decker, D. J. (2008). Power in natural resources management: an application of theory. *Society and natural resources*, *21*(8), 729-739.

Ridder, D., & Pahl-Wostl, C. (2005). Participatory integrated assessment in local level planning. *Regional Environmental Change*, *5*(4), 188-196.

Schmidt-Thomé, K., & Mäntysalo, R. (2014). Interplay of power and learning in planning processes: A dynamic view. *Planning Theory*, *13*(2), 115-135.

Schwartz-Shea, P. & Yanow, D. (2011). *Interpretive Research Design*: *Concepts and Processes*. London: Routledge. Available at: http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/slub-ebooks/detail.action?docID=957663 [2020-02-07]

Westin, M. (2019). *Rethinking power in participatory planning: towards reflective practice*. Diss. Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet (SLU). Uppsala.

Westin, M. (2021). The framing of power in communicative planning theory: Analysing the work of John Forester, Patsy Healey and Judith Innes. *Planning Theory*, 0(0), 1-23.

Westin, M., Mutter, A., Calderon, C., & Hellquist, A. (2021). "Let us be led by the residents": Swedish dialogue experts' stories about power, justification and ambivalence. *Nordic Journal of Urban Studies*, *1*(2), 113-130.

Williams, G. (2004). Evaluating participatory development: tyranny, power and (re) politicisation. *Third world quarterly*, *25*(3), 557-578.

World Bank (1996). *The World Bank Participation Sourcebook*. The World Bank, Washington D.C.

Zafra-Calvo, N., Balvanera, P., Pascual, U., Merçon, J., Martín-López, B., van Noordwijk, M., ... & Díaz, S. (2020). Plural valuation of nature for equity and sustainability: Insights from the Global South. *Global Environmental Change*, *63*, 102115.

Popular Science Summary

Participatory processes involve citizens in the decision-making of, for instance, urban planning processes that address issues ranging from the design of a public park to more complex problems such as sustainable development that affect citizens. These participatory planning processes aim to balance power between different involved actors, such as politicians, businesses, and citizens and give citizens a voice. In practice, however, these planning processes are influenced by various power dynamics, mostly invisible keeping powerful actors in power. Moreover, power imbalances that exist outside societies are also present in planning processes. Therefore, planning contexts that differ from the European planning context can contain other power forms, affecting interactions between the involved actors inside the participatory planning processes. Therefore, planners have a crucial role in designing the planning processes and coordinating the dialogue between the actors involved. Their task is to identify and balance the different forms of power, which can lead to fairer and more equitable outcomes of planning processes. The problem is that planning literature in general often only narrowly deals with the analysis of power and does not directly focus on the different forms of power in participatory planning processes.

To contribute to solving this gap, I explore planners' understandings of different forms of power, which are present in participatory planning processes. Therefore, I interviewed planners from Argentina, Bolivia, and Colombia and employed a theory distinguishing between visible, hidden, and invisible dimensions of power. In the interviews, the planners described situations from their work that they associate with power. For instance, in response to citizens' wishes not being included in a planning process, they boycotted the construction of the planning process. They thereby challenged the unequal power balance in the planning process. This finding is intriguing because planning theory often only looks at power inside planning processes and not outside them. In the next interview step, the planners were introduced to the three dimensions of power and asked whether they could relate these forms of power to their practical experiences. The collected practice stories of the planners are insightful examples of these three dimensions of power, making the often invisible forms of power more visible and showing how power works in practice. Further, the planners' practice stories revealed how different forms or dimensions of power interact in planning practice.

Thus, these practice stories exemplifying different forms of power can be a helpful tool for planners in participatory planning processes in Latin America and beyond to reflect on power and thus contribute to the analysis of power in participatory planning processes.

Acknowledgements

I would like to give special thanks to my supervisor Camilo Calderon for his active and dedicated supervision. During this time of writing a thesis, he has supported me in structuring my thoughts, and through productive discussions and constructive feedback. Also, he has helped me to understand my own work method. Camilo has challenged and motivated me, which has advanced this work and enriched my learning process beyond this thesis.

