

Function Orientation, System Adaptation, and Governance Mechanisms in Community Renewal from the Perspective of Social Space Theory

Stefenie Lai^{1,a,*}

¹*Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning, The University of Sydney, 143 City Road, Darlington, New South Wales, Australia*

^a*slai6207@uni.sydney.edu.au*

^{*}*Corresponding author*

Keywords: Community Renewal, Social Space, Multifunctional Orientation, Adaptive Analysis, Embedded Governance

Abstract: The issue of mismatched community functions is brought to light by the complex environment of socially divided development, the ageing population, and the public crisis of the New Crown Epidemic. The fundamental structural issues of social space have not been resolved by the physical remodelling of physical space. In order to create a community that is warm and welcoming, it is important to consider what kind of space inhabitants require from the viewpoint of human perception and to research the issues with function mismatch and system adaptation from the viewpoint of socio-spatial theory. A single governmental control finds it challenging to adjust to the diversity and dynamism of the community since community regeneration is a process of embedded governance. The study develops a governance framework for community renewal and suggests a system logic based on the endowment of socio-spatial resources, allowing community renewal to meet individuals' needs. The socio-spatial and community governance theories are combined in the study, and rooted theory as well as several case studies are used to analyse the socio-spatial system's multilevel structure and the relationships between its constituent parts. The study also develops a theoretical framework for socio-spatial governance and enhances the spatial sense of community governance theory as well as the application of socio-spatial theory to urban renewal. Finally, it establishes the intrinsic relationship between community governance and socio-spatial theory through community renewal.

1. Introduction

The community is the fundamental unit of residential life, national administration, and the carrier of human life. Community regeneration encompasses both the physical and social spaces in a community. To ensure that the functional supply of the physical space fits the dynamic demand of the social space, a thorough analysis of the contradiction of spatial mismatch from the physical space into the social space is required, as well as the optimisation of the adaptability of community supply. A specific example of the imbalance between the functional structure of the physical space

and the contradiction of the dynamic demand of society is the failure to predict long-term social development demand during the residential construction of the last century, which led to conflicts over parking space and the challenge of cooperative coordination for the addition of elevators.

Functional incompatibilities require a greater level of system adaptation analysis. Functional inconsistencies, such as excessively compact spatial densities, lead to spatial disorganisation, which has an impact on the system's functionality and increases the system's vulnerability as a whole. The Pandemic crisis highlights the community's functional systems' susceptibility to societal crises due to the community's outdated infrastructure and lack of medical emergency facilities.

Higher demands are made of spatial functions and system adaptability due to the diverse needs of social development. The lack of humanization and flexibility results in social and spatial conflicts and inconsistencies, and vulnerable groups continue to be unable to take use of a variety of public services. The governance structure that supports the functional configuration is also a part of community system adaptation, along with functional facilities including infrastructure, public services, security, health education, and living space. A crucial component of adaptation is the protection of the elderly and vulnerable populations. The adaptive mechanism of urban and community governance needs to be rethought in order to increase the adaptive potential of community systems. Issues like whether the centre of gravity of decision-making is too high, causing a split between the upper and lower levels, whether the government's configuration and provisioning are responsive to the needs of the residents, whether social citizens have a voice in governance, and what kind of governance structure should be in place for the functional orientation of the socio-spatial perspective are all things that need to be thoroughly studied at the theoretical level.

1.1. Governance mechanisms from a socio-spatial theoretical perspective

Moving on to a theoretical level, Henri Lefebvre's socio-spatial space theory can more precisely describe the underlying reasons of spatial mismatch and systemic fragility. Lefebvre put forth a "spatial production" hypothesis that connects physical space to social production. Through social practises and activities, individuals establish social connections with one another through their physical senses, mental faculties, perceptions, and ideologies. The actualisation of space, including production and reproduction, is the first aspect of socio-spatial production. Each social form's set of locations and spatial identities is a production practise that is situated in a specific physical environment and yields perceptible aspects of space. The second dimension is the representation of space, which is connected to the order imposed by production and relational interactions and is an abstract area of spatial planning and conceptualisation that is covered in geography, planning, and architecture. The space of representation, which represents space as an external representation of social rules, values, and experiences, is the third dimension. Lefebvre thus suggests a triadic spatial dialectic consisting of three distinct realms: spatial practise (the tangible material realm, closely related to the space of perception), spatial representation (the realm of planning and designing), and representational space (the experiential, functional space that is dominated and processed). The triad is further materialised into three linked phases: conceptual space (spatial representations), representational space (representational space), and perceptual space (spatial practises). [1]

From the perspective of socio-spatial theory, the functional orientation of conceptual space, the balancing of the functional supply of representational space and the demand for perceived space, and the management of political, economic, and social relations that underlie spatial production all exhibit the contradiction of functional mismatch. The functionality of representational space is dominated by conceptual space, which is constrained by ideology and power. As a result, initially diverse and distinct communal spaces gradually transform into homogenised representational spaces.

