



## 'Together We Know a Lot': A Reflective Case Study of Social Learning Through Participatory Action Research

Andi Binet, Vedette Gavin, Dina Abreu, Carl Baty, Mitikei Chengerei, Josée Genty, Will Justice, Araceli Tepoz Mendez, Gail Roderigues, David Underhill, Kelsey Salmon Schreck & Mariana Arcaya

To cite this article: Andi Binet, Vedette Gavin, Dina Abreu, Carl Baty, Mitikei Chengerei, Josée Genty, Will Justice, Araceli Tepoz Mendez, Gail Roderigues, David Underhill, Kelsey Salmon Schreck & Mariana Arcaya (2025) 'Together We Know a Lot': A Reflective Case Study of Social Learning Through Participatory Action Research, *Planning Theory & Practice*, 26:5, 702-719, DOI: [10.1080/14649357.2025.2592585](https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2025.2592585)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2025.2592585>



Published online: 23 Jan 2026.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 109



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



# ‘Together We Know a Lot’: A Reflective Case Study of Social Learning Through Participatory Action Research

Andi Binet<sup>a,b</sup>, Vedette Gavin<sup>c,b</sup>, Dina Abreu<sup>b</sup>, Carl Baty<sup>b</sup>, Mitikei Chengerei<sup>b</sup>,  
Josée Genty<sup>b</sup>, Will Justice<sup>b</sup>, Araceli Tepoz Mendez<sup>b</sup>, Gail Roderigues<sup>b</sup>,  
David Underhill<sup>b</sup>, Kelsey Salmon Schreck<sup>b,d</sup> and Mariana Arcaya<sup>b,e</sup>

<sup>a</sup>School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada; <sup>b</sup>Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium, Boston, MA, USA; <sup>c</sup>Verge Impact Partners, Columbus, OH, USA; <sup>d</sup>Conservation Law Foundation, Boston, MA, USA; <sup>e</sup>Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA

## ABSTRACT

This paper examines the social learning process among a group of community resident and academic researchers working together on a Participatory Action Research study exploring the relationship between urban development and community health. Through a reflective case study of our collaborative data analysis team’s work, we highlight key social learning dynamics on our team, as well as key enabling conditions that fostered social learning. We offer considerations for intentionally designing social learning processes to enhance the contributions of community engagement in research and practice, and explore the implications of our findings for strengthening the relationship between knowledge and action in planning.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 7 April 2025  
Accepted 17 November 2025

## KEYWORDS

Participatory action research; social learning; community engagement; knowledge production; collaboration

## Introduction

After a workshop in 2022 to develop a strategy for measuring neighborhood-level structural racism in metropolitan Boston, USA, two community members collaborating on a Participatory Action Research (PAR) study exchanged reflections about their discussion that evening. The first, an older white man, described feeling appreciation: “I learn so many different things from different people that I never thought I would ever be talking about or listening to. It’s amazing how much this group of people brings to the table.” The second, a younger Black man, expressed surprise at how his comments during the workshop were received: “I know that I have to explain certain things to people who have not experienced them, and y’all take it on the chin. People have met me with very upset responses when I tell them stuff... it’s like I ripped down the curtains, and it’s broad daylight, and they’re trying to sleep. It’s not usually a positive experience, and y’all are taking it pretty well.”

Both individuals, co-authors of this paper, are Resident Researchers (RRs) on the Healthy Neighborhoods Study (HNS), a longitudinal PAR project addressing the relationship between urban development and health in nine neighborhoods across metropolitan Boston. The

workshop was a regular monthly meeting of the HNS' Continuous Collaborative Data Analysis (CCDA) team, a subset of Resident Researchers responsible for formulating and answering HNS research questions through analysis of primary and secondary data, and using findings to inform community-level planning and action projects.

The CCDA team's motto was 'Nobody knows everything, together we know a lot,' quoting a statement from an anti-oppressive facilitation framework that is one of the "ground rules" for all HNS workshops (Anti-Oppression Resource and Training Alliance, 2017). The CCDA group came to strongly identify with this statement, for two reasons. First, it emphasized that no individual alone already possessed the knowledge the group sought, rather that our goal was to create new knowledge together. Second, it signified a shared sense of collective achievement: the feeling of being able to 'know a lot' together was the result of years of collaboration and trust-building among people who started out as strangers.

Questions about the production and use of knowledge are central to planning theory and practice, and longstanding debates concern the value of community members' perspectives for informing plans and policies (Forester, 1999; Innes & Booher, 2004; Legacy, 2017). In response to historical patterns of exclusion, planners have been encouraged to engage diverse ways of knowing and have experimented with different approaches to democratizing the process of knowledge production (Corburn, 2003; Novoa & Vasudevan, 2025; Roberts & Kelly, 2019). Today, the field seems to be gaining enthusiasm for the potential of community-engaged research, but transferable models for generating actionable planning knowledge in a participatory manner remain few and far between.

In this paper, we offer a reflective case study of the HNS' collaborative data analysis team, comprised of community residents and academic researchers. To begin, we review the planning literature on knowledge production and social learning. Next, we describe the programmatic set-up of the collaborative data analysis team and the broader PAR study. Then, we systematically reflect on how our group came to 'know a lot' together. We interpret our experiences through the lens of social learning, and explore the implications of our experiences for democratizing planning inquiry and strengthening links between knowledge and action in planning at a time when rapid technological change is transforming how planners know and act.

## Literature Review

### *Knowledge in the Planning Process*

A central question in planning theory is how knowledge may inform action (Friedmann, 1987). Different planning traditions have different ideas about how knowledge relates to action, but the relationship is typically assumed to be linear: researchers contribute to a general body of knowledge, which practitioners then draw on to determine what to do in specific situations (Saija, 2014).

Defining planning as a process of linking knowledge to action leads many to emphasize forms of 'evidence-based' planning, on the assumption that better evidence leads to better policy (Davoudi, 2006; Tate, 2020). This poses a few tensions. First, the scientific evidence base is formed by scholars seeking to produce generalizable knowledge, but planners are trying to solve context-specific problems (Krizek et al., 2009). Second, evidence-based practice often emphasizes technical knowledge which may erroneously render planning problems apolitical (Davoudi, 2006). Third, emphasis on evidence-based interventions may inhibit creativity: sometimes planners need new ideas and strategies, which depend on experiential and context-specific

knowledge (Natarajan, 2017). Fourth, people impacted by the problems under investigation are typically excluded from the process of producing evidence about the problem, resulting in weak links between knowledge and action.

