IJoC | Urban Communication

The Communicative City Redux

SUSAN DRUCKER
Hofstra University, USA

GARY GUMPERT
Urban Communication Foundation, USA

The communicative city is a construct that can be used to measure and recognize urban municipalities that provide or facilitate the creation and maintenance of a healthy communicative environment. Utilizing the criteria established through a series of interdisciplinary meetings, the Urban Communication Foundation introduced the Communicative City Award, honoring cities with the vision and skill to enhance communication in the interest of creating a healthy and humane social environment. The aim of this initiative is to advance the goal of underscoring the need for cities to place or foreground communication needs in the public agenda. An international jury composed of communication scholars and design and environment behavior scholars and practitioners evaluate the city's initiative with regard to criteria of communicative cities. These criteria are clustered into three major areas: places of interaction, infrastructure, and politics/civil society. Disqualifications have been articulated as part of the criteria as well. Ultimately, this initiative seeks to not only recognize and set a communication agenda for cities but directly benefit award-winning cities through communication research–based recommendations that address remaining challenges identified by municipal leaders.

Keywords: communicative city, quality of life, places of interaction, infrastructure, civil society, awards

The terms *global city*, *smart city*, *connected city*, *sustainable city*, *inclusive city*, and *green city* all encapsulate the collective value placed on a location where many people live and work. All these terms are both descriptive and normative of a reality based upon a gathering of people located in close proximity. A city consists of structures and services, but a city without people is simply an inanimate shell—a dead space. People and their needs define a city.

Susan Drucker: sphsjd@hofstra.edu
Gary Gumpert: listra@optonline.net
Date submitted: 2015–06–10

The dream of an inspiring city is an old one. Three-term New York Governor Mario Cuomo, addressing the 1984 Democratic National Convention in San Francisco, responded to President Ronald Reagan's description of the United States as a "shining city on a hill":

> Mr. President you ought to know that this nation is more a "tale of two cities" than it is just a "shining city on a hill." In many ways we are a shining city on a hill. But the hard truth is that not everyone is sharing in this city's splendor and glory. A shining city is perhaps all the President sees from the portico of the White House and the veranda of his ranch, where everyone seems to be doing well. But there's another city; there's another part to the shining city; the part where some people can't pay their mortgages, and most young people can't afford one; where students can't afford the education they need, and middle-class parents watch the dreams they hold for their children evaporate. (Cuomo, 1984, para. 2–3)

The English poet Matthew Arnold spoke of "that sweet city with her dreaming spires," invoking a spiritual, normative view of Oxford. It was his city of a dream. The "shining city on the hill" metaphor is not a new one: "You are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid" is found in the Gospel of Matthew 5:14. This "city on the hill" trope is both a description of people and structures and a normative approach to what the urban landscape ought to be. It is a place of connection. It is a commune—meaning a large gathering of people sharing a common life (from the Latin *communis*, things held in common). Whether the motivation for such commonality is protection, sustenance, or economics, the city, in one sense, is an idealized metaphor but one that changes with time and circumstance. It is a place that may become flawed by time and circumstance—a place sometimes inhumane and destructive.

In *The Wizard of Oz*, Dorothy, the straw man, the cowardly lion, and the tin man follow the yellow brick road to the Emerald City only to find that it is a mirage, a fantasy created by a benign fraud— the Wizard. But the moral and the vision remain compelling—that dreams can become a reality and are to be found in the city on the hill.

It has been said, "We are the ape that shapes our environment, the city builders—Homo urbanus" (Smith, 2012, p. xi). But once built, as Shakespeare asks, "What is the city but the people?" (*Coriolanus*, Act 3, Scene 1). Cities are where people forge relationships; they are places of social interaction. The urban landscape was created for and by people motivated by the need for protection, stimulation, provisions, and procreation. Survival required proximity, safety, and the social nurturing of family and community. Accompanying the accelerating growth of the urban domain there has been an increase in the intensity of urban scholarship.

The urban sociologist, the environmental psychologist, the political scientist, the geographer, and the cultural historian offer unique and discipline-bound visions of the city, each approaching the subject through an idiosyncratic vision and contributing valuable data. However, the past and future of cities are rooted in the fundamental need to communicate. Certainly the city and those who inhabit it are influenced by social change and technological development, but the development of a broader communication

approach (one is hesitant to call it a discipline) and the methods of measuring communication in the city have lagged behind.

How to study, evaluate, and recognize the communicativeness of cities using existing methods is challenging. This essay introduces and explores the concept of the communicative city and its methods for identification.

Exemplary Cities/Awarding Cities

Many awards laud the positive aspects of municipalities around the world. A survey of these suggests ways of evaluating and measuring urban attributes and experiences.

Many terms have been used to identify the different positive conceptions of the city; each emphasizes a type of valued reality. For some, the vision of a city involves cleanliness and clean air; for others, the fantasy is of a city of wealth. For some, property is prized, and for others the city is a site of community or civic engagement. Increasingly, environmental consciousness has resulted in the description of cities with the encomium "sustainable and green." Some municipalities support art, others bohemia or education, walkability, low crime, or affordable housing. In the attempt to understand, categorize, and quantify the dreams and characteristics of the shining city, diverse criteria and indexes have been developed. The following discussion provides some notion of their nature and scope.

Some cities have been ranked on the bases of quality of life, livability, or goodness. Quality-of-life rankings feature the economic environment (e.g., cost of living, banking services, currency exchange regulation), and others feature climate, the natural environment, recreation, housing, political and social environments, public services, health care services, and education) (Monocle, 2013; Numbeo, 2015). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (2014) Better Life Index features housing, income, jobs, community, education, environment, civic engagement, health, life satisfaction, safety, and work–life balance.