The ability of individuals to adjust to the use and application of perceptual space is directly influenced by the functionality of representational space. Residents will become stressed when they believe that the space's functional supply cannot adjust to meet their actual demands. However, when they believe that the supply and demand for the functionality match, they will feel a feeling of identity, belonging, and tolerance as a result of adaptation. A full understanding of the logical relationship between the conceptualisation, representation, and perception of space, as well as the development of a governance mechanism to address the essence of the multidimensional mismatch of functions and systemic adaptation in socio-spatial space, constitute the basis for community renewal from the perspective of socio-spatial theory.

1.2. Research significance

Without addressing the more serious structural issues with social space, the study of the governance mechanisms underlying the systematic adaptation of community space and the functional mismatch of physical space should not stop at the level of functional renewal of physical space. To support the governance structure and institutional environment for diversity and adaptive renewal of the community space, it is necessary to delve into the social characteristics and governance structure within the social space and achieve a breakthrough in the governance mechanism.

1.2.1. Realising community regeneration by concentrating on human needs, from physical to human and social rejuvenation

The theoretical study of community regeneration is the basis for the full revitalisation of people and society. Community regeneration is not only the revitalisation of physical space but also the revitalisation of people and society. The majority of current research on community regeneration focuses on the power struggle between the state, the market, and the populace, physical space design, or stakeholder coordination. Urban dwellers' needs for space from a human needs standpoint are less frequently considered. There are fewer studies on spiritual and social space, as well as human perception of space. Theoretically, it is important to consider how community space has evolved from the standpoint of conceptualising, perceiving, and representing social space as well as to focus on system functionality and adaptability as well as community renewal from various angles and at various levels. Greater impromptu and varied spatial production methods should be investigated in terms of governance structures and systems, according to the governance theory of public management. By fusing the theories of complex adaptive systems and governance theory, this study attempt to further develop and improve Lefebvre's socio-spatial theory in this paper. Its also attempts to expand its development and application in real life.

1.2.2. Integration of socio-spatial and governance theories to address structural issues within spatial systems

Traditional research on community regeneration has not ventured into the social space system to examine the fundamental mechanisms of governance structure and function from a physical space perspective. The goal of this study is to build a systematic analytical framework of "function-oriented-system-adaptive-governance mechanism" for community regeneration. It does this by integrating the theories of socio-spatial, complex adaptive systems, embedded governance, and practical difficulties. The nature of homogeneous spatial production, which is dominated by government and capital alliances, has been rethought in light of Lefebvre's socio-spatial theory. According to Lefebvre (1991), space should not only be dominated by the political economy within a top-down power structure, which results in homogeneous, homogeneous living spaces, and

residents can only live passively in moulded spaces. [1]

2. Literature Review

Incorporating urban renewal, planning and design, socio-spatial, and governance theories, this review analyses the multi-level system of community renewal from the perspectives of physical space, socio-spatial, and governance theories. It also looks at the relationship between function orientation, system adaptation, and governance mechanisms. The ideal fusion of spatial functions is examined from the standpoint of physical space in urban redevelopment, planning, and design theories. The integration of governmental, market, and social factors as well as the improvement of community governance structure and system design are all topics covered by governance theories in public management. Returning to the original research issue, it is necessary to examine the community renewal influence mechanism from many angles in order to understand the governance structure and mechanism underlying the inadequacy of community functions and system vulnerability. In order to maximise the functioning and adaptability of community spatial systems, a thorough analysis should be done to determine what sort of governance structures and procedures should be implemented.

