NATIONS UNIES ? #W+) 3 = + = = [y+ = ! O 3 3 UNITED NATIONS

COMMISSION ECONOMIQUE POUR L'EUROPE +%C? A+ 5E7 ! a]7 ? = ? ; 3Q+E7 ! a 7 ? ; 3EE3 a ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

SEMINAIRE E+ ; 3 = ! C SEMINAR

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SETTLEMENTS

Distr.
GENERAL

Ninth Conference on Urban and Regional Research

HBP/SEM.53/4
24 January 2002

Leeds (United Kingdom), 9-12 June 2002

Original: ENGLISH

Discussion Paper Theme I

URBAN SOCIETY AND ECONOMY: TOWARDS SOCIAL EQUITY THROUGH EFFECTIVE PLANNING POLICIES AND TOOLS

A BEHAVIOURAL PERSPECTIVE

Discussion Paper by David Fell, (United Kingdom)
and V.K. Storchevus (Russian Federation)

Preliminary reflections

> "From the number of imaginable cities, we must exclude those whose elements are assembled without a connecting thread, an inner rule, a perspective, a discourse. With cities, it is as with dreams: everything imaginable can be dreamed, but even the most unexpected dream is a rebus that conceals a desire or, its reverse, a fear. Cities, like dreams, are made of desires and fears, even if the thread of their discourse is secret, their rules are absurd, their perspectives deceitful, and everything conceals something else.
>
> "I have neither desires nor fears," the Khan declared, "and my dreams are composed either by my mind or by chance.
>
> "Cities also believe they are the work of the mind or of chance, but neither the one nor the other suffices to hold up their walls."
>
> **Italo Calvino, Invisible Cities, 1974**

Introduction

1. There is a very wide range of issues at stake when considering how the effective use of urban planning and policy tools can assist in the process of achieving social equity. It is possible, furthermore, to adopt a wide variety of perspectives on these issues. One perspective that is frequently missing, however, from both the research and the policy domain, is a behavioural perspective.

2. This paper introduces such a perspective, and presents a brief discussion on a number of the issues raised. This behavioural perspective is concerned with the way in which individuals and organizations in (urban) society actually behave, and, more especially, with the motivations that underpin this behaviour. In designing planning and policy tools intended to bring about sustainable and liveable cities, these behaviours and motivations need to be taken into account. Furthermore, there may be scope to design policy tools deliberately intended to change behaviour, so as to bring it in tune with the objective of improving the liveability of cities.

3. The behavioural approach has its roots in a wide variety of disciplines: economics, sociology, geography, psychology, political science, ethology, biology, anthropology and philosophy. In each of these areas, the approach has had a mixed history. Furthermore, the fact that thinking has been split across this diverse set of subjects has mitigated against the development of coherent progress and has, in our view, limited the acceptance of the approach into the mainstream. This contrasts, for example, with the status of mainstream land-use and transport planning.

4. In economics, for example, theories of individual behaviour and the behaviour of firms,[1] developed initially to reduce the vast complexity of economic life into manageable equations, are increasingly being criticized as leading to fundamentally misconceived notions for both research and policy.[2]

5. In the fields of sociology and philosophy, more productive lines of enquiry - from thinkers such as Lefebvre, Ward, Illich, Atkinson, Thompson[3] – have explored the world "from the bottom up" rather than the top down. Although not necessarily strictly behavioural, the common denominator of these and of similar writers and thinkers is that they consider the ways in which real people behave, rather than the way in which an ideologically grounded policy intends or expects them to behave. This thinking has tended to be marginalized from mainstream policy-making.

6. A coherent, integrated behavioural perspective on urban development has not, as a result, developed strongly. The consequences of this failure, however, have become progressively more apparent in recent years, particularly as successive waves of urban regeneration policy continue, in many cases, to have little or no effect.

7. A recent and anonymous example illustrates this very clearly: adjacent to a deprived edge-of-city housing estate, a local authority made innovative and efficient use of both central government and local government finance to develop an industrial and trading estate. The intention was to create job opportunities for unemployed adults on the estate, thus addressing not only an important social issue but also an environmental one, by reducing the need to travel. The

scheme was carefully designed to encourage businesses that were likely to need the sorts of skills available on the estate; and the scheme was successful in this respect. The number of jobs taken by residents of the estate exceeded the scheme's target.