I would also like to thank the interviewees for talking to me and sharing their experiences. Their stories added a whole new *dimension* to my studies on power and filled them with interesting and captivating accounts of planning practice, which made this research experience that much more interesting!

Then I would like to thank my translator for taking the time and having the impressive ability to translate simultaneously. Further, my family's support and love during this time were invaluable. I would like to thank them always believing in me. And finally, I would like to thank my best friend for the support and for the relaxing and energizing *efter-plugget-mys*.

Appendix1 - Overview of the Interviewees

Interview Identification	Country	Description	Engaged in Planning
Interviewee 6	Argentina	- Works for the city government in the urban development department - Coordinates participatory processes - Gender: Female	Since 2018
Interviewee 7	Argentina	- Works for the city government in the urban development department - Coordinates participatory processes or urban projects and social research - Gender: Male	Since 2017
Interviewee 1	Bolivia	- GIS technician for a planning department in the municipality - Environmental consultant for 13 years - Currently researcher at a university - Gender: Male	Since 2003
Interviewee 2	Bolivia	- Professional Development Worker - Advice, Design, Coordination, Elaboration & Execution in participatory processes regarding habitat and housing	Since 2013

		- Gender: Male	
Interviewee 3 *(In Spanish)*	Bolivia	- Facilitate decisions between seven municipalities and the government in a metropolitan area - Gender: Male	Since 2004/2005
Interviewee 5 *(In Spanish)*	Bolivia	- Working for the municipal government - Secretary for the department of planning - Gender: Male	Since 1987
Interviewee 8 *(In Spanish)*	Bolivia	- Working as director of planning and operations in the municipal government - Gender: Male	Since 2005
Interviewee 4	Colombia	- Researcher at a national research Institute for biodiversity & social as well as governance aspects - Currently working in an international project funded by the EU - Gender: Female	/
Interviewee 9	Colombia	- Researcher in area of urban planning, ecology and urban biodiversity - Gender: Female	Since 2017/2018

Appendix 2-Interview Guide

1.Introduction (max. 5 min)

- Presenting myself and the project aim and design
- Practical information about the interview
    - Length – 3 parts
    - Language: English. However, I could understand and speak some Spanish in case this would be needed.
    - Internet connection
- Ethical concerns
    - Confidentiality, anonymity, and recording
    - Interview will be recorded and transcribed. Your data will be kept secure and confidential, and your name will be anonymized.
- INTRO: Facilitation?
    - Is there anything you would like to say or ask before we start the interview?

2. Personal Introduction (max. 10min?)

I would like to better understand your role as a facilitator and the participatory processes in which you work.

- Could you briefly introduce yourself and say where you work and what position you hold?
- How long have you been working in the field of planning? How many participatory processes have you facilitated?
- Could you describe the aspects and activities of your work that relate to the design, communication, and coordination (= facilitation) of stakeholder participation (collaboration and dialogue)?

Can you tell me about the participatory PROCESSES you work in?

- What is the **purpose** of these meetings?
  (awareness raising, information sharing, collecting opinions, decision making, conflict resolution)
- **Participants**: Who is invited and who (usually) joins these processes?

Are people willing to participate or are they reluctant? What do participants expect from these processes?

- How do people interact? What are the **relationships** between the participating actors?
  (conflictual, cooperative, very different views, homogeneous, similar needs and views, hierarchical)
- What **methods** are used to enable and facilitate dialogue and collaboration?
- What is/was your **role** in these processes?

I would like to understand the CONTEXT of these processes a little more.

- What are the **regulations** for participatory processes in your country or city?
  - Are they mandatory or a recommendation?
  - Are they expected by the public?
- How are planning process typically done in your city and organisation?
  - (Bottom up/ Top down) government, expert-based/ -driven practices.

3. Practice Stories around Power (max 15 min)

In the next part of the interview, I would like to focus on the topic of power, in particular your experiences with power in your role as facilitator, designer, coordinator, and manager of participatory processes.

- Could you describe to me a situation, e.g., a process, a meeting, or a discussion that you have coordinated and/or facilitated, which you associate with power in your work?
  - I am not after a right or specific way of understanding power but more your views on it based on your experiences.

