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Dear Colleague:

Welcome to Alexandria, Virginia and to our two-day workshop, “Theorizing Ways of Knowing: Beyond Interest.”

We are delighted to co-host this event that brings together pre-eminent scholars in order to further our mutual scholarship and exploration of both knowing and addressing problems. Nearly 35 individuals from around the United States and abroad are joining us for this signature event; a complete list of attendees follows.

We were also thrilled that a number of you submitted proposals for workshop sessions. Copies of the proposals from our 13 presenters are included in this package for your review and information. The workshop sessions are organized into three tracks: What is Knowing? Understanding and Conceptualizing Knowing; What is Known? Mapping Knowing and Categories of Knowing; and How Can We Organize Knowing? Expertise and Local Knowing.

Finally, also enclosed is a range of information that we hope will make your time here in Alexandria both enjoyable and relaxing. If there are any questions or any way that we can assist you throughout your stay to make it more enjoyable, please don’t hesitate to contact us.

Warm Regards,

Martha Feldman
Anne Khademian

Anne Schneider
Helen Ingram
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ABOUT THE COAST-TO-COAST INCLUSIVE MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE

The Coast-to-Coast Inclusive Management Initiative. In 2005, Virginia Tech's Center for Public Administration and Policy and the University of California at Irvine launched its Initiative for the Study and Practice of Inclusive Management (IM), which is built around the study and practice of participation, collaboration, and the renewal of democratic capacity by individuals in public, private and nonprofit organizations when addressing public problems.

This initiative is led by Dr. Martha Feldman of the University of California at Irvine and Dr. Anne Khademian of Virginia Tech. Activities include the ongoing research focused on inclusive management, a Fellows program that engages IM-oriented managers and leaders in order to build a community of scholarship and practice about inclusive management (IM) in the public sector, and regular roundtables, conferences and workshops on the practice and scholarship of inclusive management.

ABOUT OUR SPONSORS AND HOSTS

University of California at Irvine, Center for Organizational Research. COR facilitates research on new organizational forms and processes now taking shape in a variety of contexts. As the 21st century unfolds, we increasingly find organizing that diverges from traditional bureaucratic structures. Such possibilities can be found in global teams, web-based collaboration, network structures, collective threats to security and privacy, micro enterprises, international non-governmental organizations, alliances across private, public, and non-profit fields. These developments raise opportunities for alternative modes of decision-making, just as they present challenges for accountability and efficacy. They also raise questions about how existing distributions of power both constrain and enable organizational experimentation. COR contributes to the development of organization theory by connecting scholars from many disciplines who bring their knowledge and methods to a common understanding of these issues.

UC Irvine has enjoyed a long tradition of innovative, interdisciplinary organizational research that dates back to the founding of the campus in the mid 1960's. COR continues and solidifies this tradition with affiliates from anthropology, business, computer science, economics, education, humanities, informatics, organizational studies, political science, public policy, public management, sociology, and urban planning.
By providing a focal point and common meeting ground for organizational scholars, COR creates a venue for developing collaborative research projects. COR also offers educational resources for students. Activities for 2006-07 include the on-going monthly COR working paper seminar, public lectures by noted organizational scholars (from UCI and other universities), and the power and empowerment graduate seminar. Funding for COR's activities has been generously provided by Research and Graduate Studies, School of Social Ecology, School of Social Sciences, Paul Merage School of Business, Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences, Department of Planning, Policy, and Design, and Department of Sociology.

Arizona State University, School of Justice and Social Inquiry. The School of Justice and Social Inquiry at Arizona State University develops partnerships with several other ASU programs to pursue issues of justice and democracy associated with many different contemporary issues. The relationship with ASU's Consortium for Science and Policy Outcomes, led by Daniel Sarewitz, emphasizes the role of technology and ways to "democratize science" as well as how to maximize the value of science and technology to public policy. These programs both work with the Center for Nanotechnology and Society, led by David Guston, to critically examine the development of nanotechnology in society.

University of California at Irvine, Center for the Study of Democracy. "The Center for the Study of Democracy (CSD) at the University of California, Irvine sponsors research and education aimed at improving the democratic process in the United States and expanding democracy around the world. We believe that the democratic process is one of America's most precious natural resources. Democracy makes many of the remarkable achievements in American society and economy possible; the global spread of democracy can similarly contribute to personal freedom, individual well-being and increased international cooperation. In 2001 the CSD became UC Irvine's 14th major Organized Research Unit. The Center has a multi-disciplinary faculty from four UC campuses." (Source: Center for the Study of Democracy website, http://www.democ.uci.edu)

University of California at Irvine, Newkirk Center. "The Newkirk Center for Science and Society was established in May 2001, with a generous endowment provided by Martha and James Newkirk, frequent benefactors to the University of California. The Center's goals are to improve science's response to community needs and to increase the effective uses of scientific results for the benefit of society.

"The Center promotes appropriate and effective uses of research in the natural and social sciences to enhance the quality of life. It finds ways to develop and share research knowledge with the public and policy makers so they can make informed decisions on vital policy issues on law, education, environment, health care, crime, and public infrastructure.

"The Center carries out its mission in several ways: through workshops, colloquia, Town Halls, Distinguished Visitors, and communication programs. It encourages the use of high quality scientific findings and directs attention to instances where inadequate research has led to significant community changes." (Source: The Newkirk Center website, http://www.newkirkcenter.uci.edu)
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Center for Public Administration and Policy. Virginia Tech's Center for Public Administration and Policy (CPAP) is in Alexandria, Blacksburg, and Richmond, Virginia. CPAP- Alexandria is located in Virginia Tech's National Capital Region. The Center promotes the common good of our constitutional republic and the advance of public service by providing outstanding education, research, and outreach in the theory and practice of public administration, management, and policy.

The Center for Public Administration and Policy promotes the common good of our constitutional republic and the advancement of public service by providing outstanding education, research, and outreach in the theory and practice of public administration, management, and policy. CPAP aims to achieve the following objectives:

• To provide qualified public administrators currently in service, and early-career students who intend to become public administrators, with challenging applied and theoretical professional development opportunities in public management and public policy.

• To prepare teachers and scholars for faculty service in colleges and universities around the country and the world who will educate citizens and administrators and broaden the scope of knowledge in public administration and policy studies.