8. However, most of the individuals that secured jobs immediately moved away from the estate, anxious – now that they had a job – to live in a better neighbourhood. New in-movers to the estate were typically unemployed, such that by the end of the project, although in job creation terms the scheme had been successful, there had been no net impact on the housing estate, and the environmental outcome represented a deterioration.

9. Many such "unintended consequences" have their roots in the behavioural domain. Yet a cursory glance across the agenda for sustainable and liveable cities reveals little appreciation of, or research into, this domain. Against this background, it seemed appropriate that this topic paper should consider the issues of urban society and economy from a behavioural perspective. The paper presents a case justifying the potential benefits of adopting a behavioural perspective, focusing in particular on the issues of social equity in an urban setting.

10. Following this introduction, chapter I presents a consideration of the range of actors, or agents, whose behaviour is relevant to urban liveability. We turn in chapter II to the range of activities undertaken by these agents in the urban setting and consider, in particular, the outcomes or impacts – often negative - of these activities. In chapter III, we look at how different elements of society access these activities, not only in physical terms via transport, but also in social terms. Chapter IV examines the process of behavioural change itself. In particular, this chapter looks at how the behaviour of individuals and groups in urban society can be changed to meet the needs of sustainable and liveable cities better. The policy and research implications are also assessed. Chapter V considers some of the barriers to change.[4]

I. AGENTS, ACTORS

11. In this paper, the term "agent" is used in its sociological sense, to refer to any individual or organization operating in a social setting. In an urban context, these "behavioural units" are, broadly: individuals, households, neighbourhoods, communities, commercial enterprises, voluntary enterprises, trade unions, State organizations.[5]

12. Each type of agent exhibits "behaviour" and, moreover, behaviour that is idiosyncratic to that type. A behavioural perspective on sustainable and liveable cities, therefore, requires us to think about the behaviour of all these agents both separately and together.

13. The behaviour of these agents will dictate the success or otherwise of policy initiatives intended to produce more sustainable or liveable cities. Householders, for example, make choices about location, as they balance the demands of travel, family, work, leisure and lifestyle. The behavioural outcomes arising from these choices may not be in any sense socially or environmentally or economically ideal, such that standard theories may have little explanatory power. Car ownership, for example, is peculiarly resistant to social or economic or environmental argument. The Netherlands-based HOMES project, for instance, shows that there is a significant psychological component that needs to be incorporated into understanding this area of behaviour.[6]

14. Another example is the rise of suburbia, or urban sprawl. Although facilitated by car ownership, and despite the prospect of long journeys to school or work or leisure, very large numbers of individuals and households want to live in the suburbs. What are the motivations behind this? If planners begin to restrict the availability (supply) of residences in such locations, it seems unlikely that demand will simply dry up.

15. Similarly, private enterprises should choose, on rational economic grounds, to locate in locations with access to markets, with good transport links and a plentiful supply of suitably skilled, affordable labour. Regular surveys of business preference indicate that this is, indeed, the case.[7] In addition, however, and on more behavioural grounds, businesses also want to locate in places with a good image, where there are other peer businesses, and so on.

16. In both instances, agents have behavioural characteristics which, whilst not necessarily rational, are nevertheless apparent and may be subject to analysis. Recent research efforts have begun to explore these issues,[8] but so far relatively little of it seems to have been specifically concerned with the actions and behaviour of agents in the urban setting.

17. Another area where a behavioural perspective may prove useful concerns the interactions between types or, more particularly, groups of agents. Many cities throughout Europe are currently experiencing international in-migration, and quite rapid changes in demographic structure.[9] Major issues of multiculturalism, citizenship, religion and discrimination are raised by these developments.

18. Tensions within society are often associated with these developments, wherever they occur. We suggest, below, that a fuller understanding of "belonging" and "identity" may help us to understand these tensions.

19. These actions and interactions always take place within a particular set of constraints – of time, money and space. Of particular significance is the financial element. In the short term, agents' interest in meeting their own needs requires access to sufficient financial resources. For the urban form itself, this implies that there is an adequate wealth-generating environment, an economy able to support the agents within it. Without a satisfactory economy, it is difficult to envisage a liveable city.

20. In the longer term, the ecological constraint becomes more significant. An economy that is systematically depleting the Earth's resources is not sustainable.[10] The economy of a liveable and sustainable city must, in the longer term, reduce its ecological footprint[11] to a scale consistent with long-run survival. The process of ensuring that this is the case needs to start sooner, rather than later.