In practice, the relationship between knowledge and action is usually murkier than it is conceived to be, and planners must make judgements about intervention in the face of many unknowns (Campbell, 2006). This has led scholars to explore strategies for further integrating knowledge and action. For example, Davoudi (2015) argues that instead of thinking about knowledge as something planners obtain prior to action, we should think about knowing as something that planners do. Similarly, Campbell (2012) argues that transformative planning requires synthesis because it more readily enables clarity and judgement in the face of uncertainty. To build the synthetic capabilities necessary for transformative planning, she recommends that planners and researchers work together to frame problems and determine the forms of analysis that need to be undertaken in an “ongoing process of mutual learning” (Campbell, 2012, p. 144).

### *Social Learning in Planning*

To guide action, planners use various forms of knowledge, but how is this knowledge developed? Drawing on the pragmatist tradition, some have argued that planning is a “practically situated social learning activity” (Friedmann, 1987; Healey, 2009, p. 277; Mumford, 1938; Schön, 1984). From this perspective, the field exists as a “community of inquirers” deliberating over what planning is and does through a “continually open, exploratory and evolving process” (Healey, 2012 p. 194).

The term “social learning” describes “a process in which individuals and groups exchange or jointly develop knowledge through human interaction” and can occur at the level of the individual, groups, organizations, or society (von Schönfeld et al., 2020, p. 413). As one tradition of planning, social learning centers on what Friedmann (1987, p. 186) calls “the task-oriented action group,” typically of a dozen or fewer participants, a “temporary social system” irreducible to the characteristics of individual participants. Through such groups, action and learning are cyclically co-constitutive.

Friedmann (1987) proposes a model of transformative planning that combines social learning with social mobilization to challenge relations of power in society. In this model, social learning plays a key role in producing a critical account of the situation to be changed, exploring practical solutions, and strategizing about how to enact them. To use social learning for transformation, Friedmann (1987, p. 47) suggests that it is “the responsibility of planners...to help structure settings that will allow both actors and planners to increase learning from experience, and to use what has been learned as a basis for further planning and action.”

Planners still have much to learn about how to structure and direct social learning processes. Recent efforts have explored who learns what from who in social learning processes at the individual level, and revealed that social learning can produce both positive and negative outcomes – for example, it can foster ideation but slow implementation (von Schönfeld et al., 2020). Overall, though, our field’s understanding of social learning remains focused on learning among professional planners and policymakers (Healey, 2009).

### *Engaging Diverse Epistemologies in Producing Planning Knowledge*

Contemporary planning theorists understand planning knowledge to be embedded in social relations and generated through networks. In policy contexts, these are typically ‘bounded’

networks involving scientific experts and professional practitioners (Rydin, 2007). But planners have also challenged the primacy of specialist, technical knowledge, and called for planning to engage multiple epistemologies and “local, experiential and contextualized knowledge” (Rydin, 2007, p. 54; Sandercock, 2003, 2004; Vasudevan & Novoa E, 2022).

Local knowledge, instead of originating in professional techniques, originates in people’s contextual experience and the meanings made thereof. Local knowledges are useful for understanding specific contexts, the meaning of patterns and relationships apparent in data, community values and desires, and how to accomplish things in a context and who can help or hinder the changes being sought. For example, Natarajan’s study of the role of local knowledge in planning processes showed that local knowledges had a “distinct spatiality” and “strong re-framing power,” broadening planners’ knowledge base by offering “holistic social facts that connected policy domains, causal details of spatial patterns... [and] practical understandings of place dependencies” (2017, p. 21).

Local knowledges are plural, and may seem incommensurable with one another and with generalized technical knowledge, but as Geertz argues, “crafts of place... work by the light of local knowledge” (1983, p. 167). Figuring out how to engage and balance technical and local knowledges in planning practice has not been an easy task. Planners have made important efforts to include local knowledge in the planning process, sometimes through broad-based public participation, and sometimes through deeper collaborative or co-production approaches (Rosen & Painter, 2019). To improve the utility and impact of local knowledge in planning processes, Rydin (2007) suggests planners need processes for both “opening up” – giving voice to multiple knowledge claims – and “closing down” – testing and recognizing certain claims – in order to be able to handle multiple knowledges in practice.

### *Participatory Action Research: An Approach to Democratizing Inquiry*

Participatory Action Research (PAR) is an approach to inquiry that centers those most impacted by the phenomena under investigation, and focuses on using co-produced knowledge for action to improve local conditions.

As a form of community-engaged inquiry, PAR has long been of interest to planning researchers as a tool for place-based change (Reardon, 1998). PAR falls into the tradition of deliberative practice, and is a means for planners to “facilitate processes of multiparty inquiry and learning, trust and relationship building” (Forester, 1999, p. 4). A review highlights four central features of PAR in planning: direct involvement of non-professional researchers in the knowledge production process; that process centrally involving the application of knowledge produced; reflection and evaluation of the knowledge’s usefulness; and subsequent adjustment of both inquiry and action strategies (Saija, 2014).

Within PAR processes, a range of quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods can be employed with primary and secondary data. Typically, data sources and methods should be determined collaboratively in response to community-led problem-framing. While a broader range of approaches under the umbrella of citizen science involve laypeople in data collection, what distinguishes PAR is lay involvement through all research phases from question formation to interpreting and acting on findings. Forester argues that, at its best, PAR functions as a series of rituals through which participants learn by surprise and “can come to see one another in new ways, to redefine and reformulate problems, to clarify opportunities, [and] to reorder priorities individually and collectively” (1999, p. 143)

PAR can enhance the rigor of planning research. Centering local knowledge helps ensure that research instruments, sampling and data collection are contextually appropriate. During analysis, community members can draw on their knowledge of their community to identify factors driving outcomes, help think through puzzling results, and offer insight into why results are what they are (Balazs & Morello-Frosch, 2013). PAR can even foster useful new paradigms and “social inventions” for addressing complex planning challenges like climate adaptation (Lim, 2024a, 2024b). And, though PAR is not inherently more ethical than other research, the reciprocity and trust required for effective partnerships can help ensure that the research surpasses basic ethical standards.