The 2014 Global Age Watch Index ranked 96 nations on quality of life for people over age 60—featuring income, employment opportunities, access to public transport, and life expectancy (Woollaston, 2014). Quality of life in cities has been measured by criteria associated with cleanliness (Mercer, 2014). The Slow City emerged from the Slow Food movement as applied to urban planning:

> The Slow City manifesto contains 55 pledges or criteria, grouped into six categories upon which cities are assessed; environmental policy, infrastructure, quality of urban fabric, encouragement of local produce and products, hospitality and community and Citta Slow awareness. (Slow Movement, 2015, para. 4)

Quality-of-life indicators address "issues of environmental protection and sustainable urban development, urban design and form, the support of local products, and educational awareness" (Mayer & Knox, 2009, p. 21). Such quality-of-life standards are distinct from standard-of-living

indicators. Quality of life is a broader concept that includes economic indicators as well as the built environment, physical and mental health, education, recreation and leisure time, and social connections.

"Diverse city" happiness scales have been developed (The Pursuit of Happiness, 2014) as well as unhappiness criteria, including "unwelcomed snowstorms and dreaded heat waves [that] can affect your happiness—but so can income, workplace environment, and career opportunities" (Smith, 2014, para. 3).

Livability has become a basis of city rankings. Monocle's Most Livable Cities Index and the Economist Intelligence Unit's Livability Ranking and Overview are just two examples. Livability standards have proliferated. Criteria range from infrastructure, environment, and accessibility to culture, health care, education, and environment. Some organizations strive to develop "livable city frameworks" (International Making Cities Livable, 2014).

The proliferation of criteria has led to the propagation of rankings and award programs allowing cities to proudly advertise their recognition as: livable, clean, large, sustainable, green, healthy, and slow. Awards recognize projects, vision, design, and research.

In the United States, the National Civic League (2014) annually bestows the All-American City Award to "projects that display civic engagement, collaboration, inclusiveness, innovation and impact" (para. 2). Particularly encouraged are projects that involve "engaging and supporting vulnerable boys and young men" (para. 2).

The National League of Cities (2015) award program "recognizes cities and towns that have turned ideas into accomplishments" (para. 1). It supports several award and recognition programs including the City Showcase "celebrating city achievements identifying "successful, creative programs from cities and towns across the country" that "participate in this unique set of recognition, networking, and knowledge sharing opportunities" (para. 1).

The United States Conference of Mayors' (2014) Annual City Livability Award is open to municipalities in the United States for recognition of "one or more city government programs in any policy area" (p. 6). Programs can be public or public–private partnerships.

In Europe, the Access City Award is part of the European Union's initiatives associated with the effort to create a barrier-free Europe ensuring improved accessibility.

> The Access City Award recognises and celebrates a city's willingness, capability and efforts to ensure accessibility in order to: guarantee equal access to fundamental rights; improve the quality of life of its population and ensure that everybody— regardless of age, mobility or ability—has equal access to all the resources and pleasures cities have to offer. (European Commission, 2015a, para. 2)

The award recognizes cities for successful initiatives that allow people with disabilities to participate fully in society. The award covers four key areas of accessibility:

- The built environment and public spaces
- Transport and related infrastructure
- Information and communication, including new technologies (ICTs)
- Public facilities and services (European Commission, 2015b)

The Urban Land Institute's (2015) Urban Open Space Award "celebrates and promotes vibrant, successful urban open spaces by annually recognizing and rewarding an outstanding example of a public destination that has enriched and revitalized its surrounding community" (para. 1). In 2015, this award program was expanded for submissions worldwide. These awards for excellence recognize a full development project and consider not only architecture and design but contributions to community.

Metropolis: World Association of the Major Metropolises, an international organization of cities and metropolitan regions, gives the Metropolis Award to cities with more than a million inhabitants. The organization is dedicated to exploring "issues and concerns common to all big cities and metropolitan regions" (Metropolis, 2015a, para. 2). The 2017 award will be given in recognition for

> outstanding urban development experiences . . . related to improving . . . quality of life, preferably in the areas of environment, housing, public transport, safety and economic, social and cultural development. Special consideration is given to cases with positive impact on women, young people and people with some form of disability. (Metropolis, 2015b, para. 2

The more focused Sustainable Cities Award recognizes cities that integrate different types of resources or capital for a better future in cities around the world. The conceptual approach is to use the following types of capital:

- Environmental Capital—Natural Resources Preservation
- Social Capital—Well-being and Social Relations
- Human and Intellectual Capital—Innovation and Social Intelligence
- Technical and Infrastructure Capital—Transportation and ICT
- Culture and Leisure Capital—Experience
- Political Capital—Confidence and Public Trust
- Financial Capital—Assets and Financial Management (Globe Award, 2015, para. 1)

Such a city "needs to demonstrate one or more special initiatives that it has undertaken in the last two years in one or more of the various types of capital above in order to reach a more sustainable future" (Globe Award, 2015, para. 2).

Community and communication are inherently significant to the work of the Project for Public Spaces (PPS), a nonprofit planning, design, and educational organization dedicated to sustaining public spaces that build stronger communities (Project for Public Spaces, 2014b). The public spaces PPS seeks to create and maintain are social spaces—sites of interaction where "celebrations are held, social and economic exchanges occur, friends run into each other" (Project for Public Spaces, 2015, para. 1).

PPS is based on the work of William (Holly) Whyte, author of *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces* (1980). The organization has a program honoring Great Public Spaces. In evaluating public spaces, four qualities are featured: access, activities, comfort, and sociability. Most significant in the communication perspective is sociability, for which PPS seeks a description of the social tenor of the place and the mood of the sense of behavior of people toward one another. It examines whether places are used by groups or single users. It asks whether there is a sense of local pride in the place, whether it is seen as a meeting place, and whether it is used by locals or visitors/tourists (Project for Public Spaces, 2014a). PPS developed the Place Diagram as a tool to help people in judging places.

