Spatial Democracy, a Capability Approach towards Commensurability.
There is a lack of democracy assessment of metropolitan governance forms.

A spatial capabilities framework allows for this evaluation.

Experiments have to be conducted to design this framework.
Metropolitanization makes governance more complex.

- Since 1970s, metropolitanization is the upscaling of urban functions and way of life.
- Breaks the possibility of a unique scale of politics and policies.
- Parallel movement of dispersion and concentration. [Castells, 2008].
- Make more complex the articulation of distance management modes: co-presence, mobility, telecommunication [Lévy, 2003; Litman, 2003].
- Governance models: metropolitan reform, rational choice, new regionalism.
Democracy is to be the main criteria of evaluation of governance.

- What criteria to evaluate governance forms?
  - Efficiency (satisfaction towards the service)
  - Democracy (satisfaction towards the organization)
- Satisfaction towards the service and satisfaction towards the governance form are two distinct things.
- Satisfaction towards the service is not affected by the governance form [Kübler 2005].
- Improving governance is not the same thing as increasing service coverage and efficiency.
Theories of democracy provide norms but no tools.

- Democracy is an essentially contested concept [Connolly 1983].
- Democracy theories are diverse and irreconcilable [Rosanvallon 2012].
- Numerous typologies have been proposed: liberal, pluralist, participative, marxist…
- Proposed governance models are looking to optimize efficiency of service and/or improve democratic accountability by pre-defining what democracy ought to be.
There is a lack of democracy assessment of metropolitan governance forms.

A spatial capabilities framework allows for this evaluation.

Experiments have to be conducted to design this framework.
Space offers a way of comparison and common measurement for democracy assessment.

- Space is a social dimension.
- The spatial turn [Soja 1989], shifting the focus from areas to networks, has little influence on political sciences.
- A space is a social object defined by its spatial dimension [Lévy 2003]:
  - Attributes: metric, scale, substance.
  - Type: area, place, network.
  - Inter-spatialities: co-spatiality, interface, inclusion.
  - Distance mode: co-presence, mobility, telecommunication.
- We have to find an inductive way, from the individual perspective.
Spatial capabilities offer a way to an inductive approach.

- Capabilities were introduced in the field of development studies [Sen 1983, Nussbaum 2000] in a normative sense.
- They describe what an individual is actually able to achieve in a given context considering what he values (his functionings).
- They can be used as a descriptive framework, without ascribing values to increase and decrease in specific capabilities.
- A spatial capability is a capability to set one’s chosen distance and distance mode (co-presence, mobility, telecommunication) between two realities.
Hypothesis: spatial capabilities are correlated to the way people evaluate governance as democratic.

- Specific studies have been conducted but cannot be generalized.
  - E.g. Nall 2013 on the effect of the Interstate network on political preferences.
- They show that how people use space is related to their political preferences.
- It has never been systematically demonstrated.
There is a lack of democracy assessment of metropolitan governance forms.

A spatial capabilities framework allows for this evaluation.

Experiments have to be conducted to design this framework.
An experiment can be designed based on a direct democracy analogy to link spatial capabilities to governance preferences.

• Qualitative phase: identify and find logical correlations between spatial capabilities and governance preferences.

• Two bodies of data:
  – Spatial capabilities can be derived from their practices, survey-based.
  – Governance preferences are too abstract to be asked in a survey.

• Experimental simulation to put the interviewee in situation of making governance decisions and express choices.
Governances preferences are gathered through a simulation game.

- Give graspability, time and feedback to the interviewees.
- Gather log data that can be used to refine analysis.
- Isolate governance preferences form service preferences.

The ReDistricting Game [Juckett & Feinberg 2010]
Generalization requires a comparative case study.

- Methodology focused on identifying paths for generalization of field research findings.
- Generalization by the similarities identified in comparable cases and identify local biases.
- Identify the local parameters of correlation
- Metropolitan areas of Zürich and the San Francisco Bay Area:
  - Multipolar
  - Fragmented, governance without government
  - Extensive implementation and use of semi-direct democracy at the scale of metropolitan policies
Produce a model whose degree of generality is high enough to be useful in an evaluative process.

- Build a framework to understand democracy in an inductive way, bottom-up.
- Give a way to conduct a democracy assessment that is not tied to a specific understanding of what democracy ought to be.
- Tool to understand how space related policies are influencing the democratic functioning of metropolitan areas.
There is a lack of democracy assessment of metropolitan governance forms.

A spatial capabilities framework allows for this evaluation.

Experiments have to be conducted to design this framework.
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