PAR also comes with challenges. PAR is more resource-intensive than conventional social science, with compensation of community researchers as a substantial expense. PAR is also more time-intensive, as relationships need to be built prior to designing research, and research can only progress at the speed of trust. This can pose difficulties for academic collaborators, especially junior scholars (Raynor, 2019; Slade, 2019). Community and academic team members may have different priorities and timelines from one another, which may come in to conflict. Unchecked power imbalances across community and academic collaborators may also produce conflict or mistrust, and can undermine the rigor of the approach.

Though there are substantial barriers to PAR, there is also significant room to expand the use of PAR in planning research and practice as a tool for tackling complex social challenges in a place-based, collaborative manner (Hendricks et al., 2022). Recent innovations in participatory planning involve citizen-led, collaborative inquiry for working through complex and conflict-ridden planning challenges (Roberts & Kelly, 2019; Rosen & Painter, 2019). PAR also has the potential to help planners work through other dilemmas in participation and engagement, for example, engaging communities around highly-technical subject matter, or navigating complex intergenerational divides (Daeppe et al., 2022; Sandercock & Attili, 2014).

## Methodology

In this section, we describe the large-scale PAR project that this work took place within, and then introduce our reflective case study methodology.

### *The Healthy Neighborhoods Study*

The Healthy Neighborhoods Study (HNS) is a longitudinal (2015-present), multi-site Participatory Action Research project exploring the relationship between urban development and health in nine rapidly-gentrifying neighborhoods across the metropolitan Boston region (Arcaya et al., 2018). Through partnerships with community organizations in each of the nine study communities, the HNS is driven by a network of about 45 “Resident Researchers,” residents of study communities who are involved in all aspects of the research including research design, data-gathering, analysis, and acting on findings (Binet et al., 2019). The HNS is led by a consortium comprised of Resident Researchers, community partner organizations, and public agency partners, and facilitated by a team of researchers from academia and a non-profit organization.

Resident Researchers vary widely in age, background, life experiences, and prior familiarity with research. Resident Researchers are trained in PAR methods and ethics by HNS staff, and are registered as IRB-approved study personnel. They are paid a stipend of \$20 per hour,

increasing annually with experience, and work approximately 175 hours per year across all HNS activities. Community partner organizations support Resident Researchers' participation and leadership. Academic team members and HNS staff facilitate partnership development and the research process, and the consortium is rounded out by public agency partners who advise on research design and knowledge mobilization.

The HNS PAR model centers Resident Researchers' local knowledge (The Healthy Neighborhoods Study, 2020). From 2015–2023, we followed a roughly annual cycle of inquiry, analysis, action and reflection. First, we formed or re-affirmed partnerships with community organizations, through which we recruited new Resident Researchers when necessary. Then, we used a series of collaborative research design workshops to develop research questions, identify data needs, and design data-gathering tools and sampling plans. Following ethics training, we gathered data, and then analyzed data through collaborative processes described below. Action projects followed analysis, and lessons learned through action projects informed the next year's research design. In 2024, the HNS team ceased primary data collection and shifted our efforts towards action-learning projects informed by prior empirical findings and monitored for quality improvement using an implementation science model.

Reciprocal learning between Resident Researchers and academic and public agency partners is central to how we work. Through processes like collaborative research design and data analysis, and shared time together conducting fieldwork or celebrating our accomplishments, partners learn from Resident Researchers about their communities' challenges, assets, values and priorities. Similarly, Resident Researchers learn about advances in research and policy from partners. We also learn about one another – our identities and families, our pasts and our hopes. Still, this does not erase power differentials. To address the corrosive effects of such hierarchies, HNS leadership takes steps to distribute power and resources within the project, including by providing direct funding for Resident Researchers and partner organizations, and making project management and budgetary decisions together through our consortium model.

### *(Continuous) Collaborative Data Analysis: Program Design and Development*

Since inception, the HNS has used collaborative processes for data analysis that center Resident Researchers in all analytical decision-making. This work occurred in two phases.

#### *Phase 1: Collaborative Data Analysis, 2016–2020*

In the first four years of the HNS, Collaborative Data Analysis (CDA) workshops were held on an annual basis. These day-long workshops brought all Resident Researchers and organizational partners together to review and discuss new data, develop and test hypotheses, and interpret findings. The workshops generally had five components: introductions and icebreakers; a 'Data Analysis 101' primer; a rotation of 3–4 analysis stations that participants would visit in small groups; full-group reflection; and a shared meal and social time. The workshops were designed and facilitated by HNS staff (Binet et al., 2019).

#### *Phase 2: Continuous Collaborative Data Analysis, 2021–2023*

In January 2021, we launched the Continuous Collaborative Data Analysis (CCDA) program, the primary focus of this article. The program had two components: a 'CCDA team' of 9–10 Resident Researchers that met for monthly workshops, and an annual 'Full-team CDA' day-long workshop

that all HNS consortium members would attend. The CCDA team would be responsible for making key analytical decisions and moving analytical projects forward, while the full-team workshop would be an opportunity to bring everyone else up to speed on analytical progress and strategize about linking analysis to action.

The underlying goal of this redesign was to be able to ask and answer more research questions. Our hope was that it would give Resident Researchers: more opportunities to shape the research agenda; more experiences working with different kinds of data; more time for interpretation and reflection; and more opportunities to build cross-community solidarity through analysis of common challenges.

Resident Researchers on the CCDA team had three main responsibilities: participating in a monthly two-hour workshop, liaising with their community team to keep them apprised of analytical progress and to understand their questions and priorities, and co-designing and co-facilitating the annual full-team CDA workshop.

Each of the nine neighborhood teams was asked to identify one RR who would serve on the CCDA team. Some were new to the HNS, while others had been participating since the beginning; some had prior experience working with one another, and others did not. Outside of the HNS, they played a variety of roles in their communities, including service provision, cultural organizing, government, tenant organizing, and environmental justice organizing.

CCDA facilitators were academic and practitioner members of the study's leadership team. None of the three lived within the nine study communities. CCDA facilitator roles included: designing and facilitating monthly workshops; coordinating with other members of the academic team about workshop inputs and intended outcomes; co-designing and co-facilitating full-team CDA; and program administration.