Community revitalisation is a refined and micro-scale concept of urban renewal. Urban redevelopment in Western countries has two stages: the irrational stage and the rational stage. In the irrational stage, "physical planning" is the first step, which entails massively demolishing historic structures in city centres and eliminating slums to make way for new construction. Physical planning lacks an understanding of the nature of the real world and fails to acknowledge that cities are in a permanent state of dynamic change and that the interaction between the physical environment and social life is exceedingly complex. Three historical processes—reconstruction, rehabilitation, and regeneration—are used to revitalise historic cities in the United States and Europe (Carmon, 1999). [2]

Residence, employment, leisure, and transit in various parts of the city were listed as the primary purposes of the city in the Athens Charter of 1933 (Corbusier, 1933). [3] [4] Le Corbusier claimed that "a successfully planned community gives the impression of quietness, order, and cleanliness, and keeps its inhabitants in line" (Corbusier, 1995). [5] The main components and characteristics of Corbusier's "city of light" were functional zoning, express arterials, and high-rise residential buildings. He pioneered the use of biostructures in urban planning in Chandigarh, India, where automobiles were utilised as the primary unit of measurement rather than people, and where 50-meter-wide lanes and multi-level traffic networks formed a highly organised pattern of flow. Residents had trouble adjusting to a mechanised culture, even though "indoor streets" were eventually created to suit pedestrian and social needs (Corbusier, 1983). [6] Functional zoning has broken up the organic structure of urban space and produced an inappropriate spatial structure by ignoring unpredictability and contingency. The city life is split into dwelling, working, and leisure functions, and the relatively independent residential region cannot cooperate with other sections. Functional division is inconsistent with the inner development law of the city and the community. Despite the spatial division's symmetrical beauty and substantial waste of land resources, it has a low spatial density. Reasonable functional zoning is the organisation of the spaces that comprise a building based on different functional requirements and dividing them based on the closeness of the functions, so that the functions are both clearly zoned and interconnected (Davies, 2006). [7]

The resilience of the spatial system increases with the strength of spatial adaptability and transformation (Folke et al., 2010). [8] The ability of a system to continuously adapt internally in response to changes outside of the system is what is meant by the term "system adaptation," which is a regulatory and control process. The capacity of parts and components of a socio-spatial system

to influence the overall resilience is what distinguishes adaptation from resilience (Walker et al., 2004). [9] To build community resilience, an adaptive community system may gain insight by combining experience and knowledge (Carl et al., 2010). [10] Community systems adaptation involves a variety of change and governance capacities that open doors for community growth, development, and innovation in addition to the capacity to withstand unwelcome disruptions. Therefore, the community's systemic adaptation involves not only the system's resistance, resilience, supply, and functional flexibility, but also the ability of governance to adjust to deal with social issues.

The complex adaptive systems that make up urban communities are capable of self-organization and self-control. Community regeneration must also adhere to the system's law of self-regulation and modify the governance structure to increase the community system's capacity for adaptation. We can discover that function orientation, system adaptation, and governance mechanisms are strongly related when we combine the physical space and social space viewpoints.

Reorganising social space through governance is a process of community rejuvenation. Power is built on the foundation of spatial order (Crampton and Stuart, 2007). [11] Spatial order is a byproduct of the prescriptive character of political authority, which is how subjects of interest uphold spatial order, protect shared spatial interests, and distribute spatial resources. The direction and effectiveness of governance are directly influenced by the governance structure of spatial politics (Boone, 2013; Thomas and Burchfield, 2000). [12] Therefore, adapting governance structures and mechanisms forms the basis of community regeneration governance.

The theories of community governance also include "elite theory," "pluralism theory," "state-society relations," "collaborative governance," and "social capital theory." There is "meta-governance," "state-society relations," "collaborative governance," and "social capital theory" in addition to "elite theory" and "pluralism theory." Multi-stakeholder collaboration has taken front stage in community government since the community revitalisation movement. Decision-making authority is at the centre of both the "elite theory" and the "pluralism theory."

"Collaborative governance aims to fully mobilise and bring to bear the energies of multiple actors, requiring the participation of both public and non-government actors in collective decision-making processes, which need to be formalised, coherent, and integrated to achieve the objectives of public policy, public programmes, and public property management" (Ansell and Gash, 2007). [13] Another viewpoint on community governance is social capital theory, which justifies the success of community governance in terms of the development of social capital. In addition, the localisation process in majority of Eastern countries has been influenced by the introduction of urban growth coalition theory, urban polity theory, and urban governance theory.