21. Two further remarks are relevant at this stage. First, it is important to recognize that agents may participate in and/or be members of a wide range of social networks.[12] These memberships may give rise to many, potentially conflicting, behavioural pressures. A householder may simultaneously be a driver, an employee and a golfer: and her behaviour in the urban setting will be influenced by all three. Similarly, a business may be a profit-making entity, an employer and a tenant, again with a distinct pattern of behavioural consequences.

22. Second, and of particular importance in the current context, is that the distribution of power between and among agents is a vital component of social equity. In circumstances where some agents have more resources – financial, intellectual, legal or otherwise – than other agents, there is an unavoidable power imbalance. The behaviour of differing groups within the urban setting reflects this imbalance – and it is therefore an area to which policies could, in principle at least, be directed in order to bring about more sustainable and liveable cities.[13] Some have suggested that this imbalance is an issue of human rights, and that rights of access to (natural) resources should be constitutionally embedded in notions of citizenship.

23. • *How can actual/potential behaviour best be researched? Do established assumptions about group definitions still apply? Is "lifestyle" now more important than socio-economic group, for example?*

• *For businesses, what is the balance between "hard" factors and "image" factors in their location decisions?*

• *What mix of factors – lifestyle, income and so on – cause householders to want to live in the suburbs? How can these be addressed, so that "the compact city" becomes more attractive to citizens?*

• *What behavioural researches could shed light on the issues of in-migration and multiculturalism?*

• *How can ecological limitations become embedded in economic considerations? How can the behaviour of agents be changed to live better within ecological constraints?*

II. UNDERSTANDING ACTIONS, ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOMES

24. In the urban setting, the various types of agent engage in a wide range of different activities. For households, these activities typically include employment, leisure, shopping, learning; for businesses they include customer service, interaction with suppliers and regulators, acting as an employer, and so on. Each type of agent has an idiosyncratic pattern of activities; though there are clearly overlaps and analogies between the patterns.

25. It is research conducted in the environmental field over the past twenty years that has brought proper attention to the scale of waste generated by all this activity. Contemporary thinkers such as Girardet and Hendersen[14] make it ever clearer how unsustainable much of our current patterns of urban activity really are.

26. In addition to these ecological considerations, it is possible to consider more generally the range of negative outcomes for urban societies arising from the multiplicity of activities undertaken by agents as they pursue their objectives. It is useful to note the equity issues arising from the way in which negative outcomes typically fall disproportionately upon the weaker or more disadvantaged members of society. It is also notable that one potential definition of advantage would be the ability to insulate or otherwise protect oneself from these negative consequences.

27. The principal negative outcomes in urban society include: unemployment; poor health; inadequate access to health care; poor housing; poor education, and reduced access to education; drug addiction; and crime. These problems have characterized urban areas to a greater or lesser extent throughout the history of cities. In recent decades in the Western economies, there has

been a tendency for these problems to become progressively concentrated in certain areas of certain cities. Some communities have become subject to "multiple deprivation", becoming progressively further excluded from the benefits of mainstream economic and social progress. In the economies in transition, the very rapid pace of change in the past decade has, in some cases, led to very obvious and severe multiple deprivation. It is clear that, in these cases, very substantial numbers of people do not currently dwell in "liveable" cities.[15]

28. With traditional policy tools having struggled – if not failed outright – to address these deep and interlocking problems of modern urban life, the opportunity to adopt a behavioural, or "bottom-up" or "communitarian" perspective appears strong. There are emerging examples[16] to suggest, for example, that solutions in which the combined elements of multiple deprivation are put under community control deliver more sustainable outcomes. A similar pattern applies to businesses: economies in which self-determining businesses collaborate and interact in "clusters" without formal direction tend to be stronger, more resilient and faster growing than those that do not participate in such clusters.

29. More generally for urban areas throughout Europe, the environmental consequences of current behaviour patterns appear unsustainable. Looked at in turn, in each area of environmental impact we see a struggle between a regulatory environment, producers/suppliers, technology and consumers/users. From a behavioural point of view, it is not always clear that agents, left to their own devices, would demand more environmentally acceptable solutions, even if there is a close link between their own actions and a consequent environmental effect. For example, surveys[17] show that both consumers and businesses are inclined to think that environmental issues are someone else's problem, and that it is simply not their responsibility to change their behaviour. (The same surveys also show that significant numbers of agents are able to think one thing, and do another.)