There are many other awards. Their criteria are well intentioned and conveniently vague, stress community, and often reflect quality-of-life concepts measured by economists and political scientists. These criteria noticeably neglect the indispensable necessity of community: communication.

The Communicative Perspective

We contend that the nature, function, and identity of the city are defined, in large part, by the process of communication and its impact on place (one must avoid falling into the trap that everything is communication). The communicative city initiative espouses the axiom that a community is shaped by communication. In short, the communication perspective assumes the urban communication environment is a site *for* communication and an artifact *of* communication.

To fully grasp the scope and nature of the communicative city, the urban landscape can be parsed into five structures that are indirectly and directly connected to the communicative nature of the city:

- Physical structure—the material elements used to construct the environment
- Infrastructure or connective facilities and services
- Social structures and arrangements that link individuals
- Regulatory structure used to govern the environment
- Fictional and nonfictional depictions that structure the imagination.

Such an examination of the urban landscape through a normative communication perspective extends the analytical parameters beyond the more narrow and restrictive transmission model of communication.

> There is a distinct thread of scholarship developing through which urban/suburban/rural issues are seen through the prism of communication. Using established communication studies approaches/methodologies; these works explore the historical, philosophical perspectives along with case studies of the interpersonal and media landscape of spaces, places and communication texts. (Drucker & Gumpert, 2008, p. 13)

Relevant research has applied to the urban landscape methods of rhetorical criticism, media criticism, organizational communication, political communication, health communication, legal communication, visual communication, conflict resolution, and cultural studies. Diverse qualitative and quantitative methods are included in *Urban Communication: Production, Text, Context*, edited by Timothy A. Gibson and Mark Lowes (2007). Predominantly qualitative communication methods composed contributions in three edited volumes of *The Urban Communication Reader* (Burd, Drucker, & Gumpert, 2007; Jassem, Drucker & Burd, 2010; Matsaganis, Gallagher & Drucker, 2013).

The Jane Jacobs Urban Communication Book Award given by the Urban Communication Foundation since 2005 recognizes an outstanding book, "that exhibits excellence in addressing issues of urban communication" (Urban Communication Foundation, 2014, para. 1). It is named in honor of the late social activist and author of *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Fourteen books have received this award: various works by communication scholars reflect the breadth of the subject matter and methods applicable to urban communication studies.[1]

The search for the shining city led the Urban Communication Foundation to develop a program for recognizing cities that created or advanced communication. The need for a methodology quickly became apparent. Existing methods for evaluating the communicative quality of an urban environment were limited. Given the lack of an overarching communication perspective, the concept of the Communicative City Award developed by the Urban Communication Foundation emerged.

---

[1] The following Jane Jacobs award winners also demonstrate diverse approaches and methods of researching issues and artifacts of urban communication. Daniel Makagon, *Where the Ball Drops: Days and Nights in Times Square* (2004); Steve Macek, *Urban Nightmares: The Media, the Right, and the Moral Panic Over the City* (2006); Timothy A. Gibson and Mark Lowes, *Urban Communication: Production, Text, Context* (2007); Paul Mason Fotsch, *Watching the Traffic Go By: Transportation and Isolation in Urban America* (2007); Phaedra C. Pezzullo, *Toxic Tourism: Rhetorics of Pollution, Travel, and Environmental Justice* (2009); Scott McQuire, *The Media City: Media, Architecture and Urban Space* (2008); Andrew Wood, *City Ubiquitous: Place, Communication, and the Rise of Omnitopia* (2009); Spoma Jovanovic, *Democracy, Dialogue, and Community Action: Truth and Reconciliation in Greensboro* (2012); Teresa Bergman, *Exhibiting Patriotism: Creating and Contesting Interpretations of American Historic Sites* (2013), Mark Shiel, *Hollywood Cinema and the Real Los Angeles* (2012); and Myria Georgiou, *Media and the City: Cosmopolitanism and Difference* (2013). No clear methodology for approaching urban communication could be discerned from this expanding body of work, although each of the volumes approached the city with part of a total communication perspective.

Quality of Life as a Measure of the Communicative City

One area of research methods offering potentially suitable measures for the communicative city has been offered by quality-of-life studies. The attributes associated with quality of life are diverse, and the methods employed are varied. Studies have been conducted to evaluate various aspects of urban life, including communities, neighborhoods, housing, and parks and recreation and recreational facilities. Methods focusing on user requirements and attributes of physical and sociocultural environments that influence individual and group behavior and the quality of community life have been developed.

Such research focuses on attributes of the urban environment that contribute to the overall well-being of residents. The research features the sociophysical aspects of urban living, ranging from individual dwellings and neighborhoods to public services (e.g., transportation, rubbish collection) and community organizations. These quality-of-life studies have addressed the subjective and behavioral aspects of urban living in addition to the objective conditions that motivate them (Marans & Stimson, 2011).

Several quality-of-life perception studies have been conducted (European Commission, 2013). These studies have assessed quality of services such as transportation, health care, educational facilities, sports facilities, cultural facilities, affordable housing, green spaces, noise, crime, and the effect of immigration. Some quality-of-life methods use longitudinal perception studies, amenity typologies and inventories, and access and barrier measures. Qualitative studies explore perception and emotional well-being using surveys, interviews, and scaled results measuring factors such as happiness, sadness, and stress. Quality-of-life measures have been associated with workplace productivity (Harter, Schmidt, & Keyes, 2003) and longevity, in which life expectancy is the relevant measure (Butler & Jasmin, 2000). Mercer's (2014) survey of quality of life is based on an analysis of local living conditions comprising 39 factors in 10 categories with scores used by multinational companies to calculate compensation packages for employees. Significantly, the core of the extensive research in quality of life fails to feature face-to-face or mediated communication opportunities and infrastructure as the focus of quality of life (European Commission, 2013).