A governance structure is necessary for community regeneration in order to encourage a variety of supply from the market and social self-organization. Governance structure, as used in the context of community regeneration, refers to how authority and responsibility are distributed as well as how the government, citizens, and corporate entities interact during the governance process. According to Williamson (1996), various governance structures correspond to various operational procedures. [14] Top-down control is a key component of hierarchical government, which also emphasises the logic of power and imposes coercion through a network of rules, laws, and authorities.

Early studies of community governance structures mostly discussed local power structures and examined how members of the community interacted. The functions of several subjects in community government have been highlighted, and the cooperative governance system in which multiple subjects contribute has progressively come to be accepted. It is challenging to show the deeper institutional mechanisms of social space, however, because the "structure-process" paradigm of power structure and internal interaction lacks the study of social space and social structure.

According to self-governance theory, creating a multi-body organisational structure and

institutional system is necessary to address public problems. This would allow for a more flexible institutional framework and incentives for pluralistic participation, while also regulating governmental behaviour and establishing complementary systems. Although hierarchies, markets, and self-organizing processes can be combined, there are numerous perspectives and insights on how they should be combined. For instance, according to Mark Granovetter (1985), the social network and trust are crucial for resolving social issues. [15]

3. Multifunctional and adaptive convergence analysis framework for socio-spatial governance

The functional approach of community renewal is based on the urban multifunctionality hypothesis. From a bottom-up approach, complex adaptive systems theory investigates how adaptable community systems are and looks at the community's capability for self-adaptation as an adaptive system. The fundamental theory for the investigation of socio-spatial governing mechanisms and systems is called embedded governance theory.

3.1. Multifunctional urban theory

Wealth distribution, housing security, social integration, and cultural identity are rational activities that demonstrate people's intrinsic scale and autonomous intention and are referred to as "value rationality" by Max Weber (1904), whereas economic, scientific, and technological rational activities with external rules and constraints are referred to as "instrumental rationality." [16] Inclusive development is a balance between these two types of rationality. Max Weber (1904) referred to value rationality as "instrumental rationality," whereas rational actions governed by outside laws and regulations, such as those found in the economy, science, and technology, are referred to as "instrumental rationality" (Weber, 1958). [17] Western rationalism was criticised by Husserl, who thought it contributed to a crisis in reality (Husserl, 1996). [18] The value of social existence, the mechanisms of social action, and the significance of the individual are all examined in Parsons' social systems theory, Habermas' theory of interactional behaviour, and Giddens' theory of postmodernity. Together, these theories support the shift in social development from the paradigm of "instrumental rationality" to that of "value rationality." According to Lefebvre's critique of the 'instrumental rationality' of spatial practises and the power elite's control over the discourse surrounding those practises, instrumental rationality and particular forms of production now dominate spatial practises in contemporary societies (Lefebvre, 1991). [19] The New Urban Agenda declares that the objective of the urban community of the future is for everyone to have equal access to the right to housing, public services, and infrastructure; for residents to feel like they belong; to ensure safe, inclusive, and accessible public spaces; to promote cohesion and inclusiveness in a pluralistic society; and to eradicate discrimination against vulnerable groups. Mixed-use communities that are safe, healthy, accessible, affordable, and sustainable are enjoyed equally by all.

The New Urban Agenda declares that the objective of the urban community of the future is for everyone to have equal access to the right to housing, public services, and infrastructure; for residents to feel like they belong; to ensure safe, inclusive, and accessible public spaces; to promote cohesion and inclusiveness in a pluralistic society; and to eradicate discrimination against vulnerable groups. Mixed-use communities that are safe, healthy, accessible, affordable, and sustainable are enjoyed equally by all.

3.2. Embedded Governance Theory

Although both the embeddedness and self-governance theories have significant implications for

socio-spatial governance, the selection of a governance theory must take into account national circumstances in light of the historical and institutional environment. The embeddedness governance theory, in which the government and self-organization are embedded with one another, is chosen as the theoretical support for socio-spatial governance because the choice of governance theory must correspond to the national situation in light of the historical and cultural environment. The theory of embeddedness was put forth by Karl Polanyi, who claimed that "the human economy is embedded in social relations" and that market societies contain two opposing forces: a laissez-faire drive to expand markets and a reverse protectionism that prevents the economy from becoming de-embedded. De-embedding the economy from the society will inevitably encounter resistance because human behaviour plays a crucial role in the development of a society, resulting in opposition since individuals act to protect their social standing, social power, and social assets.