• To engage faculty, practitioners, and graduate students in systematic research and study designed to improve the quality of policy making and public service within the diverse jurisdictions of government in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the region as well as the national and international levels. (Source: The CPAP Website: http://www.cpap.vt.edu/)
# Workshop Agenda

## FRIDAY, May 18, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:30 am - 10:00 pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 am - 12:30 pm</td>
<td>Welcome and Working Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12:30 pm - 2:45 pm | Session 1
|                | What is Knowing?
|                | Understanding and Conceptualizing Knowing                            |
|                | Michael Kenney, Davide Nicolini, Anne Taufen-Wessells and Paul Carille |
| 2:45 pm - 3:00 pm | Break                                                                 |
| 3:00 pm - 4:30 pm | Session 2
|                | What is Known?
|                | Mapping Knowing & Categories of Knowing                             |
|                | Max Stephenson, John Bryson and Barbara Crosby, Natalie Heffernan    |
| 4:30 pm - 5:00 pm | Wrap-up Discussion for Day 1                                         |
| 5:15 pm - 5:45 pm | Mini-Bus Transportation to Alexandria City Dock                      |
| 6:00 pm - 7:45 pm | Reception and Boat Ride to Mount Vernon Aboard the Miss Christin     |
| 8:00 pm - 10:00 pm | Dinner at the Mount Vernon Inn                                       |
|                | Guest Speaker: Vice Admiral Patricia A. Tracey, United States Navy (Ret.) |

## SATURDAY, May 19, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am - 1:30 pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am - 8:30 am</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8:30 am - 10:00 am | Session 3 - Part A
|                | How Can We Organize Knowing?
|                | Expertise and Local Knowing                                         |
|                | Dvora Yanow, Clare Ginger and Earthea Nance                         |
| 10:00 am - 10:15 am | Break                                                                 |
| 10:15 am - 11:45 am | Session 3 - Part B
|                | How Can We Organize Knowing?
|                | Expertise and Local Knowing                                         |
|                | Jodi Sandfort, David Thacher, Barry Rabe                             |
| 11:45 am - 12:15 pm | Wrap-up Discussion for Day 2                                         |
| 12:00 pm - 1:30 pm | Concurrent Working Lunch                                             |
| 1:30 pm       | Workshop Concludes
<p>|                | Mini-Bus Transportation to Ronald Reagan Washington International Airport and Washington Dulles International Airport |</p>
<table>
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<tr>
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<th>First Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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Dinner at Mount Vernon - Friday, May 18, 2007

Guest Speaker
Vice Admiral Patricia A. Tracey, United States Navy (Ret.)
Client Industry Executive, EDS

Pat Tracey is client industry executive for the Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) Program. She is responsible for providing strategic planning and business development advice. NMCI, the world's largest federal government information technology contract, is an enterprise-wide managed service that ultimately will provide the US Department of the Navy secure and universal access to voice, video and data information exchange for more than 360,000 desktops at over 300 locations across the United States and sites in Cuba, Japan and Puerto Rico.

A native of The Bronx, New York, Pat completed a distinguished 34-year career in 2004, retiring as a vice admiral and the most senior woman officer in the history of the U.S. Navy. Following her retirement, she established an independent consulting business focused upon systems planning and analysis, governance within the Department of Defense, and professional development of Navy executives. She returned to government service to lead one of 6 teams of Department of Defense executives conducting strategic review in support of the Quadrennial Defense Review. Prior to joining EDS, she served briefly as a Senior Fellow at the Center for Naval Analysis.

Tracey was commissioned in 1970, and reported for her initial assignment to the Naval Space Surveillance System. Thereafter, her staff tours focused on ever-increasing responsibilities in strategic planning, systems analysis and human capital planning. These include service as the Placement Officer for graduate education and service college students; extended planning analyst in the Systems Analysis division, then manpower and personnel analyst in the Program Appraisal Division; and Director, Enlisted Plans and Community Management Branch - all on the Navy staff; then, Director for Manpower and Personnel, J-1, on the Joint Staff; and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Military Manpower and Personnel Policy). There, she was responsible for the establishment of all policies concerning military personnel matters.

Tracey’s operational assignments include Executive Officer, Naval Recruiting District in Buffalo, N.Y., Commanding Officer, Naval Technical Training Center at Treasure Island, Commanding Officer, Naval Station Long Beach, California; and as a Flag Officer: Commander, Naval Training Center, Great Lakes; and Chief of Naval Education and Training.

In her final assignment before leaving the Navy, Tracey became first Director of the Navy Headquarters Staff - leading the activities of a 1400 person headquarters including nine three star flag officer level directorates. Following the 9/11 attack on the Pentagon which destroyed 89% of the Navy Staff spaces, she led the emergency reconstitution effort taking the staff to wartime footing by midnight after the attack. She then directed design and construction of restored workspaces bringing the Navy staff back in the Pentagon for business in 10 weeks.

Tracey’s educational achievements include a Bachelor of Arts degree, cum laude, in Mathematics from the College of New Rochelle; a Master’s degree, with distinction, in Operations Research from the Naval Postgraduate School; and a Fellowship with the Chief of Naval Operations' Strategic Studies Group. She holds an honorary Doctorate of Letters from Wilson College.
Welcome to Alexandria, Virginia!

Climate/Weather
May in the Washington region is generally sunny and temperate, with daytime temperatures of 75 degrees F/24 degrees C and nighttime temperatures of 50-60 degrees F/10-16 degrees C.

Hotel
Courtyard Marriott Hotel
2700 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
703-329-2323
http://marriott.com/hotels/travel/wasal-courtyard-alexandria/

Note that the hotel is located approximately 1.5 miles west of Old Town Alexandria. The hotel provides complimentary parking on site if you will be driving to Alexandria or renting a car.

Important Phone Numbers
In the event of an emergency, call 911.

In case you need to reach the workshop organizers after hours:
Anne Khademian Cell 610-349-8586
Beth Offenbacker Cell 703-623-4811

Workshop Location
We are arranging for transportation to pick up all workshop attendees at the hotel on Friday, May 18 at 11am and on Saturday, May 19 at 8am.

All workshop sessions will be held at:
Virginia Tech, Alexandria Campus
1021 Prince Street (between Patrick and Henry Streets)
Alexandria, VA 22314

Getting Around

• Returning to the Airport. We will provide complimentary transportation on Saturday, May 19 at 1:30pm to Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport (estimated arrival at Reagan National 2pm) and subsequently Washington Dulles International Airport (estimated arrival at Dulles 3:30pm). However, we are unable to provide return transportation to Thurgood Marshall Baltimore Washington International Airport.

• ALTERNATIVE OPTION - Super Shuttle. This is a shared ride provider that offers good quality service at a reasonable price (generally $35-45 plus tip). Anticipate that if you take this option you may or may not be the first person picked up, so if time is an issue for you, another transportation option may be preferable.
You can make advance reservations at least 24 hours before departing at 800-BLUE VAN (258-3826) or (202) 296-6662.