30. Clearly, the full range of economic, financial, social and environmental factors need to be considered when addressing these deep-seated problems. An understanding of the motivations underpinning the behaviour of the agents involved can only help the situation.

31.
- *How can an understanding of agent behaviour best help to address the problems discussed?*
- *How can environmental issues be pushed up the agenda (for consumers and businesses), particularly when there are pressing issues of health, nutrition and crime?*
- *What behavioural research can be done that best helps to tackle the problems of introducing market principles to urban areas in the countries in transition?*
- *How can it be made easier for agents to behave in a sustainable fashion?*

III. ACCESS

32. A behavioural perspective also proves useful when considering the question of how agents both access the activities and avoid the negative outcomes discussed above.

33. In physical terms, access is principally about transport and transport infrastructure. Traditionally, provision for physical transport is planned in terms of networks and modes. There

has been little attention paid to the behaviour of the users of transport systems, and the motivations underpinning these behaviours.

34. The increased and high cost of travel by mass public transport, and the inability of the majority of the population to buy an individual car because of low incomes, create a considerable hindrance for the development of the transport mobility of the urban population in countries in transition. Although there has been a certain growth in transport mobility for commercial purposes, there has been a sharp drop in the number of commuter trips and trips for recreation, cultural and educational purposes. It seems highly plausible that a better understanding of the behavioural background to this change would help foster appropriate policy responses.

35. As well as transport access, however, there is – particularly from a social-equity point of view – the issue of social access. Access to employment opportunities, access to housing, access to health care, access to networks, access to urban services, access to political infrastructure, access to the Internet, access to the financial resources necessary to participate in the urban setting: these are all forms of access that vary between the types of agents we have outlined, and that vary in such a way as to promote or undermine the liveability of an urban area.

36. Access to skills is also a key area when considering the liveability of urban areas. Unless individuals have access to skills, they cannot get access to safe, secure and rewarding work. Furthermore, without suitable skills, individuals may not be able to access local health provision, political infrastructure, indeed a whole range of other components of urban liveability. An analogous argument applies to enterprises: without suitable skills, they will not thrive.

37. Delivering suitable (basic) skills to individuals is generally accepted to be the responsibility of the State via mainstream education. A debate continues about the precise split of responsibility between the State, the individual and the (future or subsequent or current) employer when skills become more specific. Furthermore, the split of responsibility tends to vary between agents, or groups in society, and is a function of income and power. Urban regeneration – and, by extension, liveable cities - requires that marginalized groups regain access to skills, and not in a purely passive fashion.[18]

38. A behavioural perspective throws an important light on these issues. It is all well and good to provide, or to endeavour to provide, learning opportunities for individuals. However, it is the motivation (or otherwise) of individuals that will dictate precisely how and which opportunities they will take up. Unless individuals see a clear, future benefit to themselves from participating in training and learning (i.e. they can see a future life or job opportunity coming into being as a result), they are less likely to participate. The process of providing access implies not only the tools of access, but also a sense of what it is that is being accessed.

39. More generally, social access refers to a process of participation in urban, civic life. In many ECE countries this has become a growing concern, partly through the repeated failure of urban regeneration projects, and partly through falling rates of participation in elections both at local and national level. Some countries are taking up the notion that individuals and enterprises should become re-engaged with the social, economic and political processes at local level.

40. Consultation is a process that, implicitly at least, adopts a behavioural perspective – or, perhaps, a "user" perspective. Consultation can be seen as a formalized process for ensuring that all types of agents are involved in decision- and policy-making. Rather than deriving policy from an idealized or ideological grounding, a consultative approach recognizes not only that agents within society have a valid stake in the decision-making processes that affect their lives, it also recognizes (implicitly at least) that the behavioural response of agents to urban policy and planning decisions will materially affect the success or otherwise of those policies. The rise of consultation within the urban policy domain also raises interesting questions about both the formulation of policy and the conduct of research.

41. The use of surveys and focus groups, for example, has a track record going back into the 1950s in the United States, and the 1960s/70s in Europe. First developed as a means of enabling businesses to test the likely market response to new products and services, these techniques have spread into the political domain, and into the process of considering the liveability of cities.[19] At the local level, however, consultative approaches blur into participative approaches.