Follow up questions:

- What happened? What did you do then?
- How did you handle the situation?
- **What was required from you?** (What skills, behaviour, understanding, attitude…) helped you?
- Where is power in this situation that you are describing? (Who has power?)
- How **is the power working or being exercised** in that situation? (By whom? For what?)
- Have you thought about your own power or how you exercise power in this process/meeting?

- Did you considered the issues about power that you describe when you were preparing for the process/meeting?
- Did you reflect about it after?
- Did it influence in anyway your facilitation of other processes or meetings? How?

- Can you tell me about another situation/ experience that comes to your mind when you think about power in your work as facilitator?

4. Definition of Power

Thank you very much for those insightful stories and experiences.

- Based on what you have been describing, how would you define power?

5. Introduction of Power Concepts from Literature (max. 10-15 min)

In the next part of the interview, I would like to briefly introduce a power framework from the literature and ask you if you can relate to it from your practical experience. The framework consists of three dimensions.

The **first dimension** refers to "visible exercises of power".
An example of this dimension could be that actor or group A influences actor B to think or do something that B would not otherwise have thought or done. So, this dimension of power is very public and is about decision-making, where it is usually clear who is making the decision and why they are making it. An example could be that the government makes a decision and then enforces a law that society must follow.

- Do you understand what is meant with the first dimension of power?
- Do you have any questions?
- Have you reflected about this aspect of power before?
- Can you see this dimension (visible exercises of power) in any of the stories you mentioned before?
- If not, can you think of another situation where this form of power was present in your work?

The **second dimension** refers to "hidden processes of power"
A typical example of this is agenda setting, and thus making certain issues which are not on the agenda unacceptable to be discussed. So, some actors influence the process so that it focuses on topics and decisions that are aligned with their interest, while excluding interest points of other actors. For instance, the issue of higher

income housing or commercial areas get on the agenda while social housing is not. This dimension of power is less obvious, its not always clear who makes the decisions and is about controlling the discussion points, so that for instance issues of potential conflict are not on the agenda.

- Do you understand what is meant with the second dimension of power?
- Do you have any questions?
- Have you reflected about this aspect of power before?
- Can you see this dimension (hidden processes of power) in any of the stories you mentioned before?
- If not, can you think of another situation where this form of power was present?

The last and **third dimension** refers to "Invisible Power Processes".
This dimension influences systemic inequalities based on, for example, age, gender, social class or religion, which cause unequal life chances among different members of a society. The social setting can favour Actor A over or at the expense of Actor B without either of them being aware of these invisible power processes. Inequalities are collectively maintained by doing things the same everyday activities way they have always been done (according to the social order and cultural habits). This form of power works through unspoken rules that are often also unquestioned and accepted. Examples of this are that women support a patriarchal/ oppressive society or that the opinion of older people is given more weight than the opinion and interest of younger actors.

- Do you understand what is meant with the third dimension of power?
- Do you have any questions?
- Have you reflected about this aspect of power before?
- Can you see this dimension (invisible processes of power) in any of the stories you mentioned before?
- If not, can you think of another situation where this form of power was present?

In the End

Those were all the questions I had prepared for the interview. Thank you very much for your time and openness.

- Do you have any final reflections based on our conversation?
- Would you like to add something?

Publishing and archiving

Approved students' theses at SLU are published electronically. As a student, you have the copyright to your own work and need to approve the electronic publishing. If you check the box for **YES**, the full text (pdf file) and metadata will be visible and searchable online. If you check the box for **NO**, only the metadata and the abstract will be visible and searchable online. Nevertheless, when the document is uploaded it will still be archived as a digital file. If you are more than one author, the checked box will be applied to all authors. Read about SLU's publishing agreement here:

- https://www.slu.se/en/subweb/library/publish-and-analyse/register-and-publish/agreement-for-publishing/.

☒ YES, I/we hereby give permission to publish the present thesis in accordance with the SLU agreement regarding the transfer of the right to publish a work.

☐ NO, I/we do not give permission to publish the present work. The work will still be archived and its metadata and abstract will be visible and searchable.