- **ALTERNATIVE OPTION - Taxi.** Ask the front desk at your hotel to order a taxi on your behalf.
  - Estimated Cost to Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport from Virginia Tech or Hotel: $15-20 plus tip
  - Estimated Cost to Thurgood Marshall Baltimore Washington International from Virginia Tech or Hotel: $75-100 plus tip
  - Estimated Cost to Washington Dulles International Airport from Virginia Tech or Hotel: $45-60 plus tip

- **Metro.** Metrorail is an affordable option for getting around the region. Cost is approximately $1-2 each trip (depending on the time of day). See the enclosed Metro Map for more information.

Virginia Tech’s 1021 Prince Street location is approximately a 10-block walk east from the King Street Metro Station. While there is a taxi stand, taxis may or may not be available at the King Street Metro Station depending on time of day. (See below for a list of local cab company phone numbers in the event a cab is not available and you have a cellphone available for use in ordering one.)

The Courtyard Marriott is approximately a 5-block walk west from the Eisenhower Avenue Metro Station. While there is a taxi stand, taxis may or may not be available at the Eisenhower Avenue Metro Station depending on time of day. (See below for a list of local cab company phone numbers in the event a cab is not available and you have a cellphone available for use in ordering one.)

- **Alexandria DASH Bus.** Alexandria has a convenient and affordable local bus system. A free shuttle ("DASH Along the Potomac") operates along King Street (Alexandria’s main east-west street) most evenings and weekends. See the enclosed DASH Bus brochure for additional information.

- **Taxi.** Taxis are available at the King Street or Eisenhower Metro Stations. Alternatively, you can phone for one yourself or ask the front desk at your hotel to do so on your behalf.
  
  Alexandria Yellow Cab Inc., (703) 549-2502  
  Diamond Cab Company, (703) 548-7505  
  King Cab Company, (703) 549-3530

**Dining Options Nearby**
Alexandria and nearby Washington DC offer a plethora of dining options that serve almost every taste and every price range.
Throughout the Washington region, from Washingtonian Magazine (includes reviews)
http://www.washingtonian.com/sections/restaurants/index.html

Alexandria restaurants
http://www.funside.com/dining

Washington Post Restaurant Guide, including reviews

Area Activities
For a complete list of area shopping, cultural, sporting and entertainment activities and area attractions, visit http://www.funside.com/things_to_do.

WORKSHOP BACKGROUND

The Coast-to-Coast Inclusive Management Initiative

Theorizing Ways of Knowing: Beyond Interest
May 18 and 19, 2007
CPAP Alexandria

There are many different ways of knowing problems. Often, differences are understood as core beliefs, organizational missions or self-interest. These understandings encourage advocacy, compromise and negotiation as ways of solving problems. The results of these compromises, however, tend to be short lived because fundamental differences remain.

We¹ are interested in exploring the theoretical bases for moving beyond interests as a focus for problem solving and as a way of developing sustainable approaches to complex problems. We have explored these issues in relation to public policy and public management in the paper that we enclose with this invitation. These issues also arise in a variety of different contexts, both public and private, and we invite ideas that develop them broadly. Please consider the following questions as ways of prompting thoughts about these issues:

- What does knowing mean?
- How do ways of knowing a problem differ from core beliefs, organizational missions, individual self-interest, etc.?
- How do ways of knowing emerge or evolve?
- What role do objects play in creating ways of knowing?
- How can we combine or make use of local/experiential knowledge and expert knowledge in developing new ways of knowing?

¹ Martha Feldman, University of California, Irvine, feldmanm@uci.edu; Anne Khademian, Virginia Tech, akhademi@vt.edu; Helen Ingram, University of California, Irvine, hingram@uci.edu; Anne Schneider, Arizona State University, Anne.Schneider@asu.edu.
FRIDAY, MAY 18, 2007

SESSION ONE

WHAT IS KNOWING?
Understanding and Conceptualizing Knowing

Presenters
Michael Kenney, Davide Nicolini, Anne Taufen-Wessells and Paul Carlile

WORKSHOP PROPOSAL

Ways of Knowing Terrorism:
Communities of Practice and Islamic Extremism

Michael Kenney

Terrorism is a form of political violence that requires knowledge of demolitions, weaponry, and clandestine operations, a host of related activities. Political extremists acquire abstract technical knowledge (technē) through knowledge-based artifacts, many of which are available on the Internet, and formal training programs. However, militants often acquire the practical, experiential knowledge necessary to plan and execute attacks (mētis) through apprenticeships and practice, including actual attacks. Ways of knowing terrorism are often mediated by and acquired through associational networks and larger communities of practice.

While counter-terrorism scholars have produced a large body of literature in recent years, ways of knowing terrorism have not been a central, or even peripheral, concern for researchers. Contrary to an emerging body of literature on terrorism and organizational learning, which emphasizes the role of formal training programs and artifacts, I propose that much extremist learning occurs tacitly, through fluid associational networks and “communities of practice,” where veteran militants and novices communicate, swap stories, and improvise, generating “knowledge-in-practice” through everyday interaction. Through these networks and communities of practice, participants create inter-subjective knowledge, build social relations, and transform their personal identities. In this presentation, I hope to explore how tacit, inter-subjective ways of knowing terrorism through communities of practice can be applied to my fieldwork on Islamic extremism in Spain and the United Kingdom in the Summer of 2007.

Michael Kenney, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science and Public Policy
School of Public Affairs
Penn State Harrisburg--W160
777 W. Harrisburg Pike
Middletown, PA 17057-4846

Telephone: 717-948-6046
Fax: 717-948-6320
mck14@psu.edu
WORKSHOP PROPOSAL

Practice As the Site of Knowing

Davide Nicolini
Warwick Business School
University of Warwick
Coventry, CV4 7AL
UK
Tel: +44 247652 4282
Email: Davide.nicolini@wbs.ac.uk

In my contribution I will endorse and try to further what in the last few years has become known as the practice-based approach to knowing in organizations. A practice-based perspective addresses organizational knowing as a form of social and material expertise, which is, as knowledge in action, situated in a historical, social, and cultural context, and embodied in a variety of forms and materials.

Contrary to the misleading tendency of locating practical knowledge in communities, I will put forward the idea that it is practice, understood processually as practicing, which constitutes the site of knowing. The notion of site supports the idea that knowing is sustained in practice and manifests itself through practice, so that when we examine a practice we inherently examine a knowing. At the same time, it prevents us from collapsing the two, a move that would reduce, instead of enriching, our ways of understanding organizational phenomena. Accordingly, through the concept of site we can scrutinise the knowing and its phenomenology as a distinct dimension of the practicing without assuming them to be separate.