The Urban Communication Audit

The Urban Communication Audit represents a methodology for the identification of a communicative city that emerges directly from communication scholarship. Developed by Leo Jeffres, the audit is based on the International Communication Association Communication Audit for "describing communication within organizations, mapping out the turf and providing a sample of measures" (Jeffres, 2008, p. 257). The Urban Communication Audit provides a technique to inventory communication patterns in a geographically identified community combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The approach uses both network and systems theory to explore the extent to which the communication network links people into a community social system.

Ten methods were identified for their ability to collect data on urban communication systems. Inventories of physical locations, formal and informal communicative opportunities, mass media inventories, communication diaries, content analysis of mediated messages, communication behaviors,

community displays, community and systematic observation of communicative behaviors and interactional patterns are all data collection tools to be used in interviews with influentials and/or surveys of residents who were asked to describe communicative patterns and community (Jeffres, 2008).

The Urban Communication Audit has been used to evaluate "third places" (a place other than work or home where people spend time) (Jeffres, Neuendorf, Jian, & Cooper, 2013. Urban sociologist Ray Oldenburg (1999) in *The Great Good Place: Cafes, Coffee Shops, Bookstores, Bars, Hair Salon*s, *and Other Hangouts at the Heart of a Community*, developed the concept of the third place, arguing that these places are essential to a community's social vitality. These are the spaces that are essential for community and functioning democracy; they provide a venue for public association and grassroots politics.

The Communicative City Process

The Urban Communication Foundation set up three meetings to define the communicative city concept and identify criteria and a systematic approach to be applied to identifying the communicative features of a city. The participants at meetings held in Washington, DC (2007), Paris (2007), and Rome (2008) were asked to define those qualities best describing the communicative city and those characteristics that disqualify the communicative nature of a specific urban setting. Then they were asked to develop principles or procedures of inquiry. The intent was to establish a list of criteria that constituted and defined the communicative city.

The method was modeled after the "structured dialogic design" (SDD) advanced by Aleco Christakis and designed for collaborative and systematic exploration and resolution of complex issues through discussion of diverse stakeholders. The design was selected, in part, for its usefulness in revealing to dialogue participants the emerging relationships of ideas. The process was later laid out in *Talking Point: Creating an Environment for Exploring Complex Meaning* by Thomas Flanagan and Aleco Christakis (2010). With the SDD method, facilitators encourage participants to identify all possible concerns and visions. The process works by developing triggering questions to advance the discovery process. Collaborative question framing leads to consensual answers but also creates depth of insight into "problems." The process:

> elicits ideas and points of view from all stakeholders . . . elicits and deals with the different priorities of stakeholder participants; equalizes power relations among the stakeholders; goes beyond identifying factors that are important, to specifying those that are most influential in achieving goals. (National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, 2008, para. 9)

Proponents of this approach argue that:

> Structured Dialogue fundamentally differs from many other methodologies that poll stakeholders to find out what problem they think is most important, or what action they deem most effective, but do not probe deeper, proceeding directly to prescribing action

plans. . . . These plans usually fail because they fail to identify the crucial leverage points. (National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, 2008, para. 10)

SDD is often planned as a series of iterative engagements, moving from definition through design to action. In the case of communicative cities, the definition of normative features and qualities of superior communication environments leads to the development of criteria and questionnaires for the nomination/application of candidate cities. The action stage was then developed with the plan for the rollout of the award program, schedule for jury appointment, acceptance of nominations/applications, jury site visits, deliberation, announcement, and decision. A special issue of *The International Communication Gazette* (Gumpert & Drucker, 2008a) was devoted to the results of these meetings.

Emerging Clusters for Measuring the Communicative City

Fifteen participants at each meeting—consisting of communication scholars, architects, environmentalists, lawyers, journalists, and environmental psychologists—were asked to come up with five characteristics to describe the communicative city. The responses were clustered into three primary categories:

1. Those activities that broadly constitute sites and opportunities for social interaction.
2. Those factors that constitute the urban infrastructure.
3. Those factors that are operationally political or civic in nature.

These clusters provided a framework of key constituent parts of a communicative city. What follows are the Paris, Rome, and Washington, DC, group responses combined. These responses tend to: (1) be normative in nature and (2) broadly apply to various dimensions of the urban environment, such as specific communities or areas, neighborhoods, and, at times, the city as a geographical entity (Gumpert & Drucker, 2008b). Thus, the participants interchanged *place(s)*, *space(s)*, *urban*, and *city*.

The distinction between place and space is particularly tricky, but Doreen Massey's (2001) articulation of the difference is helpful.

Places are spaces of social relations. . . . The crisscrossing of social relations, of broad historical shifts and the continually altering spatialities of the daily lives of individuals, makes up something of what a place means, of how it is contrasted as a place. (p. 41)

Places are thus created by communication opportunity.

The purpose of the Communicative City Award is to recognize places whose policies facilitate interaction among its citizens through public policies and private initiatives that enhance quality of life on various dimensions. In an ideal communicative city, the infrastructure maximizes interaction and engagement, and the climate for communication is characterized by civility, diversity, and freedom, with a minimum of official constraints and unwarranted surveillance.

Places of Interaction (Cluster 1)

Places of interaction are characterized by some combination of these constituent parts and stress proximity and immediacy of sociability and the opportunity to be involved with others. They provide sites and opportunities for social interaction, places to watch others, to be alone, that are walkable, places to communicate culture and heritage, spaces to play, places with numerous nodes of activity, accessible public spaces, places that welcome outsiders and visitors. The emphasis is on the relationship that the individual has with others. Mediated relationships are surprisingly secondary in the establishment of the criteria. The following are features of "places of interaction" identified by participants in the Urban Communication Foundation's Communicative City Award meetings.