The CCDA team met on a monthly basis from March 2021 – November 2023 for a two-hour workshop. Workshops typically featured a short introductory “icebreaker” activity, two longer analytical activities, and a reflection activity. Analytical activities ranged widely and included: articulating new research questions, developing hypotheses, deciding how to score data, qualitative coding, interpreting statistical tests, meaning-making, and discussing how to communicate findings to broader audiences. Each year, the CCDA team also spent about two months of their time preparing to co-facilitate the annual full-team CDA workshop. This included shaping the agenda, co-designing activities, and practicing facilitation.

### ***Reflective Case Study Process***

Reflexivity is a central value and practice in PAR (Greenwood & Levin, 2006). Researchers engaged in PAR are strongly encouraged to develop a reflective practice as a tool for navigating relational, ethical and procedural challenges (Saija, 2014; Slade, 2019). At the group level, cycles of reflection are a tool for moving through phases of a PAR process, for example the establishment of ethical norms among team members, or the development of research tools (Cahill, 2007; Parker et al., 2020). Reflection is emphasized across the HNS: all of our workshops feature reflective activities for purposes including informing research design decisions, interpreting data, discussing the implications of findings, and improving our internal collaborative processes.

For this reflective case study, we built on our foundation of reflective practice to explore Resident Researchers' experience with the CCDA program. Our reflective case study process comprised a series of eight reflective discussions among Resident Researchers on the CCDA team, over 10 months in 2023. The CCDA team co-designed the reflective case study process

as it unfolded, and worked together to synthesize the major themes that arose and discuss their implications for urban planning more broadly. CCDA workshops were held virtually, and were audio- and video-recorded. The program facilitators also took written notes documenting discussions. The notes were thematically analyzed by facilitators, and preliminary themes were then discussed and refined by the CCDA team.

This case study is co-authored by the CCDA facilitators (AB, VG, KSS) and Resident Researcher team members (DA, CB, MC, JG, WJ, ATM, GR, DU) – we use ‘we’ to refer to all of us, and when necessary, specify when actions or perspectives are those of facilitators or Resident Researcher team members in particular.

## **Reflective Case Study Results: How Do We Know a Lot Together?**

### ***Deciding to Develop a Reflective Case Study***

In late 2022, perceiving that Resident Researcher discussions in CCDA workshops were illustrating important features about how the group works, facilitators developed a proposal for a systematic reflection process focused on “how we know a lot together.” In the January 2023 CCDA meeting, facilitators proposed conducting a case study of our group’s learning processes through collective reflection. Facilitators explained what a case study is and how they are commonly used, and proposed some options for how the team might go about building our reflective case study over the course of the year.

Resident Researchers then discussed the proposal, with enthusiasm. “The hows and whys are just as important as the whats,” said one RR, speaking to the importance of sharing our processes in addition to findings from specific analyses. Another RR said that “The phrase ‘nobody knows everything, together we know a lot’ is like an onion, it has layers to peel back and can apply to a lot of things.” No group members expressed reservations, and all members agreed to proceed with the proposed reflective case study.

### ***Making Meaning of ‘Together We Know a Lot’***

The first step in our process to understand how ‘together we know a lot’ was to solicit reflections on this theme from all HNS Resident Researchers and community partners at our full-team Collaborative Data Analysis workshop held in March 2023. CCDA RRs were going to be co-designing and co-facilitating this workshop featuring all 45 Resident Researchers and 9 community partners from across the HNS neighborhoods along with organizational partners.

To co-design the reflection activity for the workshop, the CCDA team did a hypothesis-generation activity to guide our design decisions. The group gravitated around the hypothesis “If we ask participants to reflect on when survey respondents mention experiences addressing community problems, then we will learn whether we are responding to the right problems and targeting the right solutions.” The CCDA team were interested in exploring how the experiences that community members share with RRs shape RRs perspectives as researchers, and thought that understanding how all RRs filter what they hear from community members into the research process would be a good jumping-off point for our reflective case study.

Based on this hypothesis, the team developed a two-part reflection activity to facilitate in small table groups at the full-team workshop. During the first part, participants would journal independently about “an experience [they] had connecting with someone in [their] community

about something we study on the HNS.” Then, RR table facilitators would ask tablemates to take turns sharing these experiences, follow up by asking “What does that experience tell us about how to make research meaningful and useful?” and invite others in the group to share what resonated with them. During the workshop, hand-written flipchart notes were taken by staff facilitators at each table station. These notes served as the basis for the CCDA team’s subsequent discussions of how ‘together we know a lot.’

At our next CCDA meeting, we focused on processing and debriefing the outputs from the reflective activity at the full-team CDA workshop. With guidance from facilitators, RRs reviewed the notes from each of the table groups, with a view to trying to synthesize ‘the how’ of ‘together we know a lot.’ The following insights emerged.

Foundationally, there is “respect [for one another] from the get-go” because RRs all already have experience learning from one another via other HNS activities. Into this environment of mutual respect, RRs sensitively bring what they’ve learned through their interactions with community members. RRs highlighted the importance of making connections between the experiences of different people they encounter through research, and applying their understanding of these connections to analytical decision-making. “Life can be very different from person to person,” explained one RR, “and when we hear from more people, we can see both the differences and patterns in their experiences.” Other RRs on the team explained that being able to “put yourself in other people’s shoes without causing harm” and “when people are open with you” make them feel confidence in their role as researchers.

RRs bring what they learn from hearing about other people’s experiences in the field into the CCDA process, and work together to identify patterns and trends by finding connections in experiences across communities. RRs reflected that they validate patterns through resonance across one another’s perspectives or actions: “Sometimes someone else “gets you” right away,” one RR described, while another described feeling like patterns are validated when they can see how other communities are also trying to respond to similar problems and can see their own work in greater context.

From this initial validation comes trust and care for one another, and confidence in the group. “There hasn’t been a time where I haven’t learned something that I could take back to my community,” said one RR. Another explained that this trust enables collaborative problem-solving. “You’re trying to solve a puzzle but you can’t find the missing piece on your own. But if you’re working together, trying different pieces to see if they fit, you can solve it.” RRs described filling in for each other’s gaps in knowledge and experience, and valuing all contributions as pieces of a bigger puzzle: “we don’t value one skill over any others, so everyone is able to contribute what they do have.”

RRs then suggested that identifying patterns in a trusting environment enables them to name underlying truths that may not be acknowledged in everyday encounters, and highlighted conversations about structural racism as an example. They described how this can be emotional: “it’s kind of funny and sad to see these patterns that we already knew about.” At the same time, RRs said that being able to connect with one another about these shared truths on an emotional level feels important and empowering. “We’re part of something bigger, and this fortifies us” explained one RR.