In my contribution I will argue that the notion of practice as the site of knowing directs our attention to the specific junctures of the practicing when knowing makes itself present, as well as to the processes that allow different and dispersed ways of knowing in practice to work together. The notion of site thus suggests that for studying knowing in practice we need to attend to the specific junctures when knowing in practice manifests itself, such as the process of learning, the repair of break-downs, and the expansion of the existing practicing through the introduction of innovative elements. It also directs our attention to the fact that the site of knowing is by definition a net or nexus of interconnected practices, thus prompting us to empirically investigate the ways in which different knowings work and the role that material artefacts play in such process. Last but not least, the notion of practice as the site of knowing suggests that the nexus of interconnected practices constitutes necessarily a regime and is thus associated with specific empowerment and disempowerment effects. My discussion will be grounded in empirical materials derived from a longitudinal research study of telemedicine conducted in northern Italy and from ongoing work on the organisation of biochemical innovation projects in the UK.
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Bridging Possibility and Plausibility in Watershed Park Planning

Anne Taufen Wessells

Objectives such as environmental conservation and green site design should be embraced by municipalities and regions. This is a frequent assertion of environmental policy. What is less readily available, however, is an analysis of how this can be done. One way of approaching this challenge is to characterize the necessary evolution in understandings and development practices as Ways of Knowing urban sustainability. I am interested especially in the coexistence of different concepts of knowing: knowing as rooted in cognition, discourse, speech and text; and knowing as rooted in experience, learned expectations, and established patterns of doing. I would like to use this presentation to explore the idea that “the structure of the way we know policy issues” (Feldman et.al. 2006, p. 21) is comprised of these different ways of knowing working in tandem, and that a more experiential way of knowing policy issues is in fact the critical locus for achieving policy change and positively affecting management outcomes.

My research considers current governance and development practices in the creation of “watershed parks” in four metropolitan areas: Denver, Colorado; Los Angeles, California; Phoenix, Arizona; and San Jose, California. I define an urban watershed park as a waterfront open space that has been ecologically engineered to replenish and conserve groundwater, restore regional biodiversity, manage stormwater, reduce pollution and improve water quality. I used a multi-method research design to investigate and characterize the process of creating a watershed park in each city, focusing on the policy actors who mobilize people and resources to implement a new social-ecological hybrid in urban park design.

My findings indicate that the coalitions are not discrete or stable entities with clearly defined interests. They reach beyond those initially identified as policy actors; members describe their own perspectives as evolving over the course of years and decades; and the collaboration that gets things done rarely takes place in stakeholder planning meetings. As a result, I have replaced the construct of the coalition with that of the actor-network (Latour 2005) in order to account for the powerful but prosaic associations I find between people, as well as the pivotal role of non-human actants (for instance, steelhead trout, planning images, local tax laws, the rivers themselves) in the trajectory of watershed park developments. I strive to connect this understanding of the actor-network to experiential bases of knowledge, and to the pragmatic question of how better outcomes in watershed development can be achieved.

Citations
Feldman, Martha S., Anne M. Khademian, Helen Ingram, and Anne S. Schneider. (under review) Ways of Knowing and Inclusive Management Practices.
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Infrastructures of Performance:
Addressing the Challenge of Novelty in Distributed Innovation Systems

Paul R. Carlile
Boston University

In the presentation I will explore the challenge of distributed innovation through an examination of what I call infrastructures of performance. The performative challenge of innovation is that it puts in tension what is new or novel with what has been done in the past. Innovation then requires change, but too much change can lead to chaos and not enough can lead to competitive failure. In this work I explore three different empirical settings to understand not only how this sweet spot of innovation is determined, but more importantly how determining what to change and what to keep the same is accomplished across a distributed set of actors.

My exploration will start with an Open Source Software community and then stretch to a production and design setting at Toyota and the further to a basic science setting focused on developing treatments to repair the damage caused by multiple sclerosis. What this affords is an exploration of settings where the challenge of identifying and addressing the consequences of novelty is increasing.

To concretely describe how novelty is identified and its consequences addressed in a distributed system we develop the concept of infrastructure. Infrastructure consists of the relations among two things: actors and artifacts. By actors we start with their practice-based knowledge and then use that to account for the differences that exist among actors given differences in amount of knowledge (i.e., novice-expert) or type of knowledge (i.e., specialization) (Carlile and Rebentisch, 2003). By artifacts we call attention to the objects, techniques or methods that actors use to share and assess their knowledge with other actors (Carlile 2004). The capability of an infrastructure, its performance, is determined by the capacity of the artifacts and the ability of the actors to use the artifacts to identify novelty and address it consequences.

This description of infrastructure builds on Bowker and Star’s description of infrastructure (1999) in that it is collective, inherently relational and nearly invisible until it breakdowns. What we add is that Bowker and Star’s interests are directed at describing the interaction of actors and artifacts as a process, as a performance, but not comparing the outcomes of different performances and explaining sources of the variability in those performances. Our focus on the capacity of artifacts and the ability of the actors are the sources of variability that explain the variance in observed outcomes of performance.

Our articulation of an infrastructure of performance is also different from the treatment of actors and artifacts by Actor Network Theory (Latour, 1987; Callon, 1987). By focusing on how different configurations of artifacts and actors and their respective capacities and abilities determine the relative performance of each configuration we move beyond the sufficiency of telling one historical description of a given context. This movement takes us beyond just a description of context to a comparative analysis of contexts and the sources of their relative performances (Black et. al, 2004). Embracing this comparative analysis we can now combine both uses of the word performance; performance as a process and performance
as an outcome; and we see more clearly the descriptive and normative power of seeing "ways of knowing" as infrastructures of performance.
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Exploring Four Forms of Leadership Imagination

Max Stephenson Jr.

In a recent text on nonprofit organization leadership Barry Dym and Harry Hutson offer a claim that set me reflecting on just what might constitute the qualities that nonprofit and public organization leaders must possess to succeed:

“Fit (alignment between leader’s aptitudes and organizational culture and context) bridges leadership variety and complexity of circumstance. We had come to believe that having the right person in the right spot at the right time is a better predictor of leadership success than any particular qualities of individual leaders.”

They go on to argue against the traits theory of leadership and to contend that different leaders serve more effectively at different stages of the organizational life cycle. Leaders, that is, should be found who operate effectively at specific times and in particular conditions. Their capacities do not exist apart, or rather, cannot be harnessed to anything other than, the aim of organizational alignment in a given operating context. This perspective both perplexed and frustrated me, as it appeared to make an organization’s environment determinative of what its leaders might do within it. I was also not convinced that one needed to assume that “great leaders are born” to get out of this thicket.

