

TRANSITIONS IN PRACTICE

Elizabeth Shove, ESRC climate change leadership fellowship
 Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, LA1 4YT E.Shove@lancaster.ac.uk 01524 034210



Party Turns and Thought-Glimpses from Working Party No.1 – July 2009

Day 1: Thursday 9th July 2009

<i>Turns</i>	<i>Glimpses</i>
<p>Introduction and explanation (Elizabeth)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Party as one means of fulfilling leadership fellowship, and 'building capacity' (through having fun) - Featuring: Concept Breaks (introducing key themes); Articulations (partygoers' chosen reading); Postcards (as link to the outside world and wider circle of would-be partygoers); Floorball (transitions in action) or swimming. - 3 Lancaster Parties, then finale to exhibit thoughts and outputs, probably in a big free London space (take learnings to Whitehall? trade fair format?) - A further £3k available for between-party collaborations 	<p>ES: "Sort of ambition": to effect a shift in (policy) focus from 'green persuasion' to everyday life with environmental consequences; Includes "stirring up the literature" and what counts as evidence.</p>
<p>Concept Break: Getting Wet (Elizabeth)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introducing the practice of showering as an example of social change 	<p>Relatively short history of getting wet daily, and different purposes of bathing through millennia.</p> <p>Big uptake of private baths in Victorian times, through manufacturing of demand, rise of germ science, and big infrastructural interventions.</p> <p>Showering can be explored via matrix of interlocking elements: Ideas [yellow]; Stuff [blue]; Procedure [red].</p> <p>The interaction occurs as the practice is undertaken by individuals 'consumers'.</p> <p>The env impacts from showering result from the interaction of frequency and infrastructure (not just bath vs electric shower vs power shower).</p> <p>Balance between bathing and showering varies by nation; ultimately we can</p>

	<p>ask is this the end of the bath?</p> <p>Note: Waterwise 2009 urge a “better understanding of drivers”; aside from the lever to turn on the shower, what might they mean? (“I’m not ruling it out just yet, but it’s a funny place to start” - ES)</p>
<p>Introduction and Exhibition (all)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In which partygoers introduce themselves by means of a photo of their bath(shower)rooms, and their washing products 	<p>Not much variation – technology and layout pretty standard (1 partygoer reported bath only, c.6 shower only)</p> <p>Lifestage a big impact: having kids changed bath practices</p> <p>Big impact of home ownership status: the many renters had the bathroom they were given. Very few partygoers had put their bathroom in new; Glenn (EA) commented that he was one of the few who had chosen his bathroom; to which ES responded “...or maybe not”.</p> <p>Power showers appear still to be in place for the minority only (although some debate over what the term might cover – Glenn EA).</p>
<p>Articulation Round 1 (all – see separate sheet)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Svenja: Nick Baker 1996; Maze, Ramia & Redstrom 2008 - Alexia: Hopkins 2008, The Transitions Handbook - Tom: Darier 1996, Environmental Governmentality - Geoff: Gershanfeld 2005, the Fab Lab 	
<p>Shower Diaries and Shower Paths (all)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In which partygoers pair up to keep a diary of their showering practices over the past week, and their biographies in showering over a lifetime 	<p>While the photos showed that the infrastructure is fairly standard, the diaries showed that frequency and purpose varied widely.</p> <p>Much more showering than bathing observed, reflecting the rest of the busy schedules.</p> <p>Across lifetime, increased bath/showering reported in teens, and again at university (not least free hot water in halls).</p>
<p>Concept Break: Path and Project (Nicola)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introducing the concepts of path and project based on Pred (1981) 	<p>Daily activities interact with the lifepath, and with activities in the past and future; habitual behaviour develops.</p> <p>Changes in one realm influence others (eg. showering connects to exercising). Likewise one person’s path can influence another’s.</p> <p>Projects cut across paths; are goal-orientated. Projects can be in competition, pushing each other to the periphery and out of the lifepath.</p> <p>Practices also have careers themselves, while individuals have careers in</p>