A place to watch others
A place for human interaction
A place of variety
Places of mixed use and mixed age
A place to share experiences
A place that is safe
Places to be alone
A place to hide—allowing for some degree of anonymity
A place with access to media
A safe and secure place
A space to play
A place in which to experiment
A place under surveillance making it safe
A place that is walkable
A place of human scale
A place that is not too large
A place with a manageable soundscape
A place to encounter others
A place that has numerous nodes of activity
A place that provides the choice to participate or not participate
Places offering serendipity or surprise
Accessible public spaces
Accessible third places
Spaces in which to argue
Places of diversity
A place to get lost
A place to celebrate vice
A place to communicate culture and heritage
A place that welcomes outsiders and visitors

As a method, an inventory can be compiled or a questionnaire can be used. In the case of the Communicative City Award nominating process, the following questions were asked to determine the city's sites of interactions:

- Describe the specific reasons the city should be recognized as a communicative city, including appropriate sites of interaction and how they came to be (e.g., parks, public spaces, eating/drinking establishments, community centers).
- Does the city have policies and practices for interaction between administrators and citizens?
- Does the city provide the environment that invites its citizens to social interaction?
- What are your community's two most pressing challenges or weaknesses with regard to communication?

Infrastructure (Cluster 2)

The infrastructure of a city shapes and is shaped by the need for communication. The original infrastructure of cities was the physical environment: paths, roads, streets, marketplaces, meeting places, and city walls (Gumpert & Drucker, 2008b). The communication infrastructure has a physical and nonphysical character, with economic, public policy, and legal dimensions serving as critical parts. The characteristics of infrastructure articulated by participants in the Urban Communication Foundation's Communicative City Award meetings included:

A place of press freedom
A place where individuals have access to local media
Access to communication technologies across the city
Network connection availability
Cheap connectivity
Municipal broadband
Public transportation
Good roads
Hospitable to pedestrians
Eco-friendliness
Availability of information and communication technology
ICT training services for citizens
Established multimedia information systems providing public information on government and health
Good signage
Logical layout of streets
Sidewalks
Multiple public spaces
Free speech rights and zones
Emergency services
Security and police protection
Communications infrastructure in cases of physical disaster

A place that has symbolic identity
A place with a defined image
Institutionalized public art
Cultural displays
An affordable place

The infrastructure responses required prompting, because the communication implications—for example, of highways, sidewalks, access to electrical power—were not always clear to the respondents.

To address these criteria an inventory can be compiled or a questionnaire used. In the case of the Communicative City Award nominating process, the following questions were asked to ascertain the communicative infrastructure:

- What are the primary physical and nonphysical amenities and policies that provide the public communication opportunities?
- What are the regulations and policies associated with media access?
- What are the regulations and policies associated with communicative freedoms?

Politics/Civil Society (Cluster 3)

Politics and civil society are associated with the relationship of citizens to government and power, including participation in planning and policymaking; opportunities for collaboration; and public participation, which includes involvement of diverse segments and (ethnic, racial, socioeconomic, age, etc.) perspectives and support for both public celebrations and protests. Also included are commemorations of city history, transparency in government, and online access to public services.

Circumscribed communities require governance and regulation. They are, therefore, by definition, places that facilitate communication of a political nature (e.g., involving the relationship of citizens to government or the state as well as social relationships involving authority or power in society, civic engagement, and participation in planning and policy making). The characteristics of identified included:

Places to demonstrate
A place that commemorates its history
Sites communicating city history—monuments/memorials
A place that enhances identity and identification
Cooperative involvement of citizens
A place that encourages civil engagement
A place with open government information policies
Transparency
Governmental bodies
Local democracy
ICT citizen power and involvement
Representation of all cultural groups in city government

Multiple public dialogue spaces
Public programs for city to address the communicative needs of communities
A place providing administrative services online
A place that encourages pride of place and identity
No major communities excluded in having a voice
Wide range of opportunities to engage
Policies favoring heterogeneity and diversity
Multicultural activities
Diversity in media landscape
A place with a mechanism for creative problem solving
Strong civil society
Civic cultural places to gather
Allowing for the self-organization of places
Decentralization of the means of communication
Educational programs for communication skills

Disqualifications (Cluster 4)

After lengthy discussion, the participants in the Communicative City Award meetings determined the criteria that would disqualify a city.

Corruption
Censorship and repression of speech
Rules and laws against gathering
A homogeneous population
A dangerous city
A city whose citizens don't feel they have a stake in its improvement
Digital panopticon
Total control/surveillance
A segregated city (elderly segregated from young; rich segregated from poor; segregation based on ethnic, racial, or religious grounds, etc.)
Gated and divided parallel communities
Nonvibrant places and dead spaces
Isolated communities
Low density
Poor communication infrastructure
Lack of places for people to gather to celebrate or protest
Mandatory language requirements

The above criteria can be applied by either compiling an inventory or asking for a response to the following prompts:

- Describe projects/initiatives that have significantly improved the public's access to information, that have afforded public involvement in planning and policy making, and have supported public involvement in celebrations and tolerance of protests.

- Describe how the employment of resources (public or private) has enhanced opportunities for communication within the community, including support for media, use of communication technologies such as WiFi and websites, and support for public forums and centers of interaction.

Significantly, constituent terms representing the communicative city relate to communicative freedoms—for example, accessible public spaces, spaces to argue, places for human interaction, free speech rights and zones, press freedom, civic and cultural places to gather, and government transparency (Drucker & Gumpert, 2010). The focus of disqualifications is rooted in the right to communicate: Key criteria disqualifying a city directly relate to violations of the rights of free speech, press, and privacy. Disqualifications such as censorship and repression of speech, rules and laws against gathering, excessive government surveillance, a digital panopticon, and lack of privacy demonstrate the normative position that expressive freedoms are fundamental to a communicative city (Drucker & Gumpert, 2010).