RR’s synthesis of their reflections on “how we know a lot together” are summarized in [Text Box 1](#). Our reflections illuminated features of a process by which connecting individuals’ stories to others facilitated the ability to identify patterns and trends, develop trust and care for one another, name underlying truths, and move towards collective problem solving.

*Text Box 1: Lessons learned about how we know a lot together*

- Mutual respect earned from cumulative experience learning from one another
- Connecting one person's story or experience to all of the others you have heard
- Empathy: putting yourself in other people's shoes without causing harm
- Valuing all contributions and filling in one another's gaps in experience or knowledge
- Validation via identifying patterns and trends of common experience across communities
- Seeing patterns together enables naming underlying truths
- Shared commitment to acknowledging and addressing shared truths
- Trust and care enable collaborative problem-solving

### **Enabling Conditions for Knowing a Lot Together**

For the next phase of our reflective case study process, which extended over three workshops, CCDA facilitators asked RRs what parts of this story they wanted to unpack in more depth. They identified three themes that represent enabling conditions for 'knowing a lot together': trust, listening, and the relationship between learning and leadership.

#### **Trust**

RRs first chose to reflect on how trust among our team is built, and how this trust enhances mutual learning. During our May 2023 CCDA meeting, RRs first journaled independently about the level of trust they felt when they first joined the HNS, and turning points that changed their feelings of trust in others on the team. Then, we discussed their reflections across three thematic areas: how does trust grow, why is trust important for PAR, and what advice can we offer others about building trust in PAR projects?

RRs' contributions highlighted how observing and experiencing the ways that PAR benefitted their own communities helped them build trust in the cross-community team. In the words of one RR, "When I first started, I got involved because the survey caught my attention, and I thought, if it caught mine, it'll catch my community's attention. My trust started when I got to know you all and see how interested you are in getting to know other communities' culture. I thought, this is where I want to learn more and this is where I want to stay, this will benefit my community." In a similar vein, others described the experience of being able to apply knowledge and findings from CCDA in their own communities, and how seeing the ways that research gave people an opportunity to talk about what they're going through made them trust that others on the team cared about their community. One RR said, "residents were able to trust me through the surveying, and this made me trust my team." Other observations about trust-building referenced informal relationship-building, the process of "peeling back the layers of the onion together" as we learn, and the experience of re-building trust when it is broken by strengthening bonds with others.

Facilitators then asked RRs to consider why trust is important to PAR. RRs surfaced five themes. First, trust matters because as individuals without prior research experience, "you don't really know what you're getting in to" when you sign up for a PAR project like the HNS. Second, RRs agreed that trust matters because the community members who we collect data from need to be able to trust that their information is safe with us. Relatedly, RRs agreed that we need to be able to trust our data to use it. Fourth, RRs discussed that trust is important for PAR since information is shared and used through networks shaped by trust. And finally, RRs discussed how trust is necessary to navigate conflicts, which will happen.

To conclude, RRs reflected on what lessons they would share with other groups about building trust in PAR. These reflections are summarized in [Text Box 2](#).

*Text Box 2: Lessons learned about building trust in PAR*

- Consistency and reliability: showing up consistently for the small things gives one another certainty that we'll do what we said we would
- Trust is learned: we learn together about "how to know who to trust"
- Trust extends to community: when people you trust in your personal life trust your PAR group, it tells you that the group is trustworthy
- Trust is built by seeing results and being able to use the data meaningfully
- Trust won't look or feel the same for everyone. But as long as each person has their nodes of trust, they're able to find the group trustworthy
- Trust is hard-earned, and broken trust is painful. It's necessary to be able to name and rectify harm.

### *Listening*

Next, in June 2023, our team reflected on how listening – a major part of the Resident Researchers' role – informs how they interpret and make meaning of data. Specifically, we sought to consider how Resident Researchers balance listening to what other people say, what the data says, and their own lived experience as they interpret data and make analytical decisions together. To surface these themes, RRs journaled alone reflecting on how they balance between these three types of information in the process of interpretation, shared their reflections through a facilitated discussion, and also discussed a new statistical finding with the goal of deliberately attending to how the group made sense of new information in real-time.

A number of Resident Researchers described a somewhat sequential process where they first considered others' experiences, then balanced this with their own experience, and then turned to what the data says. Reflecting on the interpretive process, key themes included how positionality, life circumstances, and role within the community mattered for meaning-making, and how RRs sometimes 'read between the lines' when surveying and bring these perspectives to bear on interpreting findings as well.

To wrap up this workshop, RRs were asked to name a shape that corresponds with how they perceive the listening and interpretive process. The shapes they listed included: fractals, building blocks, swirls, spirals, webs, and waves. The group converged around the shape of a 'hurricane' – a three-dimensional spiral with momentum that grows and changes in a non-linear way.

### *Learning and Leadership*

Finally, in July 2023, the CCDA group zoomed out to reflect on the learning we do in relation to the actions that Resident Researchers and partner organizations are undertaking in their communities. At that time, RRs were engaged in LinLab, an HNS program where RRs collaborate to advance regional-level actions based on study findings. Thus, they were well-positioned to reflect on the relationship between learning and action. The workshop began with individual journaling in response to two prompts: first, "Why is learning about your community important to you as a leader? Why is it worth your time and energy?" and next, "How has the learning we've done together changed or challenged your understanding of your community?" Then, the group participated in a broader facilitated discussion about learning and leadership development on the HNS. Resident Researchers said that learning was important to them as leaders for four key reasons.

First, RRs highlighted that learning enhanced their powers of observation. They described feeling that as a result of consistent involvement in data collection and analysis, they noticed

more things in their community that they wanted to pay closer attention to, and felt more aware of changes as they unfolded. Relatedly, RRs felt a stronger predictive ability to forecast potential outcomes of changes by following patterns and trails of evidence, and felt like they could more readily see 'the bigger picture' that changes in their neighborhood were taking place in.

Second, RRs described how learning contributed to their leadership by helping them understand how needs, values and struggles in their community were interrelated, and in turn clarifying what community efforts to undertake. Learning helped RRs understand points of tension and disagreement between groups within their communities, and between people and processes of change. Learning more about their community's values helped RRs understand how to work towards meeting local needs in ways that align with community values. With this understanding, they felt more capable of creating spaces for members of their community to explore why things are the way they are. And, they also felt more capable of pinpointing and naming things that are good, working, and/or successful in the community.