	<p>practice (are captured by it, carry it for a while, then drop out – how this happens is unclear). When they're not carried by anyone, practices stop.</p> <p>Tom: Time geography was very fashionable (the Lund School); Pred revived it and pre-dates Giddens. Subsequently some pretty maps were produced, but where did it go (and has its time come again)?</p> <p>Elizabeth: as far as I know today is the first time it's been used to make shower paths.</p>
<p>Postcard Pause (all)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In which partygoers write a postcard to someone outside, to a potential partygoer who couldn't make it or to themselves. The intention is to post them (as appropriate, and addresses permitted), having scanned them for display on the website. 	
<p>Articulation Round 2 (all – see separate sheet)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Martin: Semenza & March 2009 on redecorating street environments - Claire: Gram-Hanssen 2007, Consuming technologies - Tim: Jared Diamond 2006, Collapse - Berry: Clay Shirky 2008, Here Comes Everybody - Andrew G: Gregson et al 2009, Object Maintenance and Repair - Louise: Bulkeley & Gregson 2009, on household and municipal waste - Gregoire: Juliet Schor 2005, Worktime Reduction 	
<p>Group Discussions (all)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In which partygoers divide up into groups (some large, some pairs) to follow up on issues of the day 	<p>Berry: What's a Practice?</p> <p>Tom: When you ask someone what they're doing, the answer they give you is a practice.</p> <p>Sergio: Unlike behaviour, practice doesn't emerge from the individual. Objects and instruments operate in certain ways; they are not driven by individuals'</p>

	<p style="text-align: right;">behaviour.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">person</p> <p>Gregoire: implications for policy – start with the practice and not with the</p> <p>Tom: We need practice theory because different behaviours have different amounts of choice attached.</p>
Floorball/Swimming	

Day 2: Friday 10th July 2009

<i>Turns</i>	<i>Glimpses</i>
<p>Reality Break: Water Supply, Demand and Policy (Glenn)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Glenn delivers an Environment Agency perspective of water use from the supply side 	<p>Predicting future demand is key to ensuring universal access to clean water; but long predictions required – it takes 15-25 years to build a new reservoir.</p> <p>Dynamics of supply complicated by ownership: privatised water co's must make a profit, while prices are set by the regulator Ofwat (aim is to beat Ofwat); EA decide how much water can be taken out of the reserves and supplied; Defra responsible for overseeing the whole system.</p> <p>Demand forecasting by EA based on scenarios, but water co's prefer a more rigid line (ownership-frequency-volume equation).</p> <p>Andrew D: supply side manufacture as much as predict demand – practices promoted through the prevailing socio-tech regime; becomes self fulfilling</p> <p>Elizabeth: price is too low to have traction on consumer demand, yet conventional economist can't model higher prices than demand requires. Service economists required to model what price a shower (getting fresh), or a car wash?</p>
<p>Concept Break: Systems in Transition (Elizabeth)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introducing four transition-based models of social change: Rogers, E 1962, Diffusion of Innovations Rip & Kemp 1996, Socio-technical Change Geels 2002-05, Socio-technical Transition Shove 2009, Circulation of Elements 	<p>In Rogers DoI, the innovation remains unchanged as it is pushed up hill (a little red pill)</p> <p>Rip & Kemp present innovation originating in protected spaces (niches), and subject to micro, meso and macro influences. Notably failed innovation is mapped, raising the question of why some practices stick, and others don't. Geels builds on Rip & Kemp's three levels as niche, regime and landscape. Still fundamentally evolutionary (regime as a selection environment), and</p>