42. From a research point of view, qualitative interviews, quantitative surveys (of households, individuals, etc., by post or telephone or face to face) and ethnographic techniques (such as the field research techniques used in anthropology) offer the main routes to information on both current (social) behaviour in the urban setting and potential future behaviour. Focus groups, or panels of individuals, represent a component part of such an approach. However, as such groups are more formally integrated into the policy formulation and decision-making process, their objectivity must necessarily be called into question. Their perspective on matters necessarily changes as a result of their changed participation.

43. These issues have not, to our knowledge, been fully resolved. There remain a large number of questions (some of which are suggested below). What seems certain, however, is that there is a key role for a behavioural perspective in considering, researching, and facilitating improved access to the benefits of urban living – access which is a vital part of ensuring the liveability of cities.

44.
- *What sort of research techniques best enable us to understand the behaviour of agents, and their motivations? What is the relationship between these research techniques and processes of civic engagement? Should they be kept separate?*
- *Can social access be adequately measured, or quantified?*
- *How does access vary across different groups in urban society, and how can this be made more equitable?*
- *How can the environmental and social consequences of specific transport and social access solutions be made clear to both agents and policy makers?*

IV. CHANGE

45. Fiscal, planning and other policy tools can and sometimes do influence or change the behaviour of agents in the urban setting. Although, as we suggested in the introduction, the unintended consequences of urban policies frequently arise from the unforeseen behaviour of the agents involved, there are, equally, some circumstances and instances where intended positive

outcomes were achieved; where behaviour did, indeed, change. There could and should be many valuable lessons from such instances.

46. There are, naturally enough, many thousands of projects and programmes, throughout the urban areas of the ECE region, which are effectively delivering at least some components of "the liveable city". Many are demonstrably influencing and changing people's – and other agents' – behaviour. But there appears to be little or no more general consideration or application of a behavioural perspective on these specifically urban issues.

47. Part of the reason for this may lie in an ethical difficulty. In one sense, formulating policies intended to change people's behaviour – perhaps, in turn, their attitudes, or even values – is a form of direct, social management with uncomfortable historical echoes. For some, depending on their cultural and political perspective, such an approach may conflict directly with the notion of freedom of choice in a free society.

48. This returns us to an issue raised briefly in the introduction: namely, the distinction between policies that seek to take account of a behavioural perspective, and those that are deliberately intended to change behaviour. There is no clear "answer" here. We would contend that policies that have considered the behavioural domain are more likely to prove successful, even if they contained no explicit attempt to change behaviour. We also believe, however, that in some areas of urban/human activity, unless there is a specific, directed effort to change behaviour, then the long-run liveability and sustainability of our cities cannot be assured.

49. Recent years have certainly seen a range of policies – from global to the local level – that seek to address environmental concerns directly by changing behaviour. Some examples illustrate this.

50. The rapid transformation of the market for vehicle fuel, for example, has seen the virtual elimination of leaded petrol in Western Europe within a decade. Millions of individual consumers changed their purchasing practices – but did they change their behaviour? A mix of regulation, fiscal incentives, consultation with industry, targets and incentives - i.e. a comprehensive management strategy - delivered these changes.

51. Currently, most major vehicle manufacturers are in the early stages of mass production capability for a range of gas and electric vehicles.[20] The functionality of these vehicles is virtually indistinguishable – certainly in the urban setting – from traditionally propelled vehicles. Only limited incentives would be required from government to bring about a similar, profound transformation in behaviour.

52. Turning to waste, surveys[21] reveal that householders consistently say they do more recycling than is evidenced by waste statistics. Householders are not necessarily lying in response to questions – they may simply be forgetful, or they may be trying to give the "right" answer to an interviewer.

53. Some detailed behavioural research has been undertaken,[22] and more is under way.[23] As well as being useful in promoting recycling, this kind of analysis will be even more vital when attempting the more profound exercise of reducing the amount of waste created in the first place.

Quite simply, policies intended to increase recycling, or reduce waste, will not work if they do not take account of the fine-grained behaviour of household(er)s as they create waste.

54. Finally, concerns about food quality and food safety have become more pronounced across the ECE region in recent years. There has, as a result, been a dramatic increase in the proportion of organic food sold. This rapid change in consumer sentiment – and behaviour – took policy makers, and some food retailers, by surprise. Now, however, the opportunity exists to build on this shift in behaviour and motivation, to deliver a more sustainable system of food supply to urban areas in the region.