Summary of Criteria

Using these criteria as a qualitative method, communicative qualities could be identified. In the spirit of applying this method, the Urban Communication Foundation introduced the Communicative City Award to recognize places whose policies facilitate interaction among its citizens through public policies and private initiatives that enhance the quality of life on various dimensions.

To qualify as a communicative city a nominee/applicant has to demonstrate the creative use of resources to enhance communication opportunities. Evidence of specific achievements, initiatives, and projects that demonstrate recognition of the significance of human interaction; public communication; and information, mass media, and communication technologies is required.

Each applicant/nominee is asked to answer the following questions:

- What is your city's vision for communication opportunities, policies, and practices?
- What government agencies are engaged?
- What public–private initiatives or nonprofit organizations are involved?
- Does future city planning address communication?
- What future plans does the city have for its communicative development?
- What examples are there of how your city has demonstrated its efforts to address the communication needs of its citizens?

Awarded Cities

The Urban Communication Foundation assembled a five-member multidisciplinary jury to evaluate the city's initiatives with regard to criteria of communicative cities. Each jury included

communication/media scholars, legal scholars, architects, environmental psychologists, and urban journalists/architectural critics. The first award was given to Chicago in 2012 and the second to Amsterdam in 2014.

The 2014 winner, Amsterdam, illustrates the jury's application of several key criteria. Criteria in Cluster 1, Places of Interaction, were clearly identified. Specifically, accessible public spaces, accessible third places, places for encounters with others, places to watch others, and a manageable soundscape were documented. Amsterdam has a major central square (the Dam), 21 markets, 30 parks (ranging from several small ones to the large Vondelpark), and 1,500 restaurants, cafés, and bars.

Specific initiatives to encourage interaction included Amsterdam World Jazz City 2014. According to Cees Hamelink, chairman of Amsterdam World Jazz City 2014, there was "the underlying communicative goal of connecting all people through the universal language of Jazz music" (C. Hamelink, personal communication, Oct. 14, 2015). The program organizers explicitly recognized the relationship of city and this music, noting that jazz brings strangers together (Amsterdam World Jazz City, 2013). The United Nations and UNESCO recognized the significant communicative functions of jazz that can reduce "tensions between individuals, groups, and communities," stimulate "intercultural dialogue," and serve as a "a vector of freedom of expression," able to "break down barriers and create . . . opportunities for mutual understanding and tolerance" (United Nations, 2015, para. 1).

The second criteria cluster, infrastructure, was satisfied through diverse smart city innovations. Amsterdam was an early innovator in the digital cities/smart cities movement. The infrastructure is owned by public operating companies. It is among the cities most frequently quoted as examples for the successful implementation of municipal wireless networks, with initiatives dating to 2006. A municipal fiber-optic network is provided. There has been public–private cooperation between the municipality, entrepreneurs, Amsterdam Smart City, and KPN (the leading telecommunications and IT service provider in The Netherlands).

An open information infrastructure is evidenced by the availability of information and communication from the municipal government. The legal infrastructure promotes press freedoms. Mayor Van der Laan has said, "We are an open and democratic society. Freedom is what counts" (quoted in Newmark, 2015, para. 2).

Architecturally, Amsterdam has been at the forefront of a movement to explore the communicative and artistic potential of large urban screens. Integrated into city parks, pedestrian malls, town squares, shopping malls, and mixed-use retail/living spaces are displays specifically dedicated for such noncommercial purposes as art, education, and entertainment.

Cluster 3 features institutions supportive of political engagement and civil society. Among the criteria are diversity in the communication landscape, transparency, and access to government information. The jury was impressed by Amsterdam's Open Data program. The municipality of Amsterdam experiments with crowdsourcing on the platform www.AmsterdamOpent.nl to learn how interaction with civilians can support local policies (Amsterdam Smart City, 2014).

Amsterdam is ethnically diverse. Forty-five percent of the city's population is composed of ethnic minorities. Reaction to this ethnic diversity is evidenced by policies favoring heterogeneity and diversity. The municipality has established five advisory bodies to assist it in its migrants policy. The criteria of "representation of all cultural groups in city government" was found to be satisfied by the policy requiring civil service positions in the city to reflect the ethnic population of the city. The municipality goes beyond Dutch constitutional mandates on antidiscrimination, forming funding programs to prevent the formation of ghettos in boroughs (World Population Review, 2014).

A place with a mechanism for creative problem solving is another criteria evidenced by participatory urban planning emphasizing interaction and storytelling in the process. The criterion of being a place commemorating and communicating city history was evidenced by the 7,000 officially recognized historical buildings and monuments. Landmark preservation laws restrict the height and scale of new buildings, protecting the distinctive historic core of the cityscape.

The award winners received recognition and the right to display the trademarked "Communicative City" title, and they benefited from the communication research–based recommendations provided by selected communication perspectives and scholarship. The foundation provides a small research team to work with the city, which is asked to identify problems and concerns. The Urban Communication Foundation dispatches a research team to work with municipal and community leaders to provide research-based recommendations. Using diverse communication research methods, the team will focus on prescriptive work, suggesting remedial measures and best practices for enhanced communication-based articulated criteria from the communicative city method.