Self-organized governance is the foundation of embedded governance, which centres on multi-subject governance. In order to sustain the rivalry among the providers at a high level of cooperation and lower the production and supply costs of public services, a governance process incorporated synergistic mechanism is developed through the diversification of public service providers. There is no complete dominance and control relationship between the subjects of governance, according to embedded governance, which also acknowledges the complementary nature of various governance subjects. Instead, the emphasis is placed on the power of multidimensional, embedded, and interactive governance. Embedded governance is better suited to address the complexities of community renewal in order to efficiently facilitate systemic adaptation, as embeddedness theory seeks to understand how diverse systems enable high levels of innovation, interaction, trust, cooperation, and adaptation at different scales.

3.3. The socio-spatial theory of Henri Lefebvre

In accordance with Henri Lefebvre's socio-spatial theory, space is created by the intentional action of the human subject and is intertwined with social relationships involving property. It is a social relationship that is ingrained in property relationships and that not only benefits from social relationships but also creates and is created by them. Every society exists within the framework of a recognised form of production, and the specific characteristics included into this framework define space, i.e., "social space is a product of society." Through the triadic dialectic of perceiving, conceiving, and portraying space, he explains this production relation.

A sense of reliance arises when a subject senses a mutual adaptation to the space in perceptual space, which is the subject's direct experience of actual space. The prevalent ideology and thinking space define the shape of conceptual space, which in turn is determined by the dominant thinking space. The functional environment that users interact with on a regular basis is the space of representation, which is the area of experience that is controlled and processed. Lefebvre (1991) proposes a "decentered" socio-spatial governance structure based on the political, economic, and social relations behind spatial production in order to address the fragmentation and homogenization of space that results from decision makers' dominance of conceptual space over representational space. Lefebvre's theory of "decentralised" space is based on his observation that, in the face of excessive political planning interventions, space becomes politically ideological rather than objective and neutral, and that political interventions do not take citizens' lifestyles into account in the planning process. In addition to serving as a container for the development of social ties, he understood that various social spaces interact with one another and produce an unlimited variety of outcomes. Lefebvre opposed replacing the investigation of actual social space with geometric, technical, and quantitative analysis of mental space. The objective social space is disregarded by both the physical space of urban planning and the spiritual space of community development.

Lefebvre separated space into three categories to analyse the social importance and political characteristics of social space: "spatial practise," "spatial representation," and "representational space," which refers to the development of perception, conceptualisation, and representation of space.

Referring to the contemporary spatial reality, Lefebvre's theory of space provides a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the phenomena of rich-poor community fragmentation, locked communities with intricate gates, homogenised areas, and cramped dwelling spaces. In *The Limits of Capital*, Harvey also draws attention to the process of social segregation that occurs as a result of gentrification of neighbourhoods, forced evictions, and the removal of low-income and disadvantaged populations from high-value areas. According to Harvey, the spatial crisis brought on by capitalism has engulfed human existence, with ongoing commercial expansion and ongoing urban space destruction. Socio-spatial theory intervenes in the world and how individuals perceive space, calling for a "humanised" spatial environment while critiquing and considering the "dehumanisation" of space.

4. Conclusions

In order to build an analytical framework for community renewal in socio-spatial governance, this study analyses the issue of functional mismatch and systemic adaptation in community space from the standpoint of conceptual, perceptual, and representational space in socio-spatial theory. It fills the gap between the perceptual space's residents' changing needs and the conceptual space's functional orientation, encourages multifunctional adaptive renewal through multi-actor collaboration, and makes multi-actor collaboration possible through an embedded governance mechanism that combines formal authority with decentralised self-organization. The practise of policy revelation must build on the institutional logic of "governance first, then renewal" by beginning with the governance structure and mechanism.

The institutional structure for community adaptive renewal is made up of multipurpose governance structures and embedded governance mechanisms. Multipurpose Adjustment Integration of market, governmental, and self-organizational forces is necessary for multifunctional adaptive renewal. Functional mismatches and systemic fragility are a result of a singularity of functional provision without corresponding checks and balances, i.e., the market and the government are too dominant and residents can only accept them passively. This singularity of functional provision results from the singularity of the provider and the governance structure. Therefore, the structural link between public services, market supply, and resident self-organization should be addressed early in the policy design process. The goal of multi-subject governance structures is to realise multi-functional supply that targets residents' perceived requirements, realise multi-subject and multi-functional synergistic adaptive renewal, and provide residents' self-organization more participation and decision-making power.