Third, RRs described how learning strengthened their understanding of, and ability to confront, structures and processes of power. RRs situated their learning and leadership in the context of historical patterns of misinformation and manipulation, critically reflecting on how educational systems have restricted what members of their communities can learn and think about how power works in society. They reflected on the importance of having spaces to be able to question structures of power, to think together about what types of knowledge need to be produced to make the type of difference they want to make in their communities, and to actually be able to build that knowledge together. The collective learning process involved arriving at a deeper recognition of people's power to learn, and the power of learning to shape their understanding of what is happening and what is possible.

Fourth, and as a result of the above, RRs reflected that learning helped them build trust with other members of their community. Their knowledge made them able to be responsive and resourceful sources of information. "It's important to know what to share, how to share it, and be there to answer questions that no one else is there to answer," said one RR. Another described the importance, as a leader, of having "confidence from my community that if I don't know, I can find out."

In terms of how learning has changed the way they see their role as leaders in their community, RR reflections centered on three capacities: linking, brokering, and influencing. RRs described how their role has resulted in them doing more learning across communities in addition to learning about their own communities, and that a notable advantage of this is the ability to demonstrate to fellow community members that alternative forms of urban and community development are possible based on what they learn from other contexts. Related is a brokering capacity: RRs described understanding their role as someone who shares information with their community, navigating the resistance that introducing new information sometimes comes with, recognizing patterns of who is listened to and given credibility and who is not, and understanding how to intervene in and challenge these power dynamics. In turn, the final theme of this conversation was an evolving sense of one's influence as a leader, specifically with respect to using what they learn to be more vocal about challenges their community is facing and more influential in shaping how decisions are made and space is used in their communities.

## Discussion

Our experience with collaborative data analysis shows that with resources, time, facilitation, and technical support, it's possible to build sustained structures for planning researchers, practitioners, and community residents to systematically engage in social learning that is both contextually useful for community and institutional actors, and capable of contributing generalizable insights to the broader planning field. Resident Researchers experienced CCDA as a process of synthesizing primary data, personal experience, and what they hear others say about their own experiences in the course of their day-to-day lives. Social learning produced what Resident Researchers described as a deeper and more empowering understanding of the systems, structures and processes that shape place-based experiences and inequities.

Resident Researchers identified three conditions enabling social learning. First was trust, built over time through shared experiences across the HNS like data collection, collaborative analysis, and action projects. Trust enabled difficult conversations about complex themes, and built participants' confidence making analytical and interpretive decisions. Second, a shared practice of listening that actively triangulates across data, personal experience, and exposure to others' experiences. And third, active leadership, both within the HNS in the form of co-facilitating workshops for the broader team and leading action projects, and in their own communities through ongoing work or volunteering on matters related to urban and community development.

Through this social learning process, we've learned about the relationship between health and place in HNS neighborhoods, including key financial stressors mediating the relationship between development and health (Binet et al., 2022), factors shaping patterns of residential moves regionally (Daepf et al., 2022), and how feelings of ownership over neighborhood changes influence health (Binet et al., 2022). We've also learned about how to apply our knowledge in the service of shared goals, for example greater community control over land (Healthy Neighborhoods Study, 2023). These contributions highlight forms of knowledge that PAR is well-suited to develop: problem-framing, systems understandings, synthesis, and judgement.

## *Applications and Limitations*

We see this model as adaptable to many contexts, urban or rural, and believe it could also work with participants from a single neighborhood. Regardless of context, critical ingredients for success include: financial resources to support sustained RR involvement and action projects; capacity to design and facilitate deliberative spaces that engage both experiential storytelling and empirical reasoning; time to work slowly and reflexively on what may feel open-ended; intentional strategies for redistributing power away from academics and to community members across the research process; and the means to come together consistently to work and to socialize.

These ingredients also point to key limitations of PAR approaches. They are resource-intensive and time consuming, as discussed above. They depend on facilitative capacity which requires training and experience to develop. Outcomes and outputs can regularly feel unclear or out-of-reach, especially early in the process, which can be challenging for morale. Conflict can emerge between people with different positionalities and derail discussions or even working relationships. The multifaceted demands of personal and professional life can pull people away and limit opportunities for collaboration. It is likely not possible to avoid these limitations, and so

those seeking to use PAR should prepare to negotiate them together and use that process to clarify shared values and raise new lines of inquiry.

## Conclusion

In this paper, a team of academic and community researchers report a reflective case study of our experience conducting collaborative data analysis processes together as part of a long-term Participatory Action Research study. We interpret our experiences through the lens of social learning, a central yet under-explored current of the planning tradition, and through this lens endeavor to systematically unpack what enabled social learning among our group – what it was about the way we worked that made it possible for us to ‘know a lot, together.’ Our findings highlight a mix of capacities like empathy, trust, and mutual respect, as well as key practical supports such as background research capability, that enable social learning.

## *Contributions to Planning Theory and Practice*

We argue that the CCDA program provides a replicable model for social learning integrating the generation and application of planning knowledge in a manner that engages multiple epistemologies, builds synthetic capabilities within social systems, and contributes to community members’ abilities to advance their own visions of urban development. Our findings contribute insight into how to structure social learning settings that bring together different types of community and institutional stakeholders, and suggest enabling conditions for social learning. These findings complement what we know about social learning among professional planners with an enhanced understanding of how social learning unfolds in groups of lay community residents working together on planning-related issues.

For decades, the relationship between knowledge and action has been at the crux of debates about what planning is and can be, and planners consistently struggle with the art of how to bridge the two in practice (Campbell, 2012; Friedmann, 1987; Healey, 2012). This struggle reflects the fact that, by and large, the processes of producing planning knowledge and acting on that knowledge continue to be separate, conducted by different actors with different objectives across different temporalities and scales (Saija, 2014). This struggle to integrate knowledge and action also reflects the challenge of incorporating multiple epistemologies into both knowledge production processes and processes of intervening in urban environments (Sandercock, 2004). Campbell (2012) argues that synthesis is planners’ bridge between knowledge and action, and Sandercock (2003) advocates for narrative-based approaches to engaging multiple epistemologies in planning research and practice.