Conclusion

The 21st century is an urban century. The shift toward urban growth is well documented. One in every 10 people lived in urban areas a century ago. The year 2007 marked the first time that more than half of world's population was urban, a figure that reached 54% in 2014 (United Nations, 2014). By 2050, the United Nations projects that figure will reach almost 75%. According to the *UN World Urbanization Prospects Cities Report*, this growth is global, with all regions "expected to urbanize further over the coming decades. Africa and Asia are urbanizing faster than the other regions" (United Nations, 2014, p. 1). The UN report further notes that "close to half of the world's urban dwellers reside in relatively small settlements of less than 500,000 inhabitants, while only around one in eight live in the 28 mega-cities with more than 10 million inhabitants" (p. 1). The report underscores the diversity of urban environments. Many cities are shantytowns rather than icons of modernity. This rapid urbanization, fueled by both international and internal migration, is unprecedented and frequently unplanned. Urbanization always brings with it economic, environmental, and social consequences, so the urban agenda is a high priority at the United Nations. Cities have always been important, but the significance of *this* historic shift cannot be overstated.

According to Cees Hamelink (2008):

The notion of the communicative city is the embodiment of a fundamental human right.

It represents the entitlement to an urban environment where architectural, spatial, psychological, topological and time-related conditions invite people to impart, seek, receive and exchange information, ideas and opinions, to listen to each other and learn from each other in an ambiance where their autonomy, security and freedom is optimally guaranteed. (p. 298).

Cities communicate, and cities are environments *of* communication. The implementation of best practices, policies, and initiatives supporting and improving effective communication, and thereby building community, can enrich this urban century. Awards can be used to recognize, appreciate, and thank, but perhaps more significantly, to motivate, inspire, encourage, reinforce, and nurture. It is the goal of enhancing the urban communication environment that is at the heart of the communicative city initiative.

References

Amsterdam Jazz. (2015). Retrieved from http://www.amsterdamjazz.org/Home

Amsterdam Smart City. (2014). Retrieved from
        http://amsterdamsmartcity.com/projects/detail/id/36/slug/amsterdamopent.nl

Amsterdam World Jazz City 2014 aims to transform the city. (2013, October 1). Retrieved from
        http://www.amsterdamapartments.com/explore-amsterdam/culture/amsterdam-world-jazz-city-
        2014-aims-to-transform-the-city

Bergman, T. (2013). *Exhibiting patriotism: Creating and contesting interpretations of American historic
        sites*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Burd, G., Drucker, S., & Gumpert, G. (Eds.). (2007). *The urban communication reader* (Vol. 1). Cresskill,
        NJ: Hampton Press.

Butler, R. N., & Jasmin, C. (Eds.). (2000). *Longevity and quality of life: Opportunities and challenges*. New
        York, NY: Springer Science and Business Media.

Cuomo, M. M. (1984, July 16). *1984 Democratic national convention keynote address.* Retrieved from
        http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/mariocuomo1984dnc.htm

Dill, K. (2015, January 16). The happiest and unhappiest cities to work in right now. *Forbes.* Retrieved
        from http://www.forbes.com/sites/kathryndill/2015/01/16/the-happiest-and-unhappiest-places-
        to-work

Drucker, S., & Gumpert, G. (2008). Book review essay—Urban communication: The blind men and the
        elephant. *International Journal of Communication, 2*, 8–20. Retrieved from
        http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/294/149

Drucker, S., & Gumpert, G. (2010). Freedom of expression in communicative cities. *Free Speech Yearbook*, *44*, 65–84.

European Commission. (2013). *Quality of life in cities: Perception survey in 79 European cities 2013.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/urban/survey2013_en.pdf

European Commission. (2015a). *Access City Award 2015.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/award/index_en.htm

European Commission. (2015b). *European Commission launches 5th Access City Award competition.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/events/access-city-award-2015/files/press_release_aca_2015_en.pdf

Flanagan, T., & Christakis, A. (2010). *Talking point: Creating an environment for exploring complex meaning.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Fotsch, P. M (2007). *Watching the traffic go by: Transportation and isolation in urban America*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Georgiou, M. (2013). *Media and the city: Cosmopolitanism and difference.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Gibson, T. A., & Lowes, M. D. (2007). *Urban communication: Production, text, context*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Globe Award. (2015). *Sustainable city award.* Retrieved from http://globeaward.org/sustainable_city.html

Gumpert, G., & Drucker, S. (Eds.). (2008a). Special issue: Communicative cities. *International Communication Gazette*, *70*(3–4).

Gumpert, G., & Drucker, S. (2008b). Communicative cities. *International Communication Gazette*, *70*(3–4), 195–208.

Hamelink, C. (2008). Urban conflict and communication. *International Communication Gazette, 70*(3–4), 291–301.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, C. L. (2003). Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: A review of the Gallup studies. In C. L. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: The positive person and the good life* (pp. 205–224). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved from http://www.nhsemployers.org/~/media/Employers/Documents/Retain%20and%20improve/Harter%20et%20al%202002%20WellbeingReview.pdf

International Making Cities Livable. (2014). *IMLC awards.* Retrieved from
       http://www.livablecities.org./imcl-awards

Jassem, H., Drucker, S., & Burd, G. (Eds.). (2010). *The urban communication reader* (Vol. 2). Cresskill,
       NJ: Hampton Press.

Jovanovic, S. (2012). *Democracy, dialogue, and community action: Truth and reconciliation in
       Greensboro*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press.

Jeffres, L. (2008). An urban communication audit measuring aspects of a "communicative city."
       International Communication Gazette, *70*(3–4), 257–274.

Jeffres, L., Neuendorf, K. Jian, G., & Cooper, K. S. (2013). Auditing communication systems to help urban
       policy makers. In M. D. Matsaganis, V. J. Gallagher, & S. J. Drucker (Eds.), *Communicative cities
       in the 21st century: The urban communication reader* (Vol. 3, pp. 99–136)*.* New York, NY: Peter
       Lang.

