Reading Tips and Study Questions: For Session 18
Planning and Social Diversity (B)—November 19th

Required reading:


Tips and questions

Modern planning in the wake—if not exactly the mold—of the rational model has generally assumed a *shared culture* among participants that often does not exist—at least not at the outset of an effort to engage people in tackling a problem or charting a course together. The consequences can be huge, and yet often overlooked, in planning practice.

Communication is a powerful window on this, which we came across first in the Arnstein reading about a “ladder of citizen participation,” in which Arnstein described different codes of talk in a fairly simple “government planners versus disadvantaged citizens” contrast.

In each case reading above, as usual, don’t worry about the specialized terms. Focus instead on the core arguments about the role of communication and culture in planning, and pay special attention to the vignettes.

1. **Tauxe’s** analysis zeros in on public hearings, which we began to analyze in the “Towering Dilemma” case. She critiques an “invisible cultural selection process.” A simple way of thinking about this category of argument is this: *Not everyone who speaks actually gets heard*. What clash of cultures, interests, and rhetorical styles does Tauxe portray? How, if at all, do these clashes relate to the “power” of the respective parties, according to Tauxe? If you have ever organized or participated in a public hearing of any kind, think about the range of rhetorical styles and how these affected the framing and articulation of key stakeholder interests and of who had rhetorical or other “power” to influence decisions.
2. What are communication “codes,” according to Briggs, what are “scripts,” and why is each important?

3. Think of a communication setting in which you have worked or in which you can see yourself working. Given the patterns outlined in these two ethnographic studies, what sorts of remedies or safeguards would you adopt?