We argue that social learning structures like CCDA can be useful planning tools because they provide a container for both story *and* synthesis, helping not only to bridge but to integrate knowing and acting. CDA engages narrative in multiple ways: RRs bring their own narratives of their experiences and contexts into the analysis process; narratives can comprise the data; the act of analysis involves understanding the stories expressed by data and connecting them to our own stories; sharing our findings with our collaborators involves telling a shared story about what we learned and what it means; and acting on what we learned involves visionary storytelling about paths to different futures.

Our findings have implications for how we train planners, highlighting the importance of facilitative and engagement skills, reflective practice, and the capacity to understand and actively draw on different forms of knowledge in group settings. Likewise, planners should be able to identify opportunities to enhance social learning within planning processes, and design strategies to engage actors with different backgrounds and capabilities in social learning processes. Finally, planners should be able to interpret different types of outputs from social learning and understand how to integrate them into broader planning processes. We encourage planners to find opportunities to expand the role of social learning in their work, whether through participatory approaches like CDA, or through structures like communities of practice and co-production models (Natarajan, 2017; Rosen & Painter, 2019; Schweitzer et al., 2008; von Schönfeld et al., 2020).

### *Social Learning, Technological Change, and Planning Knowledge*

Inspired by discussions among the CCDA team about how research sits in tension with histories of surveillance, policing, misinformation, exclusion and extraction in HNS neighborhoods, we conclude by reflecting on the significance of social learning in an age when technological advancements raise major questions about the future of planning and the role of people therein (Bates, 2024; Lim, 2024a, 2024b; Potts, 2020). Contemporary innovations in artificial intelligence, data science and “smart city” technologies augur the ascendance of novel forms of technocratic planning, which threaten to exclude communities from planning processes and exacerbate social and economic inequalities (Kitchin et al., 2019).

We argue that processes like CCDA offer alternative models for planners to develop networked intelligence, understand urban complexity and identify and prioritize among strategies for improving planning practice and city life, rooted in social rather than technological innovation. In the face of the ‘generic’ knowledge produced by AI, for example, social learning endeavors like collaborative data analysis can offer ‘generative’ knowledge and relational, contextually-grounded ways of developing ideas and making meaning in a way that increases our accountability to communities historically excluded from planning processes (Bates, 2024).

Whether, who and how these new technologies help or harm depends on how they are built and used (D’Ignazio & Klein, 2020). It’s possible to see the two paradigms – social learning and machine-based learning – as simply complementary, with planners drawing on the affordances of both to determine how to proceed in a given context. But this maintains a distinction between where knowledge is produced and acted upon. Perhaps a more transformative approach to incorporating new technologies into planning might be to use participatory social learning structures like CCDA as venues for determining what data to capture with these new technologies, how to analyze and interpret it, and how to act on it. Indeed, we have grappled with this in the HNS ourselves, experimenting with a PAR approach to ‘big data’ analysis when our own primary data wasn’t appropriate for answering one of our research questions (Daepp et al., 2022). This might be a path to a smarter city.

### **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the entire HNS Consortium for their contributions to collaborative data analysis over the years. We also thank Theo Lim, the editors, and the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback.

## Funding

This study was funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

## Notes on Contributors

**Andi Binet** is Assistant Professor in the School of Community and Regional Planning at the University of British Columbia and a member of the Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium. Corresponding author: [andi.binet@ubc.ca](mailto:andi.binet@ubc.ca)

**Vedette Gavin** is Principal Consultant at Verge Impact Partners and a member of the Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium.

**Dina Abreu** is a Resident Researcher in the Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium.

**Carl Baty** is a former Resident Researcher in the Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium.

**Mitikei Chengerei** is a Resident Researcher in the Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium.

**Josée Genty** is a Resident Researcher in the Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium.

**Will Justice** is a Resident Researcher in the Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium.

**Araceli Tepoz Mendez** is a Resident Researcher in the Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium.

**Gail Roderigues** is a Resident Researcher in the Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium.

**David Underhill** is a Resident Researcher in the Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium.

**Kelsey Salmon Schreck** is a Program Coordinator at the Conservation Law Foundation and a member of the Healthy Neighborhoods Study Consortium.

**Mariana Arcaya** is Professor of Urban Planning and Public Health in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

## References

- Anti-Oppression Resource and Training Alliance. (2017). *Anti-oppressive facilitation for democratic process*. Anti-Oppression Resource and Training Alliance.
- Arcaya, M. C., Schnake-Mahl, A., Binet, A., Simpson, S., Church, M. S., Gavin, V., Coleman, B., Levine, S., Nielsen, A., Carroll, L., Ursprung, S., Wood, B., Reeves, H., Keppard, B., Sportiche, N., Partirdge, J., Figueora, J., Frakt, A., Alfonzo, M., ... Youmans, T. (2018). Community change and resident needs: Designing a participatory action research study in metropolitan Boston. *Health & Place, 52*, 221–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2018.05.014>
- Balazs, C. L., & Morello-Frosch, R. (2013). The three Rs: How community-based participatory research strengthens the rigor, relevance, and reach of science. *Environmental Justice, 6*(1), 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2012.0017>
- Bates, L. K. (2024). A computer must never make a planning decision. *Planning Theory & Practice, 25*(4), 457–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2024.2423570>
- Binet, A., Gavin, V., Carroll, L., & Arcaya, M. C. (2019). Designing and facilitating collaborative research design and data analysis workshops: Lessons learned in the healthy neighborhoods study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(3), 324. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16030324>
- Binet, A., Nidam, Y., Houston-Read, R., Lopez, C. G., del Rio, G. Z., Abreu, D., Baty, C., Baty, A., Genty, J., Graham, G., Joseph, J., Justice, W., Roderigues, G., Underhill, D., Gavin, V., & Arcaya, M. C. (2022). Ownership of change: Participatory development of a novel latent construct for neighborhoods and health equity research. *Social Science & Medicine (1982), 309*, 115234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115234>