Macek, S. (2006). *Urban nightmares: The media, the right, and the moral panic over the city*. Minneapolis,
       MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Makagon, D. (2004). *Where the ball drops: Days and nights in Times Square*. Minneapolis, MN: University
       of Minnesota Press.

Marans, R. W., & Stimson, R. J. (2011). An overview of quality of urban life. In R. W. Marans & R. J.
       Stimson (Eds.), *Investigating quality of urban life* (pp. 1–32). New York, NY: Springer Science
       and Business Media.

Massey, D. (2001). Living in Whithenshaw. In I. Borden, J. Kerr, J. Rendell, & A. Pivaro (Eds.), *The
       unknown city* (pp. 459–473). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Matsaganis, M. D., Gallagher, V. J., & Drucker, S. J. (Eds.). (2013). *Communicative cities in the 21st
       century: The urban communication reader* (Vol. 3)*.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Mayer, H., & Knox, P. (2009). Pace of life and quality of life: The slow city charter. In M. J. Sirgy, R.
       Phillips, & D. Rahtz (Eds.), *Community quality-of-life indicators: Best cases* (Vol. 3, pp. 20–39).
       Heidelberg, Germany: Springer Science and Business.

McQuire, S. (2008). *The media city: Media, architecture and urban space*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE
       Publications.

Mercer. (2014, February 19). *2014 quality of living worldwide city rankings—Mercer survey*. Retrieved
       from http://www.mercer.com/newsroom/2014-quality-of-living-survey.html

Metropolis: World Association of the Major Metropolises. (2015a). *About us.* Retrieved from
        http://www.metropolis.org/about-us

Metropolis: World Association of the Major Metropolises. (2015b). *Metropolis awards*. Retrieved from
        http://www.metropolis.org/awards

Monocle. (2013). *Monocle's quality of life survey 2013*. Retrieved from
        http://monocle.com/film/affairs/quality-of-life-survey-2013/

National Civic League. (2014). *All-American City Award process.* Retrieved from
        http://www.nationalcivicleague.org/?page_id=5671

National Coalition of Dialogue and Deliberation. (2008). *Structured dialogic design (SDD).* Retrieved from
        http://ncdd.org/rc/item/2884

National League of Cities. (2015). *City showcase.* Retrieved from http://www.nlc.org/build-skills-and-
        networks/resources/city-showcase

Newmark, Z. (2015, January 10). Interview with Amsterdam mayor on freedom. *NL Times.* Retrieved from
        http://www.nltimes.nl/2015/01/10/video-interview-amsterdam-mayor-freedom-security/

Numbeo. (2015). *Quality of life index 2015.* Retrieved from http://www.numbeo.com/quality-of-
        life/rankings.jsp

Oldenburg, R. (1999). *The great good place: cafés, coffee shops, bookstores, bars, hair salons, and other
        hangouts at the heart of a community*. Boston, MA: Da Capo Press.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2014). *OECD better life index 2014.* Retrieved
        from http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org

Pezzullo, P. (2009). *Toxic tourism: Rhetorics of pollution, travel, and environmental justice*.
        Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Project for Public Spaces. (2014a). *Great public spaces.* Retrieved from http://www.pps.org/places

Project for Public Spaces*.* (2014b). *Our approach.* Retrieved from http://www.pps.org/about

Project for Public Spaces. (2015). *What makes a successful place?* Retrieved from
        http://www.pps.org/reference/grplacefeat

The Pursuit of Happiness. (2014). *How do you measure happiness? The top questionnaires.* Retrieved from
        http://www.pursuitof-happiness.org/science-of-happiness/measuring-happiness

Shakespeare, W. *The Tragedy of Coriolanus*, Act 3, Scene 1. Retrieved from
        http://shakespeare.mit.edu/coriolanus/coriolanus.3.1.html

Shiel, M. (2012). *Hollywood cinema and the real Los Angeles.* Clerkenwell, UK: Reaktion Books.

Slow Movement. (2015). *Slow cites and the slow movement.* Retrieved from
        http://www.slowmovement.com/slow_cities.php

Smith, J. (2014, January 10). The happiest and unhappiest cities to work in right now. *Forbes*. Retrieved
        from http://www.forbes.com/sites/jacquelynsmith/2014/01/10/the-happiest-and-unhappiest-
        cities-to-work-in-right-now-2014/

Smith, P. D. (2012). *City: A guidebook for the urban age*. London, UK: A&C Black.

United Nations. (2014). *World urbanization prospects*. Retrieved from
        http://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/Highlights/WUP2014-Highlights.pdf

United Nations. (2015). *International Jazz Day: Why International Jazz Day?* Retrieved from
        http://www.un.org/en/events/jazzday

United States Conference of Mayors. (2014). *35th annual city livability awards.* Retrieved from
        http://usmayors.org/citylivabilityawards/documents/2014Brochure.pdf

Urban Communication Foundation. (2014). *The Jane Jacobs Urban Communication Book Award.* Retrieved
        from http://urbancomm.org/grants-awards/jane-jacobs-urban-communication-book-award

Urban Land Institute. (2015). *Urban open space award.* Retrieved from http://uli.org/programs/awards-
        competitions/urban-open-space-award/

Whyte, W. H. (1980). *The social life of small urban spaces*. Washington, DC: Conservation Foundation.

Wood, A. (2009). *City ubiquitous: Place, communication, and the rise of omnitopia.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton
        Press.

Woollaston, V. (2014, October 1). What's it like to grow old in your country? Global index ranks the world
        based on quality of life for the over-60s. *Daily Mail*. Retrieved from
        http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2776444/What-s-like-grow-old-YOUR-country-
        Global-index-ranks-world-based-quality-life-60s.html#ixzz3PHNXopX9

World Population Review. (2014). *Amsterdam population 2014.* Retrieved from
        http://worldpopulationreview.com/world-cities/amsterdam-population