55. These examples illustrate a number of important features of the process of change, and the policy approach to behavioural issues. One aspect is the "chicken and egg" nature of many of the situations. It is simply not possible, in many cases, to distinguish where the process of change – positive or negative – began. It is, perhaps, a general question of political science as to the extent to which policy-making authorities should follow or lead change.

56. A second aspect concerns the actual tools available to policy makers to influence behaviour. Fiscal measures – such as charging road users for access to a certain area – represent one, long-established mechanism. Regulation, of the kind that made unleaded fuel ubiquitous, is another (although most countries supplemented the regulatory change with a financial incentive, by reducing the amount of tax on unleaded fuel compared to leaded fuel).

57. The precise scale and impact of these types of measures needs further research. What impact has there been on the purchasing behaviour of consumers? How will different types of businesses respond?

58. Other tools are available, most notably those of marketing and advertising. Private-sector enterprises have used these tools for a very long period of time to influence the choices, behaviour and even motivations of consumers. Policy makers, too, can – in appropriate settings – use these tools. With household waste behaviour, for example, it appears that fiscal incentives are frequently too small (given the structure of the waste industry) to cause householders to change behaviour, while regulatory changes are considered too politically difficult. A current route, therefore, is to persuade householders to change behaviour, using "trusted" sources. For example, a recent project was aimed at schoolchildren, to raise their awareness of the consequences of waste and the benefits of increasing recycling, with the deliberate intention that a message would be taken home to parents and carers, i.e. those formally responsible for household waste management.[24]

59. A further dimension concerns the spatial level at which policies are made and implemented. This refers back to our earlier comments on "top-down" and "bottom-up" analysis and solutions. There is a generalized problem here, typified by the concept of "nimbyism" (not in my backyard). National government may conclude, for example, that incineration is the best way to deal with solid waste, and regional governments may accept the quotas they are given, but no local community will willingly accept such an incinerator. In reverse, every local community may conclude that it wishes to achieve exemplary air quality standards, but the consequences for national policy-making could simply be intractable.

60. Clearly, the more agreement there is between spatial levels as to the overall objectives of policy, the more likely it is that decision-making can be made consistent across the levels. As with the policy tools themselves, however, it is likely that there is no single answer, rather it will vary from issue to issue.

61. Finally, issues of equity are again important here. Different groups, or types of agents in society, will be differentially exposed to any given behaviour management.

62. • *How far can/should policy makers go in bearing in mind the behavioural domain? How legitimate is it to deliberately attempt to change the behaviour of agents in the urban setting? Which are the most useful and/or acceptable policy tools to use?*

• *Would it be acceptable to aim directly to change the behaviour of a particular group in an urban society (rather than society as a whole)? Would it make a difference – for example - to a programme that made it (punitively) costly to own heavily polluting vehicles if those vehicles were predominantly in the hands of the poor or the rich? Would it be fair to impose a levy upon households that produce waste above a certain limit, knowing that "the rich" could always afford this?*

• *Are there general rules for the mix of fiscal, regulatory and informational tools required to bring about more sustainable and liveable cities? Or would the mix vary from place to place, issue to issue, time to time?*

• *How are equity issues most effectively incorporated into policy formulation?*

V. RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

63. For both cities and the agents that reside within them, the scope for future change is to a large extent determined by the pattern of historical development. For cities, the interaction of social institutions, cultural and communications infrastructure, the built environment and political circumstances provide a degree of resilience that is an important component of "liveability" – but it also provides the ground for resistance to change.

64. Other, positive factors that are germane here are the notions of identity, belonging and security. Many strands of psychology suggest that these are central elements of human well-being, and sociologists have also explored the issues.[25] The extent to which individuals perceive themselves to belong to a group or society generally, may have a powerful role to play in explaining crime and anomie; while the ways in which entire (social) groups perceive themselves in respect of other groups – are they "us" or "other" – may have an important role to play in understanding the evolution of multiculturalism in urban settings.

65. Resistance to change, whether as a result of psychological habit or membership of a particular group, can be very powerful and very ingrained.

66. Agents – the householders, firms and so on - are in an analogous situation. Agents form habits[26] for very good reasons (they save time, for example), but these habits can become a powerful block to progressive change. Indeed, a description of the unsustainability of much of human activity could be grounded on a description of our bad habits.

67. Tools and policies that fail to take account of these factors – this inertia – will fail. As well as proactive, behaviourally aware policies to encourage new, more positive forms of behaviour (or, at least, take account of potential behavioural responses), there need to be parallel policies intended to help agents overcome the barriers to change. The pursuit of sustainable and liveable cities does not begin with a clean sheet: there is a great deal of historical baggage to be dealt with.

68.
- *How can issues of identity, belonging and security be adequately incorporated into policy formulation?*
- *How might a better understanding of group and social psychology help with the management of demographic change and multiculturalism?*
- *What is the appropriate balance between allowing or forcing change, and modifying the causes of change to meet the needs and concerns of urban agents better?*

[1] There are many textbooks explaining the behavioural assumptions underpinning orthodox economic theory – see, for example, "Modern Microeconomics", A. Koutsoyiannis, 1974.

[2] See "Economics and Evolution", D. Hodgson, 1993; "Towards a New Economic Order", A. Lipietz, 1989; "Butterfly Economics", P. Ormerod, 1998.

[3] There is a wide literature here, and the authors cited are only indicative – see, especially, "Tools for Conviviality", Illich, 1974, "The Making of the English Working Class", E. P. Thompson, 1963, "Urban Renaissance", Atkinson, 2000.

[4] The authors would like to acknowledge the contribution to this paper made by the other rapporteurs; and colleagues in our respective organizations, notably Jayne Cox, Director of Brook Lyndhurst Ltd.

[5] Other types of classification are, of course, possible: entities of differing size perform in idiosyncratic ways, for example; and each type of agent can be subdivided – individuals into young, old, unemployed, etc., firms into their respective sectors, and so on.

[6] See "Green Households?", Noorman and Uiterkamp (ed), 1998.

[7] See, for example, "European City Monitor", Healey and Baker, 2000.

[8] See, for example, "Why We Buy", Underhill, 2000.

[9] See, for example, Proceedings of the EU Urban Futures Conference, Hugo, 2001.

[10] See, for example, "Blueprint for a Green Economy", Pearce, Markandya and Barbier, 1989.

[11] See, for example, "City Limits", Best Foot Forward, 2001.

[12] See "Bowling Alone", Putnam, 2000.

[13] See "Crowds and Power", Canetti, 1960.

[14] See for example "The Gaia Atlas of World Cities" Girardet, 1992/96; and "Beyond Globalisation", Hendersen, 1994.

[15] This section draws on the following sources: Proceedings of the Meeting of Inter-government Council of CIS Member States on Co-operation in Construction Activity for the 1994-2000 period. Minsk, 2000; Reports of UNDP on Capacity Building in the Russian Federation. 1996-2000, Moscow; Report of the UNCHS (Habitat) on Project FS-RUS-98-SO2 "State of the Russian Cities". Moscow, 2000; National Report of the Russian Federation "The State of the Cities in the Russian Federation". Moscow, 2000; Major Trends Characterizing Human Settlements Development in the ECE Region (ECE/HBP/108). Proceedings of the Eight Conference on Urban and Regional Research. Madrid, 8-11 June 1998. (HBP/SEM.52/2) UN/ECE; State Report "State and Development of Town Planning in the Russian Federation". Moscow, 1998; Town Planning Charter of Commonwealth of Independent States. Minsk, 1999.

[16] See "Urban Renaissaince", Atkinson, 2000.

[17] See, for example, EnviroWise 2001 and MORI 2000.

[18] See, for example, "Skills for Neighbourhood Renewal", PAT 2, 1999.

[19] See, for example, "Our towns and cities: the future. Delivering an Urban Renaissance", DETR, 2000, and note that since 1997, the United Kingdom has had a "People's Panel" run by the market research company MORI. The Panel acts as a giant focus group, commenting on possible government policies.

[20] See, for example, the Ford Motor Company's notion of becoming a "provider of sustainable mobility services" in the twenty-first century.

[21] E.g. Biffa, WasteWatch surveys in the United Kingdom.

[22] See, in particular, the work by Tucker at Strathclyde University.

[23] Brook Lyndhurst are currently conducting a research study in London, using focus groups and a 1,000-household survey, to explore the attitudes and values underpinning household waste behaviour.

[24] "Wicked Waste", BBC, 2000.

[25] See, for example, Castells, 1997 and 2000.
[26] See, for example, “Crowds and Power”, Canetti, 1960.