- Binet, A., Zayas del Rio, G., Arcaya, M., Roderigues, G., & Gavin, V. (2022). 'It feels like money's just flying out the window': Financial security, stress and health in gentrifying neighborhoods. *Cities & Health*, 6(3), 536–551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23748834.2021.1885250>
- Cahill, C. (2007). Repositioning ethical commitments: Participatory action research as a relational praxis of social change. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, 6(3), 360–373.
- Campbell, H. (2006). Just planning: The art of situated ethical judgment. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 26(1), 92–106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X06288090>
- Campbell, H. (2012). Planning to change the world: Between knowledge and action lies synthesis. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 32(2), 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X11436347>
- Corburn, J. (2003). Bringing local knowledge into environmental decision making: Improving urban planning for communities at risk. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 22(4), 420–433. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X03022004008>
- D'Ignazio, C., & Klein, L. F. (2020). *Data feminism*. The MIT Press.
- Daepf, M. I. G., Binet, A., Gavin, V., & Arcaya, M. C., The Healthy Neighborhoods Research Consortium. (2022). The moving mapper. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 88(2), 179–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2021.1957704>
- Davoudi, S. (2006). Evidence-based planning. *disP – The Planning Review*, 42(165), 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02513625.2006.10556951>
- Davoudi, S. (2015). Planning as practice of knowing. *Planning Theory*, 14(3), 316–331. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095215575919>
- Forester, J. (1999). *The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes*. MIT Press.
- Friedmann, J. (1987). *Planning in the public domain: From knowledge to action*. Princeton University Press.
- Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology*. Basic Books.
- Greenwood, D. J., & Levin, M. (2006). *Introduction to action research: Social research for social change* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Healey, P. (2009). The pragmatic tradition in planning thought. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 28(3), 277–292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X08325175>
- Healey, P. (2012). The universal and the contingent: Some reflections on the transnational flow of planning ideas and practices. *Planning Theory*, 11(2), 188–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095211419333>
- Healthy Neighborhoods Study. (2023). *(Re)envisioning land and power: A toolkit for community ownership and control in Massachusetts compiled by those active in these efforts*. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ex4mkCL8ySbezMfCtuUgcl0iXniVCfbr/view>
- Hendricks, M. D., Meyer, M. A., & Wilson, S. M. (2022). Moving up the ladder in rising waters: Community science in infrastructure and hazard mitigation planning as a pathway to community control and flood disaster resilience. *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*, 7(1), 18. <https://doi.org/10.5334/cstp.462>
- Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2004). Reframing public participation: Strategies for the 21st century. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 5(4), 419–436. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1464935042000293170>
- Kitchin, R., Coletta, C., Evans, L., Heaphy, L., & Mac Donncha, D. (2019). Smart cities, algorithmic technocracy and new urban technocrats. In R. Kitchin, C. Coletta, L. Evans, L. Heaphy, & D. Mac Donncha (Eds.), *Planning and knowledge* (pp. 199–212). Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.1332/policy-press/9781447345244.003.0015>
- Krizek, K., Forysth, A., & Slotterback, C. S. (2009). Is there a role for evidence-based practice in urban planning and policy? *Planning Theory & Practice*, 10(4), 459–478. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649350903417241>
- Legacy, C. (2017). Is there a crisis of participatory planning? *Planning Theory*, 16(4), 425–442. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095216667433>
- Lim, T. C. (2024a). Necessary considerations when framing urban heat resilience as an infrastructure issue. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 90(3), 568–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2023.2259358>
- Lim, T. C. (2024b). Words and meaning in 2024. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 25(5), 609–612. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2024.2456432>
- Mumford, L. (1938). *The culture of cities*. Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Natarajan, L. (2017). Socio-spatial learning: A case study of community knowledge in participatory spatial planning. *Progress in Planning*, 111, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2015.06.002>

- Novoa, M., & Vasudevan, R. (2025). Relational engagements and embodiments: Exploring pluriversalities of community-based scholarship in planning. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 26(1), 85–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2025.2479502>
- Parker, M., Wallerstein, N., Duran, B., Magarati, M., Burgess, E., Sanchez-Youngman, S., Boursaw, B., Heffernan, A., Garoutte, J., & Koegel, P. (2020). Engage for equity: Development of community-based participatory research tools. *Health Education & Behavior*, 47(3), 359–371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198120921188>
- Potts, R. (2020). Is a new “planning 3.0” paradigm emerging? Exploring the relationship between digital technologies and planning theory and practice. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 21(2), 272–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2020.1748699>
- Raynor, K. (2019). Participatory action research and early career researchers: The structural barriers to engagement and why we should do it anyway. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 20(1), 130–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2018.1556501>
- Reardon, K. M. (1998). Enhancing the capacity of community-based organizations in east St. Louis. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 17(4), 323–333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X9801700407>
- Roberts, A., & Kelly, G. (2019). Remixing as praxis. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 85(3), 301–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2019.1622439>
- Rosen, J., & Painter, G. (2019). From citizen control to co-production. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 85(3), 335–347. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2019.1618727>
- Rydin, Y. (2007). Re-examining the role of knowledge within planning theory. *Planning Theory*, 6(1), 52–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095207075161>
- Saija, L. (2014). Writing about engaged scholarship: Misunderstandings and the meaning of “quality” in action research publications. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 15(2), 187–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2014.904922>
- Sandercock, L. (2003). Out of the closet: The importance of stories and storytelling in planning practice. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 4(1), 11–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1464935032000057209>
- Sandercock, L. (2004). Towards a planning imagination for the 21st century. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70(2), 133–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944360408976368>
- Sandercock, L., & Attili, G. (2014). Changing the lens: Film as action research and therapeutic planning practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 34(1), 19–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X13516499>
- Schön, D. (1984). *The reflective practitioner*. Basic Books.
- Schweitzer, L. A., Howard, E. J., & Doran, I. (2008). Planners learning and creating power: A community of practice approach. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 28(1), 50–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X08319203>
- Slade, J. (2019). Doing what we can with what we’ve got: Reflections on PAR and the ECR experience. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 20(2), 305–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2019.1595486>
- Tate, L. E. (2020). Should planners create hierarchies of evidence? Learning from health and choosing our own path. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 21(4), 635–647. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2020.1806682>
- The Healthy Neighborhoods Study. (2020). *A participatory action research field guide*. <https://www.clf.org/publication/field-guide-for-participatory-action-research/>
- Vasudevan, R., & Novoa, E. M. (2022). Pluriversal planning scholarship: Embracing multiplicity and situated knowledges in community-based approaches. *Planning Theory*, 21(1), 77–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14730952211000384>
- von Schönfeld, K. C., Tan, W., Wiekens, C., & Janssen-Jansen, L. (2020). Unpacking social learning in planning: Who learns what from whom? *Urban Research & Practice*, 13(4), 411–433. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2019.1576216>