Rethinking the conceptual space's functional orientation's shortsightedness is also necessary. The majority of community homes constructed in the last century lacked public space and subterranean parking. Even now, modern community planning is still closed off, and there is no coordination with the division of the city's functional system. Modern neighbourhood planning is still confined, fragmented, and not in harmony with the city's functional systems. Long-term planning for sustainable development and consideration of the requirements of cities and neighbourhoods are both inadequate. The one-size-fits-all mentality of decision-makers has led to the over-emphasis on short-term gains in the allocation of spatial resources, while at the same time, urban governance and decision-making institutions are over-centered. Changes must be made to governance and the centre of gravity for decision-making, as well as to short-term thinking in urban development and the

systematic construction of future communities. Systematic planning and functional renewal must be carried out based on the law of development and with a long-term perspective. The fundamental principles of spatial functions should be equality, diversity, and fair opportunity. All members of the community, whether local or foreign, should have equal access to opportunities; discrimination should be outlawed; the needs of underprivileged groups should be met; differences in household registration should be eliminated; and community services should be available to all groups, regardless of geography, class, or age. Community rejuvenation will become an inclusive development process and improve citizens' feeling of wellbeing when a fair, pluralistic, and equal value system is established.

References

- [1] Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [2] Carmon, Naomi. 1999. "Three Generations of Urban Renewal Policies: Analysis and Policy Implications." *Geoforum* 30 (2): 145–58. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0016-7185\(99\)00012-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0016-7185(99)00012-3).
- [3] Service, Robert W. 2008. "Book Review: Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage." *Organizational Research Methods* 12 (3): 614–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428108324514>.
- [4] Corbusier, Le. 1973. *The Athens Charter*. New York: Grossman.
- [5] Corbusier, Le, and Giovanni-Maria Lupo. 1995. *Vers Une Architecture / 2 Lettura Critica E Confronto Fra Vers Une Architecture, 1a E 20a Ed., E L'esprit Nouveau*. Torino: Bottega D'erasmo.
- [6] Corbusier, Le, and Pierre Jeanneret. 1983. *Urbanisme, Algiers, and Other Buildings and Projects, 1930-1933. Facsimiles-Garl*.
- [7] Davies, Colin. 2006. *Key Houses of the Twentieth Century: Plans, Sections and Elevations*. London: Laurence King.
- [8] Folke, Carl, Stephen R. Carpenter, Brian Walker, Marten Scheffer, Terry Chapin, and Johan Rockström. 2010. "Resilience Thinking: Integrating Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability." *Ecology and Society* 15 (4). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26268226>.
- [9] Walker, Brian, C. S. Holling, Stephen R. Carpenter, and Ann P. Kinzig. 2004. "Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability in Social-Ecological Systems." *Ecology and Society* 9 (2). <https://doi.org/10.5751/es-00650-090205>.
- [10] Folke, Carl, Stephen R. Carpenter, Brian Walker, Marten Scheffer, Terry Chapin, and Johan Rockström. 2010. "Resilience Thinking: Integrating Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability." *Ecology and Society* 15 (4). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26268226>.
- [11] Crampton J W, Stuart E. 2007. *Space, knowledge and power: foucault and geography*. Ashgate.
- [12] Boone C. 2013. *Land regimes and the structure of politics: patterns of land-related conflict*. *Social Science Electronic Publishing*, 1(83):188-203.
- [13] Thomas J W, Burchfield J. 2000. *Science, Politics, and Land Management*. *Rangelands*, 22(4):45-48.
- [14] Ansell C, Gash A. 2007. *Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice*. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 8(4):543-571.
- [15] Williamson O E. 1996. *The mechanisms of governance*. Oxford University Press.
- [16] Granovetter M. 1985. *Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness*. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3):481-510.
- [17] Weber M. 1958. *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. Scribner.
- [18] Husserl E. 1996. *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologi, Meiner*.
- [19] Lefebvre H. 1991. *Critique of Everyday Life*. Verso.