Instead, it seemed to me that at least in some dimensions, leadership, by definition, points to the reverse. That is, leadership suggests some independent latitude to determine how one will react to events. And, as common sense proposition, we value leaders precisely for their capacity to envision just such possibilities and to chart courses to attain them—whatever the conditions confronting their organizations. This train of thought led me to reflect on what forms of imagination we value in nonprofit organization leaders and why and it is the portent of these I would like to explore at “Ways of Knowing.” I describe those on which I am reflecting next. In my view, each constitutes a valuable dimension of that set of capacities or ways of knowing that President George H. W. Bush famously labeled the “vision thing.” I list these in no particular order though I am most intrigued by the connections between the first and last listed. I should also say that in practice the boundaries of these dimensions are quite porous and leaders doubtless move among them seamlessly and often unselfconsciously as they take actions and make choices.
Aesthetic Imagination

I am increasingly struck that successful leaders must possess a keenly developed aesthetic imagination for it is just such a capacity that allows them to see possibilities that otherwise might never be articulated. In his last book, the philosopher Herbert Marcuse offered a thoughtful critique of Marxist aesthetics that suggested that those who exercise high order aesthetic imagination necessarily subvert accepted social norms and mores. As he put it in The Aesthetic Dimension,

Thereby art creates the realm in which the subversion of experience proper to art becomes possible: the world formed by art is recognized as a reality which is suppressed and distorted in the given reality. This experience culminates in extreme situations (of love and death, guilt and failure, but also joy, happiness and fulfillment) which explode the given reality in the name of a truth normally denied or even unheard.

It seems to me that we look to leaders to provide just such conceptualizations of possibility and these, as Marcuse would contend, typically “subvert” existing conditions and assumptions. I would like to explore this idea as a primary dimension of the imaginative possibilities to which citizens or organizational members commonly look to leaders to provide.

Cognitive Imagination

This dimension or form of leadership imagination is straightforward. We look to leaders to help us make sense of our environments at various scales of analysis. We ask them to see relationships among ideas, concerns or relationships we might not, to suggest how those claims are related and to provide a narrative of meaning linked to all they describe. This set of capacities demands high order analytical thinking at what some scholars have dubbed the meta-cognitive level. I want to explore to what extent it follows that leaders must possess these capabilities themselves or be able to draw astutely upon those who do possess such abilities, in order to provide the narratives that those they wish to lead are implicitly or explicitly requesting.

Affective Imagination

Leaders are expected to exercise high order interpersonal communication capacities and these typically require not only that they be able to function comfortably in diverse environments with diverse individuals, but also communicate clearly as they do so. And perhaps more deeply, these capacities require at their core two difficult additional capabilities that may or may not be closely linked in any given leader. First, many scholars of leadership suggest that leaders must operate from profound self-knowledge even as they control their own emotions to discipline themselves as they relate to others with whom they may have differences or who present difficult challenges emotionally or intellectually. Second, successful leaders appear to exude and to practice actively what has been variously labeled other-regardingness or empathy. They appear able to intuit the needs of those with whom they interact and genuinely to appreciate and act on those. This capacity is especially noteworthy and morally charged since it may readily be used to mislead and manipulate. I am especially interested in how it is that leaders come so often to misuse this form of imagination and how we might assure that such occurrences become more rare among, at least, nonprofit and public organization leaders.
Ethical Imagination

As I have struggled to discern what might distinguish nonprofit organization and public leadership from its for-profit counterpart, I have been drawn increasingly to the view that the first named must serve commons claims that ultimately are rooted in a web of ethical imperatives linked to the extension of trust in which they operate. To address this dimension, I have turned to the work of the thinker Russell Kirk who advanced the notion of the moral imagination. Like Kirk, I have linked a variant of that idea (here labeled the ethical imagination) with T.S. Eliot’s claim for the permanent things but I have done so to understand better how it is that we expect our public leaders to serve. Here is W. Wesley McDoanld’s description of Kirk’s perspective:

Kirk described the moral imagination ‘as that power of ethical perception which strides beyond the barriers of private experience and events of the moment, especially the higher form of this power exercised in poetry and art.’ ‘... the moral imagination comprises man’s power to perceive ethical truth, abiding law in the perceived chaos of many events.’ ‘It is the strange faculty— inexplicable if men are assumed to have an animal nature only— of discerning greatness, justice and order beyond the bars of appetite and self-interest.’

Intriguingly, Kirk attached this capacity to the aesthetic dimension but I am interested most in what it portends for a leader’s willingness to discipline his or her selfish (individual) aims or aspirations for goods that will benefit others. I am not convinced that one needs to assume universal moral truths, as Eliot and Kirk did, to allow this dimension to operate, but I am drawn to the view that public and nonprofit leaders act in contexts that require that commons-based claims play a vital role in their ethical and moral decision-making. Indeed, these leaders must pay at least rhetorical obeisance to the moral claims of the commons in broader and deeper ways than do their for-profit counterparts. It is these demands and tensions that I would like to think through a bit more at the Workshop.

Finally, it appears to me that many of these ethical demands, as Kirk notes, reside in part in the social firmament; that is they are a part of the shared community social imaginary (in Charles Taylor’s formulation) in which leaders must operate. One might contend that much of what leaders do is discern the demands of that imaginary and seek ways to operate within it to secure commons claims or to secure change in the assumptions on which the imaginary itself is constructed.

WORKSHOP PROPOSAL

*Action-Oriented Strategy Mapping as Bridge-Building from One Way of Knowing to Another*

John M. Bryson and Barbara C. Crosby

Action-Oriented Strategy Mapping (AOSM) is a well-developed technique for helping individuals and groups figure out what they want, or should want, how to get it, and why (Bryson, Ackermann, Eden and Finn, 2004). AOSM makes use of word-and-arrow diagrams to help groups surface and organize large numbers of constructs into shared narratives that
constitute the logic structure of a strategic plan - that is, mission, supported by goals, which are achieved by implementing strategies, which consist of portfolios of agreed actions. AOSM has its roots in a number of fields, but draws especially on management science, psychology, and sociology.

In this paper we demonstrate how maps and mapping can be used as tools and techniques for building understanding and relationships (ways of knowing) across multiple boundaries to guide action in pursuit of the common good. We use as our primary example a multi-stage mapping project designed to develop a shared vision for North Minneapolis, one of the poorest and most problem-ridden areas in Minneapolis, MN. The resulting vision has been used to coordinate the work of many actors from government, business, and nonprofit sectors to achieve better outcomes in the extended neighborhood. The vision has energized pre-existing efforts to internally reorganize the county government and to create stronger and more numerous cross-sector relationships. The vision serves as an “invisible leader,” to use Mary Parker Follett's (1942) term to describe the role shared goals can play in shared-power situations. We draw lessons from this example that may be useful in other situations wherein surfacing and developing ways of knowing are important.