	<p>fundamentally technocentric (works best for “bounded bits of kit”). Notably the S-curve has mutated into a flurry of tiny arrows: the innovation is emergent, coalescing into a practice when it interacts with the regime, which itself is changed through the interaction. Notion of failed innovation left unexplored (indeed Frank often forgets to map these arrows). Elizabeth has suggested a variant model with the ‘S-curve’ taken off, on the basis that innovations don’t just come from niches (“for godssake”) and that change in the configuration of the regime tells you all you need to know.</p> <p>Elizabeth’s own transition model works on the principle that the elements which intertwine in a practice (Ideas [yellow]; Stuff [blue]; Procedure [red]. – recall Day 1) are in constant circulation. Where they coincide (on a time map) the conditions necessary to support the practice are in place [violet]. Where these elements hang together practices can occur, and where they don’t join, practices fall apart [jaggy connectors]. The big question is “Is this just a pretty picture? Are there any ways of mobilising it in policy?”</p> <p>Note that the 7 strands in Geels’ regimes are not factors, driving behaviours, but sites. Through interaction of the strand, practice is emergent not fixed.</p> <p>Elizabeth: In Neths, this is big business – qv. Dutch Energy Policy, and the First Euro Conference on Sustainability Transitions, June 2009</p> <p>Andrew W: attended the Conference, which climaxed in a plenary on the question of whether socio-tech transitions can be governed or not. Frans Berkhout (no they can’t) vs. Jan Rotmans (yes they can – or rather “yes we can”, as he got his supporters to chant).</p> <p>Tom: also attended; it was weird, why do we get a whole conference themed around one branch of theory.</p> <p>Gregoire: re. playing with Geels model – Practice is vested in people’s action; if you take the curve off the model, the model makes no sense.</p>
<p>Group Discussions (all)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In which partygoers divide up into groups (max. 4 per group) to follow up on issues of the day 	<p>Elizabeth: The hand of policy is already visible in historic transitions, eg. sanitary science (water), electrification of the UK. They already have worked within the regime.</p> <p>Andrew D: Geels’ model doesn’t identify a place for policy to intervene</p> <p>Elizabeth: Not one, but many, if you consider sites rather than factors –</p>

	<p>redefine policy interventions. Andrew D: policy as convenor of regime strands.</p>
<p>Articulation Round 3 (all – see separate sheet)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stanley: Southerton 2006, Temporal Organisation, on five dimensions of time - Rachel: George Marshall 2007; WWF 2008, ‘Weathercocks’ - Glenn: Mike Hulme 2009, Why we disagree about climate change - Andrew D: Vare & Scott 2007, on ESD 1 / ESD (& double loop learning, & John Dewey) - Sam: Klinenberg 2002, Heat Wave (Chicago 1995) - Sergio: Bjerknes 1904, The Problem of Weather Forecasting - Jess: Julie Guthman 2008, Bringing Good Food to Others - Julien: Thackara 2007, In the Bubble (& Mikko Jalas’ Art of Loving Wooden Boats 2006) 	
<p>Concept Break: ABC and STRIPD (Elizabeth)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contrasting prevailing models of (social psychological) pro-environmental policy making with the wider set of concepts on social change provided through practice and related theory 	<p>“Once upon a time, policymakers learned to read and think...but they never got past their A,B,C”</p> <p>“A is for Attitude (and Apple, and sometimes Advertising), B is for Behaviour (and Balloon – driven by Attitudes) and C is for Choice (and Cake – if individuals chose not to do it we wouldn’t be in the fix we are today)”. In research for sustainability most effort is exerted at the tip of the iceberg (on ABC), leaving the bulk of theory unexplored: the dynamics of everyday life, where the real issues lie.</p> <p>Note that Government itself is omitted from the ABC – the invisible hand which moves...</p> <p>Time to go beyond ABC to the rest of the alphabet: STRIPD: Systems & Services; Transitions, Tipping points & Transformations; Routines (Habits) & Regimes; Institutions & Infrastructure; Practice; Dynamics & Demand Shift from Behaviour Change to Transitions in Practice. Clear cut distinctions include: individual choice vs. shared & social; external drivers vs. endogenous,</p>