In more theoretical terms, maps can serve as a “transitional object” (Winnicott, 1970) or “facilitative device” (de Geus, 1988), while mapping provides a “ritual structure” (Forester, 1999) that allows groups to move together to a better or preferred place cognitively, behaviorally, and emotionally. Mapping helps groups articulate the current “problem story” that is causing difficulty for them, and then create an “alternate story” that is less problematic, more motivating, and generally more satisfying (Monk, Winslade, Crocket, and Epston, 1997). The new story is created in part out of aspects of the situation that that were already present, so the flow from problematic past into more desirable future is facilitated. In other words, one way of knowing is replaced by or translated into another; given-ness is replaced by possibility (Mangham and Overington, 1987); and the conventional becomes an alternative, while the unlikely alternative becomes a more likely convention (Feldman, Khademian, Ingram, and Schneider, 2006).

In summary, mapping can help whenever articulating ways of knowing (or more generally, thinking) matters. In particular, we think that mapping can be particularly useful when:
- it is vital that a situation be understood better as a prelude to any action
- effective strategies need to be developed
- persuasive arguments are needed
- effective and logical communication is essential
- effective understanding and management of conflict are needed
Proposal for Workshop: Theorizing Ways of Knowing: Beyond Interest

Public administrators are representatives of the public they serve. Public administration in its simplest form translates to administrators knowing what constitutes public problems, implementing policies to solve these problems and knowing the impacts of these policies. There are many ways of knowing problems. Theorizing about these ways of knowing can be facilitated by viewing ways of knowing with a historical perspective.

Our democratic republic was founded amid a deliberative dialogue between Federalists and Anti-federalists. One could theorize that the conflict was based on different ways of knowing the problems that the new nation would face. An interesting workshop discussion might be to look at the founding ways of knowing, how these ways have evolved over time, what role objects played and how the founders used or viewed local and expert knowledge.

With a boundary drawn between Federalist and Anti-federalist opinion, discussion about the different perspectives in knowing might show clear delineation of structural or agentic variables.

Discussion of the evolution of the Federalist and Anti-federalist perspectives may provide data for a Kantian argument to its evolution. Has there been a paradigm shift with the emergence of a new theory for knowing or has a theory evolved with a foundational premise created in our founding?

The role of the Constitution and Bill of Rights may prove to be important objects in creating ways of knowing. These objects point to collaborative ways of knowing. Current objects of information technology, such as public web sites, and chat rooms may serve similar roles to the town meetings of old. Do our current objects improve or hinder our ways of knowing?

Cultural changes that value self-help over collaboration may figure heavily in ways of knowing from the time of the founding. Additionally, cultural changes evolve from an agrarian society, to an industrial society and continue to change as we move to a global, knowledge based society. Changes in knowing where to seek expertise, how to segregate work and assessing the impact may provide insight into our discussion of the theories of knowing.

Our history affects our ways of knowing. Reflection on this effect can only enhance our theories and our understanding of ways of knowing beyond self-interest.
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Ways of Knowing: The Role of Passionate Humility

Dvora Yanow
Vrije Universiteit
Amsterdam, NL
d.yanow@fsw.vu.nl

We live in an age of expertise and professionalization. This observation is not new; it has, in fact, become so commonplace that we hardly attend to its character and content - unless we look at this perception in a historical-cultural context. Even less remarked is the particular character of this expertise, the place held by universities in developing it, and its consequences for human behavior more broadly.

After all, the guilds honed a finely developed mode of “professional” practice - specialization in a field, with the equivalent of licensing and a code of appropriate behaviors (at least among masters, journeymen, and apprentices), two of the commonly held sine qua non of professionalization. Mastercraftsmen surely possessed expertise par excellence, and the guild system perfected a way of passing this knowledge from one generation to the next. Consider, for example, the Amati, Guarneri, and Stradivari schools of violin making. More broadly, with a less considered form of teaching and learning, is the local knowledge held by adult members of any society, which any outsider - any immigrant or ethnographer - has to learn and which various research methods - ethnomethodology among them - seeks to discover.

What is said to characterize the expertise of today is its technical-rational character. I will discuss in this paper the ways in which university education develops this particular form of knowledge/knowing, but my focus will be on its implications for practice, including both the relational, administrative practices of managers and the methodological practices of social science researchers. In brief, thrusting toward technical-rational expertise positions the expert at the center, possessing all knowledge, feeling no need to consider the possible knowledge, and even expertise, held by others with whom he comes in contact. Local knowledge is written out of the picture. I argue that what is needed, instead, is “passionate humility”: the conviction that we, as “experts,” are right, married with the possibility that we might be wrong. Such a consideration can lead us to a reflexivity that recognizes the positionality of our perspectives and our knowledge, which in turn can lead us to a more humane, less self-centered knowing-in-practice.
I will draw on the work of Clifford Geertz, Donald Schon, Hubert Dreyfus, and others in developing this line of thought.
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Ways of Knowing: The Role of Passionate Humility

Dvora Yanow
Vrije Universiteit
Amsterdam, NL
d.yanow@sw.vu.nl

We live in an age of expertise and professionalization. This observation is not new; it has, in fact, become so commonplace that we hardly attend to its character and content - unless we look at this perception in a historical-cultural context. Even less remarked is the particular character of this expertise, the place held by universities in developing it, and its consequences for human behavior more broadly.

After all, the guilds honed a finely developed mode of “professional” practice - specialization in a field, with the equivalent of licensing and a code of appropriate behaviors (at least among masters, journeymen, and apprentices), two of the commonly held sine qua non of professionalization. Mastercraftsmen surely possessed expertise par excellence, and the guild system perfected a way of passing this knowledge from one generation to the next. Consider, for example, the Amati, Guarneri, and Stradivari schools of violin making. More broadly, with a less considered form of teaching and learning, is the local knowledge held by adult members of any society, which any outsider - any immigrant or ethnographer - has to learn and which various research methods - ethnomethodology among them - seeks to discover.

What is said to characterize the expertise of today is its technical-rational character. I will discuss in this paper the ways in which university education develops this particular form of knowledge/knowing, but my focus will be on its implications for practice, including both the relational, administrative practices of managers and the methodological practices of social science researchers. In brief, thrusting toward technical-rational expertise positions the expert at the center, possessing all knowledge, feeling no need to consider the possible knowledge, and even expertise, held by others with whom he comes in contact. Local knowledge is written out of the picture. I argue that what is needed, instead, is “passionate humility”: the conviction that we, as “experts,” are right, married with the possibility that we might be wrong. Such a consideration can lead us to a reflexivity that recognizes the positionality of our perspectives and our knowledge, which in turn can lead us to a more humane, less self-centered knowing-in-practice.

I will draw on the work of Clifford Geertz, Donald Schon, Hubert Dreyfus, and others in developing this line of thought.
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Processes for Integrating Ways of Knowing: Modeling and Technology in Environmental Planning

Clare Ginger
350 Aiken Center
Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont 05405
Phone: 802-656-2698 Fax: 802-656-2623
cginger@uvm.edu

As in many applied policy fields, the environmental arena encompasses phenomena that we describe, theorize, debate, and make decisions about drawing on a wide range of fields of knowledge and experience. One of the challenges in such settings is whether and how we can integrate varied ways of knowing. For example, in the case of environmental racism and justice, how do we bring together knowledge generated in quantitative studies focused on outcomes of siting decisions with in-depth ethnographic case studies of the processes through which such decisions are constructed and made (Clarke and Gerlak, 1998, Ginger, 2002). How do and should people drawing insights through academic study interact with people drawing insights through daily living? How might these different ways of knowing relate to describing cause and effect relationships, and contribute to how we define issues and our responses to them? Given that our concepts of cause and effect relationships are models, what roles might participatory modeling play in making explicit our cause-effect understandings and contribute to efforts to integrate our varied understandings? And in what ways might people draw on integrated ways of knowing to reframe issues and our policy responses to them?

This presentation will explore these questions in the context of some combination of three case examples from the environmental planning arena in which people draw on varied approaches to modeling and integrating cause-effect relationships. Data have been gathered for these cases over the last 2 to 4 years. The choice of case examples depends on input from the workshop conveners about what might be of interest to workshop participants.

A. A watershed planning effort in Vermont in which a stakeholder group was convened to develop a computer model to define and assess the issue of phosphorus loading in the watershed. Participants were in conflict about whether agricultural practices were the primary source of phosphorus runoff. This conflict was accompanied by different views about what the farmers ought to do. A key question is whether and how people drew on the computer model to integrate their varied interpretations and to reframe the issue in determining potential future actions.

B. A planning process undertaken by the USDA Forest Service for the Green Mountain National Forest in Vermont. People with different and sometimes opposing views of the forest participated in public involvement processes, including a mapping exercise in which people modeled future forest use. This exercise involved a technology of mylar sheets overlaid on paper maps and colored magic markers. A key question in this case is how agency personnel integrated this with other forms of information to generate a plan that accommodated varied normative positions about future activities in the forest.
C. A project in the Philippines in which a coalition of organizations and individuals is responding to poverty by addressing population, health, and environment dynamics. In this setting, ways of knowing are linked to a range of organizational settings (e.g., conservation groups, relief organizations, public health agencies) and the cause-effect relationships drawn on by coalition members vary widely. A key question in this setting is how members of the coalition draw on and integrate varied ways of knowing to frame issues, problems, and responses in ways that encompass an increasingly broad array of organizations.

All three cases involve interactions among people who frame the issues and hope to define policy directions that integrate different understandings of cause-effect relationships in human-environment dynamics. They occur in settings that involve a range of scales for action (local, regional, state, national). The first two cases have in common a dimension of interest-based conflict focused on ecological and economic concerns. All three cases have a dimension of a group of people purposefully bringing together different ways of understanding the issues at hand. They also include efforts to join internally (to the case) defined areas of expertise with citizen or stakeholder participation. The technologies for modeling and seeking integration vary by case.
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Participation as Ethnodevelopment, or a Post-Structuralist Account of Participatory Development

Earthea Nance, Ph.D., P.E.
ecnance@vt.edu

Abstract

If development is our “modern myth of progress” (Latour, 1999), then what is participatory development? Why do we have regular development for one category of people and participatory development for the poor and marginalized? What is the source of and reason for maintaining such an asymmetry? The philosophy of Bruno Latour offers scholars a new place to stand in critiquing the practice of participatory development. By not separating the technical from the social, Latourian ontology offers an alternative to traditional methodological approaches to evaluation that still rely on this structural divide (Latour, 1993). In this paper, I will argue that the philosophical foundations of participatory development make it a form of ethno-development. What is at stake is of primary relevance to planning: who gets authority to define the legitimate role of people in development.

Practitioners and people display different logics of participation (Cooke and Kothari, 2001). Practitioners, standing outside of development and having authority over the whole process, see participation as people’s involvement and contributions. Practitioners set the stage for participation so they can later claim that the people participated and acted to bring about a successful project. People, who experience development and act from an implicit understanding of that experience, see participation as a way to enhance the representation of their interests. Their participation or exclusion, their representation or marginalization predates the participatory development project and (often) goes unacknowledged. Participatory development therefore emerges as “ethno-development,” development for those who have been left out. It is development for people categorized as marginal which at
the same time justifies and maintains marginality as a category of human existence (Perlman, 1976). It is development based on a politics of domination that discounts the ways in which people participate outside the realm of practitioner-defined participation programs. Participatory development recreates the divide between development projects as content and society as context. An accurate description of practice would reveal the relative existence of participation at different points in time and the reciprocal transformation of people and projects.

Three Latourian or actor-network theory (ANT) concepts—hybrids, networks, and symmetry—are key features of this post-structuralist account of participatory development. Participatory development mediates both technology and democracy. The resulting development projects are hybrids—neither pure subject nor pure object—implemented by a complex network of actants comprised of humans, machines, and institutions. Because these systems are hybrids that embody the social and the technical simultaneously, their outcome depends on how the systems are used by people, as well as how the systems are managed by development practitioners. These hybrid projects are themselves actants with a certain form of agency. Once constructed, the humans are dialectically changed and reorganized in relation to the technology around them. As technologies emerge, society itself changes. By the principle of symmetry, interpretations of development practice should use similar lines of reasoning to explain technical and social phenomena, and similar lines of reasoning to explain development for mainstream and marginalized population groups.

The key data sources for my critique of participatory development will be Brazil’s grand experiment in participatory sanitation, which I have come to understand by way of ethnography (Nance, 2004, 2005, forthcoming). Drawing from participatory sanitation experiences in three Brazilian cities (Bahia, Recife, and Natal), I analyze the texts and statements that engineering practitioners and engineering professors used to teach other engineers how to do “participatory development” from one city to another. I compare the discourses, the outcomes, and the procedures of participatory development. My objective is to give an account of participatory development that is true to practice and to use ANT concepts and methods to develop a post-structuralist account of participatory development.
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Reflecting on the Ways of Knowing
Nonprofit Management & Leadership Practice

Jodi Sandfort
Associate Professor, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota

For the Theorizing Ways of Knowing conversation in May, I would like to bring experiences and thoughts that I've had during the last six months as I develop an intensive leadership training institute with and for the Minnesota Council of Nonprofits (MCN). The Leadership Institute is designed for two cohorts of individuals, executive directors/senior managers and "connectors" who play roles focused on connecting their organizations to communities. The two cohorts will each attend day-long sessions over nine months (starting in March 2007), with some sessions designed to bring both groups together to expand learning. Each participant will also work on a learning project and participate in a peer, action-inquiry group to deepen their experience.

We have built the MCN Leadership Institute upon some foundational beliefs:

1. Nonprofits organizations play distinct roles in our society and, thus, need to be managed and lead differently than other organizations. Nonprofits comparative advantage is the ability to engage, inspire and aggregate human energy - to mobilize the non-financial resources of the community and teach the skills and benefits of participation;

2. The daily press of nonprofit management keeps many actors from honing their strategic decision-making to better serve this community role, enhance their organizations, or influence public discussions about their areas of expertise.

3. The execution of leadership in the nonprofit sector is a combination of analysis and style; it requires strategy, skills, and reflection-on-action. As such, leadership requires both thinking and a type of artistry. As Donald Schon describes, "Artistry is the exercise of intelligence, a (different) kind of knowing. It is not inherently mysterious; it is rigorous in its own terms; and we can learn a lot about it by carefully studying the performance of unusually competent performers."

In this effort, our training team sees ourselves as educational strategists who coordinate resources and provide a structure and method of inquiry where people can learn. We are embodying spirited inquiry and holding the challenging questions for participants. We are motivated by the question: How can we teach nonprofit people to take full advantage of their strategic, conceptual, and creative thinking?  

We are explicitly directing our attention to two distinct levels: individual participants so they can be more effective within their organizations; and organizations so they can better exercise leadership in their community, strengthen their connections with constituents, and develop deeper ties with other organizations. As such, we are building upon and grappling with some of the fundamental tensions in structuration theory about structure and human agency and conceptualize “Leadership” as, fundamentally, the exertion of agency that shifts social structures, both meaning and resources.

I do not plan to present a formal paper but will look forward to making a presentation about our learning, insights and unfolding questions. I also will look forward to participating in the learning.
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**Availability as Resource and Bias**

David Thacher

In recent literature about policy analysis, an influential defense of scientific policymaking appeals to failures of lay rationality in the assessment of risks. Cass Sunstein, in particular, calls attention to the heuristics and biases that distort human reasoning to argue that scientific experts should have substantial influence over important areas of policymaking. Sunstein particularly emphasizes the dangers posed by lay reliance on the *availability heuristic*, in which vivid and familiar images of potential risks distort judgments about the probability that they will actually occur. Concern about this so-called “availability bias” not only militates against populist influence on risk regulation (which Sunstein emphasizes) but also against reliance on non-statistical forms of knowledge about risk.

I argue that this critique emphasizes the costs of “availability” without attention to the constructive role it plays in rationality. Risk analysis requires judgments not only about the probability that a danger will materialize but also about the significance of that danger if it does come to pass. Call the first task *risk assessment* and the second task *risk appreciation*. Sunstein draws on psychological literature (particularly Daniel Kahneman’s work on “heuristics and biases” in human rationality) to argue that lay rationality does a poor job at risk assessment, concluding that we should delegate this task primarily to scientific experts. I argue that the same psychological literature (particularly Kahneman’s work documenting systematic discrepancies between experienced utility and decision utility) suggests that expert rationality will do a poor job at risk appreciation: Without close attention to exactly the kind of vivid imagery that distorts probability judgments, experts will often rely on a stylized and inaccurate representation of the event whose probability they seek to estimate.

---

3 Articulation of this question in this concise way was done by Larry Ferlazzo during his participation in the Leadership for a Changing World program at New York University.
This argument finds further support in cognitive neuroscience, which over the last decade has documented the essential role that emotion-laden imagery plays in rational choice.

Failures of risk appreciation are especially important in government policymaking and in organizations, since policymakers and managers must regularly make decisions that have implications for distal publics whose experiences they do not share. I discuss the ways in which narrative research can help counteract this bias in expert and governmental decisionmaking.

WORKSHOP PROPOSAL

Governing The Climate From Sacramento

Barry Rabe

Global climate change has been closely scrutinized by the natural and physical sciences, through diverse methods that attempt to measure atmospheric trends in greenhouse gases and predict future climate impacts. Social scientists have begun to enter the fray, primarily through exploring competing policy approaches that might reduce greenhouse gas emissions either domestically or internationally. Much of this work has drawn from economics, advancing the case that policy tools such as emissions trading and taxation are inherently preferable to other possible interventions and can be effectively applied to such a ubiquitous substance as carbon dioxide.

Stunningly little attention, however, has been devoted to the public management dimensions of this issue. Climate change clearly cuts across numerous traditional policy boundaries, including environmental protection, energy, agriculture and natural resources, transportation and economic development for starters. But most policy analysis and policy proposals to date tend to simply assume any new enactments can simply be grafted onto existing departments and ministries, often through amendment to existing legislation. As the recent odyssey of homeland security governance suggests, new forms of public management may be required and may well need to go beyond traditional efforts to simply merge multiple programs and units into a comprehensive department.

Climate change may constitute a particularly difficult management challenge whereby core issues may only begin to become clear after new ways of knowing emerge. For example, most policy analysis has considered individual policy tools in isolation, rather than examine the integrative aspects of regulation, cap-and-trade regimes, taxation, and technology subsidies that are likely to be applied to various energy sources across multiple jurisdictions at any given time. Perhaps only through actual policy experimentation and experience, rather than reliance on modeling and forecasting, can we begin to discern the true nature of this challenge and the new ways (perhaps fundamental) of management that will be required.

This presentation will build on continuing examination of sub-national climate policy development in the United States and Canada, work that is now expanding into a more comparative enterprise that also considers the European Union and Australia. It will attempt to highlight some of the likely public management challenges posed by expanding involvement with climate change (whether emission reduction or societal adaptation). It will also provide a preliminary overview of those relatively few jurisdictions that have begun to think not only
about climate impacts and specialized policies, but the longer-term challenges of climate governance and necessary professional and institutional development. This review will focus on the experiences of California (in the US), Manitoba (in Canada), and the United Kingdom (in the EU), at the very early stages of a project designed to examine long-term challenges and opportunities for climate governance.