	<p>dynamic; belief-based vs. cultural/material histories; causal vs. reproductive/generative</p> <p>Lots of ideas can be mobilised for climate change; indeed the ideas tank is full to the brim. Unfortunately the current policy pipe only lets ideas out drip by drip, and ABC are the only ones flowing.</p>
<p>Postcard Pause (all)</p> <p>- Postcards #2.</p>	
<p>Future Party Programme (all)</p> <p>- In which partygoers work in small groups to write big postcards to the whole group, suggesting avenues to be pursued in future Parties (whether Concept Breaks, inter-Party collaborations and projects, or further Articulations)</p>	<p>i) Cycle Paths (cf shower paths) and a chance to retread Pred</p> <p>ii) Spotlight on Practice Theory, including “what behaviours are practices?” (Andrew D, with apologies), and ‘where is the environment in practice theory?’</p> <p>iii) Constructing Habit (a concept break in Party No.2, from Andrew D, Elizabeth?)</p> <p>iv) A social-ecological analysis of kitchen practices (a diary study)</p> <p>v) Tea Party, including teapot paths, the practice of tea drinking, its impacts on sustainabiliTEA etc</p> <p>vi) Institutional/organisational models of social change</p> <p>vii) A GAP alumni beta-site (supporting Berry/Tim’s current project)</p>
<p>Finale: Feed back and Feed forward (all)</p> <p>- In which partygoers take turns to say what they liked, and what they would like next time round</p>	<p>Gregoire: Petcha Kucha-style self presentation (20 slides, 20 seconds each)</p> <p>Andrew D: More floorball / another day to fit more floorball in</p> <p>Stanley: More on partygoers biographies, and their theories of change</p> <p>Gregoire: Funnier ways to play</p> <p>Glenn: More on climate change, and especially adaptation (Elizabeth: seconded – a big lit shift required)</p> <p>Julien: More confrontation</p> <p>Tom: The impact of the working group on our own practices and theories</p> <p>Sergio: diary keeping between parties (tea or cycling)</p> <p>Nicola: the big question for the whole Party project – how to widen the policy pipe and operationalise transitions in practice theory (take the answers/our progress to Westminster in the final event)</p>

Appendix: Attendees

Alexia	Coke	A.Coke@surrey.ac.uk	Centre for Environmental Strategy, University of Surrey
Andrew	Darnton	ad@andrewdarnton.co.uk	AD Associates
Andrew	Glover	andrew.k.glover@student.uts.edu.au	Institute for Sustainable Futures, University of Technology, Sydney
Berry	D'Arcy	berryd@hiveideas.co.uk	Hive Ideas
Claire	May	cem22@kent.ac.uk	Kent Business School, University of Kent
Elizabeth	Shove	e.shove@lancaster.ac.uk	Sociology Department, University of Lancaster
Geoff	Gardner	Geoff.Gardner@atkinsglobal.com	ATKINS
Glenn	Watts	glenn.watts@environment-agency.gov.uk	Environment Agency
Gregoire	Wallenborn	gregoire.wallenborn@ulb.ac.be	Centre for Studies on Sustainable Development, Free University of Brussels
Jessica	Paddock	PaddockJR@cardiff.ac.uk	School of Social Science, Cardiff University
Julien	McHardy	j.mchardy@lancaster.ac.uk	Sociology Department, Lancaster University
Louise	Reid	l.a.reid@abdn.ac.uk	School of Geosciences, University of Aberdeen
Nicola	Spurling	n.spurling@lancaster.ac.uk	Sociology Department, University of Lancaster
Rachel	Howell	r.a.howell@sms.ed.ac.uk	Centre for the Study of Environmental Change and Sustainability, University of Edinburgh
Sam	Brown	s.brown@lancaster.ac.uk	Geography Department, Lancaster University
Sergio	Fava	s.fava@lancaster.ac.uk	Sociology Department, Lancaster University
Stanley	Webster	s.webster@lancaster.ac.uk	Sociology Department, Lancaster University
Svenja	Jaffari	svenja@mci.sdu.dk	Centre for Participatory Innovation Research, University of Southern Denmark
Tim	Baker	Tim@touchstonepartners.co.uk	Touchstone Partners
Tom	Hargreaves	tom.hargreaves@uea.ac.uk	School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia