25
Barcelona Societat
Journal on social knowledge and analysis

Ajuntament de Barcelona

March 2020

Keywords: transformative participation, active ageing, political agendas, co-research in urban spaces

Ageing and pathways to participation in the urban era: do we need to promote new landscapes?

Mercè Pérez Salanova
Doctor of Psychology. Institute of Government and Public Policy (IGOP). Autonomous University of Barcelona.

This article first presents the concept of participation, offering, on the one hand, the perspective of older people in their own words and, on the other, that corresponding to the political frameworks. For this purpose, the idea of "active ageing" developed by the WHO is presented as a frame of reference while introducing the international context in which it arises. The analysis of several basic principles and reflection on their application highlight the distance between the participation coordinates formulated in the proposal and their implementation. Subsequently, the contributions provided by the perspective of friendliness are analysed, as well as its contribution in a context of the increasing importance of cities, the urban era. Finally, different considerations and criteria, both theoretical and practical, are presented to move forward on participation.

Introduction

From the activity theory formulated in the mid-twentieth century to the co-research approaches (Walker, 2007), the participation of older people has continually featured in the gerontological sphere and policies targeted at older people as well as in everyday comments on ageing. It is a notion usually linked to the idea of ageing well.

In this article, we approach the concept of participation by exploring the perspective of older people through their own words, on the one hand, and that of the policy frameworks on the other. First, by taking as a reference framework the idea of "active ageing" proposed by the WHO and putting that in the international context from which it comes, and then the "friendliness" perspective. Studying both these formulations helps us to understand the meaning of their contributions, as well as how they differ with regard to participation. To conclude, I put forward a series of considerations and criteria of a theoretical and practical nature in order to promote new participation strategies.

What meanings does participation conjure up for older people?

To offer an insight into the perspective of older people, I will show the results of a broad, qualitative study that presents their views on participation, interlinked with experiences and everyday lives (Raymond, Sevigny y Tourigny, 2012)[1]. An analysis of older people's lives enables us to trace the following six lines of meaning behind social participation:

1. The research carried out in Quebec involved thirteen discussion groups in which over 100 participants were consulted, mainly older people and also frontline professionals who work with or for older people.

1. Seeing the world, being in the world and developing meaningful relationships. In this vision, what people stress is not the type of activity they do or its content but the fact that the activities are an opportunity to develop social relations. These relations are the common denominator they highlight. In some cases they emphasise the possibility of not being alone, of doing something together with other people. In others, on the other hand, the key is the quality of the relationship, the warmth of the contact, the affection. The connection with other people is presented as a strategy for combating isolation.

2. Enjoying pleasant, sociable activities in a group; taking part in leisure activities valued because everyone can choose, and appreciated for their role as a form of diversion. Taking part in activities offers a stimulus to get out of the house, be it the domestic space or a home. It offers opportunities for socialisation and establishing positive relationships, as well as enabling people to discover interests they share or to feel that they are keeping in shape.

3. Being involved in a collective project. The collective dimension refers to both the context in which the project takes place and its content. Thus, in their explanations, people mention the settings they participate in and also the different types of project in which the group involved come together. More than the scope of the project, they value the fact that the way it is set up and the context in which it takes place enable everyone to contribute. In other words, they value the possibility of doing things together as well as that of recognising diversity. Likewise, they stress that contributions should be on a tangible level with the possibility of varied contributions in a process with identifiable results and impacts.

4. Helping others as well as mutual help. Doing something for others makes people feel better in their everyday life. Often this is for vulnerable people, but not only vulnerable people, because young people are a group mentioned as recipients. The image of helping other older people is conceived as help between peers or an expression of solidarity, especially when it concerns people who are isolated or whose vulnerability impacts on the invisibility of their needs. This is a vision of social participation which makes clear the skills required: relationship skills such as a welcoming attitude and a willingness to listen to the other person; caring skills to sustain help, express affection and build a link of trust with the person being helped.

5. Transmitting knowledge. Here knowledge developed throughout a person's life merges with the expression of generativity, in other words, contributions that help or can serve to guide the following generations. This kind of transmission is possible in various spheres of activity and in different environments, social activities, volunteering and also in the family circle. In that type of participation, personal experiences serve the well-being of the immediate circle or the community. When older people conceive participation in that way, they often pose it as a demand for redefining the social role of older people. A demand they sustain by noting that knowledge transmission in any environment can contribute to reaffirming the ties between social groups, between different ways of living and thinking. For example, older people with motor or sensory disabilities point out that this kind of participation constitutes an opportunity to transmit (to their peers as well as young people with a disability) "the little tricks" they have developed over the years for dealing with the challenge of social integration.

6 .Increasing the power to take decisions on matters that concern them. In this definition, participation is posed as a feature of mediation between people and the collective or political dimensions of life in society, This requires a space where everyone is listened to and all opinions serve to define collective choices. Participation linked to decisions is conceived as a way of tackling the social or political marginalisation of older people. The practices mentioned are to be found in both the local and national spheres, as well as within the framework of public and community organisations.

If we observe the whole set of meanings, we can see they revolve around three dimensions: relationships, contributions and the impact on policies. The centre of that triangle is where the "doing", the activities, lie. We can also see the density varies between the three elements, with the

first two having a greater presence than the third. Likewise, the range of meanings leads us to think in terms of a non-explicit position, that of older people as users of services that are both specific and common to other age groups.

How is participation shaped? An introduction to the international agendas and gerontologicial frameworks

A recent review of publications that deal with the civic participation of older people covering a broad period (1963-2017) shows the growth in the number of such publications from the end of the 1990s and especially since 2006 (Serrat, Scharf, Villar and Gómez, 2019). Of course, the amount of research published is only a sample in relation to what happens in everyday life. However, in this case, besides offering us a sign, it also leads us to explore this period. Are they arbitrary dates? To my way of thinking, taking a closer look at this period of growth in research is a useful way of examining how participation in the field of ageing has taken shape. Below, I will outline a non-exhaustive series of initiatives in gerontological policies with an international scope whose evolution from the mid-1990s to the first decade of the 21st century enables us to see how participation has taken shape.

The European Commission declared 1993 to be the European Year of Older People and Solidarity between Generations, while the United Nations declared 1999 the International Year of Older People. In 2002, the WHO presented its proposal on active ageing at the Second World Assembly on Ageing, which subsequently approved the International Action Plan. Five years later, within the framework of the 2007 International Day of Older Persons, the WHO presented its Age Friendly Cities project. Let us look at some features of those initiatives.

The European Year in 1993 was celebrated with a wide range of initiatives, in many cases highly visible ones. A number of characteristics are worth highlighting. These initiatives often involved both actors on the ground and organisations with a broader scope. Information about projects on different scales was widely circulated between states, inside countries and between cities. Financial help from the Commission encouraged the creation of networks involving projects from different countries to foster the exchange of concepts and practices. The issue of participation, as a both a central and a complementary feature, grew, along with its visibility. By way of example, we have Red Salmon (named thus because salmon is a fish that swims against the current), which brings together promoters of small living units as an alternative to residential centres in various European countries. These are experiences that take a variety of forms promoted by developers with diverse statuses too. In that network, we can identify the seed of the “person-centred care” approach and innovative concepts in the care of people with Alzheimer’s (Guisset, 2008). The European call framework also put the intergenerational solidarity perspective at the forefront, leading to a growth in projects organised around participation. In Spain, during that period, both during the preparations for European Year and subsequently, there was a boom in initiatives of all kinds, among others, calls for support for projects, seminars and training courses that included participation. This contributed to broadening and diversifying the actors and spreading new ageing frameworks. In this regard, we should point out the rise and expansion of gerontological plans which, despite having no direct relationship with the European call, were indirectly stimulated by it. All the plans, from the state-wide one to those promoted by Spain’s autonomous regions as well as some cities (Barcelona for example), make the participation of older persons a central issue.

An important line can also be traced on the United Nations’ agenda in that period. In 1990, the UN General Assembly established 1 October as the International Day of Older Persons. The following year, the General Assembly adopted the UN Principles for Older Persons covering independence, social participation, personal realisation and dignity. And in 1992, it proclaimed 1999 as International Year of Older Persons.

The central feature of the route promoted by the United Nations was to hold the Second World Assembly on Ageing in Madrid. The Assembly adopted the International Action Plan, which revolved around three priorities: older people and development, fostering health and well-being in old age, and creating a favourable and conducive environment. Two aspects are worth

highlighting. First, the Plan was put forward as the basis for policies formulated by governments, NGOs and other interested parties, policies that change the way societies perceive their older citizens, relate to them and care for them. The second aspect is that, for the first time, governments accepted the need to link questions of ageing to other social, economic and human rights' frameworks, in particular those agreed on by the UN conferences and summits held in the last decade. The aim is to change attitudes, policies and practices in order to take advantage of the enormous potential offered by older people in the 21st century.

The active ageing model, proposed by the World Health Organisation at the 2002 Assembly, is the most visible expression of that aim. The document "Active Ageing: A Policy Framework" (WHO, 2002), which followed a review of the programmes devoted to healthy ageing from the mid-1990s and various lines of consultation and debate, has had a big impact on planning and practices over the last two decades, which justifies a closer look at some of its main characteristics.

Active ageing: a policy framework for action

As its title indicates, the formulation presented by the WHO in 2002 is defined in terms of a political framework. In other words, it was not proposed as a conceptual model of ageing as was the case with other formulations, such as those relating to "ageing with success" or "productive ageing". Although it is true that all of them share the characteristic of putting forward proposals for adapting to ageing, the WHO's approach pays more attention to policies than the individual perspective. Active ageing is defined as the process of optimising opportunities for health, participation and security in order to enhance quality of life as people age[2].

With regard to participation, the core component is recognising older people as contributors and recipients of development, postulated as the alternative to the stereotypes of passivity and a burden. An analysis of the document clearly shows that this position revolves around five key elements: the notion of "activity", the life-cycle perspective, the planning approach, the concept of disability and the multisectoral approach (Pérez Salanova, 2016b). Below, I will briefly describe those elements with some critical reflections on their application.

The meaning of the notion "activity"

Active ageing comprises all the important activities for the well-being of the person, their family, the community and society. *Activity* means being involved in family, social, cultural and civic matters. Consequently, from the perspective formulated by the WHO, it is a mistake to restrict that notion to the sphere of employability or productivity. The malleability of the notion "activity" is one of the traits that sustains, to a large extent, the trivialisation of what has been, and is, the object of the model proposed by the WHO. That trivialisation is probably linked to the common use of the term, a use that has undoubtedly facilitated its dissemination and contributed to its popularisation. However, that explanation should not prevent us from reflecting on the widespread use of the notion of "active ageing", which is abused in my view, by institutional, public and private players, and the effects that stem from such use.

The life-cycle perspective

By incorporating the life course, the active ageing model highlights the importance of the opportunities presented and the decisions taken throughout life in terms of their influence on living conditions throughout old age. In this sense, the life cycle is shaped by a preventive side spanning the different stages of life and which therefore affects all age groups. At the same time, the life cycle has another side, that of interaction and solidarity between the different generations in each period.

2. In 2015, the International Longevity Centre in Brazil, directed by Alex Kalache, published *Envejecimiento activo: un marco político ante la revolución de la longevidad* [Active Ageing: a policy framework for the ageing revolution] with the aim of updating the document published by the WHO in 2002.

The planning approach

This model proposes a planning approach where older people, and their carers, are involved in planning, monitoring and assessing policies and programmes. The guiding principle is the concept of older people as actors with social rights and duties. Consequently, planning with this approach requires overcoming a model based on the passive position of older people and standardised needs. Likewise, it requires a transformation of the relationship and interaction between planning managers and ordinary citizens and, accordingly, calls for the adoption of new methods and alternative procedures to those applied following the technocratic model. In practice we can see two phenomena: the approach adopted is not usually mentioned either in the “active ageing” projects or activities, and it is not uncommon for participation initiatives to be launched where older people are invited to express their opinion on matters that concern them without clarifying how those contributions will be studied or without offering accessible ways of monitoring the issues raised. In other words, an invitation to take part in transparent participation mechanisms.

The concept of disability

The active ageing paradigm encompasses all older people. It does not exclude people with functional limitations. Older people who need care or help in their everyday life are also subjects who can get involved, that is, be active in various ways and to different degrees. Here, two questions that need tackling are stressed, namely, how the disability process is constructed and how older people are perceived when they live in situations of dependency. Consequently, developing active ageing plans entails incorporating multidimensionality to the process and recognising the strengths of older people at different stages of their ageing, as well as when they need ongoing care and help.

At this point it is worth underlining that providing more care for people in fragile or dependent situations increases the risk of taking away their self-management. Applying the disability approach advocated implies changes at both the service design level (guidance and prevention, evaluation and care services) and at a relationship level (between professionals and older people). In practice, we can see that people in dependent situations are not regarded as recipients of active ageing programmes or activities, nor are they recognised as persons to be invited to take part in organising or operating participation mechanisms. Consequently, that exclusion leads to their invisibility.

The multisectoral approach

The active ageing paradigm brings with it an expansion of the sectors involved in policies targeted at older people. While the importance of social services and the health sector is recognised, the essential contribution of other sectors such as housing, transport, security, the economy, urban planning, justice, education and technology is emphasised.

Expanding the sectors is consistent with a global approach which calls for societies to adapt to ageing. Making headway in a multisectoral direction is only feasible if a mainstreaming logic is developed. Once again, when we look closely at what happens in practice, what we find most of all is occasional interventions of a preventive or facilitating nature, presented as active ageing actions organised by each sector.

To sum up, we can conclude that the widespread dissemination of the notion of “active ageing” and widespread reference to the WHO paradigm in many environments (plans and activities, conferences and meetings, reports and popular texts) offers a mixed picture. It has certainly introduced new views on ageing and key elements, including the five key points outlined. In practice, however, the simplification, trivialisation or abandonment of one of its key principles, or a lack of precision in using others, weaken the potential of those formulations. The absence of application strategies aimed at guiding and supporting their application was identified as the main cause of that weakness. The Age-friendly Cities project (WHO, 2007) that we will look at next takes up that diagnosis.

The friendliness perspective and the urban era

The Age-friendly Cities and Communities project, publicly presented in 2007, stems from two phenomena: demographic ageing and the population increase, and the importance of cities. With its formulation, it puts urban policy at the forefront and, in doing so, goes beyond the conventional framework of old-age policies, redefines the position of older people in exercising their citizenship and introduces new coordinates for participation (Pérez Salanova, 2016b). The proposal, made public after a period of pilot experiences in various countries, was accompanied by documents designed to facilitate its application. If we examine the idea of age-friendliness and relate it to the perspective formulated by older people presented at the start of this article, we see that the three dimensions of relations, contributions and impact are incorporated and that now the density of the components is similar. In other words, participation in terms of incidence is stronger.

Below, I will outline some elements of the "friendliness" perspective that I consider to be of special interest due to the possibilities they offer with regard to the cities-ageing-participation triangle. The key elements set out within the active ageing framework are certainly reflected in the three but that content is not enough to account for the substantive and operative concept of the Age-friendly Cities project. Consequently, in my view, the friendliness perspective should be seen as a specific framework linked to the so-called urban era, " a time when cities play a central role, as spaces that produce and reflect the main dynamics of the first decades of the 21st century" (Blanco, Gomà and Subirats, 2018:15).

The first element relates to the centrality of everyday environments. Talking of friendliness means we are on the ground, both at the stage when living conditions are diagnosed, at the design and start-up stages and also when it comes to evaluating the actions on the different levels of the environment; physical, built, social and digital. Placing everyday life on all those levels enables opportunities to emerge for interaction and recognition that are associated with proximity and heterogeneity, typical of old age.

The second element is the participation of older people. This component is present in all the stages mentioned above, although the application guides only go into detail on the tasks relating to diagnosing friendliness. The friendliness perspective constitutes a seed for promoting new participation models in terms of formats and dynamics. For example, workshop-type experiences help to shape more inclusive participation dynamics, where people with no experience of participation spaces feel comfortable about intervening and being recognised.

The link between the two elements mentioned, everyday environments and participation, points to a concept for rethinking cities and ageing by taking into account life cycles and not just age groups. In the same way, it allows new strategies to be developed for involving older people throughout the different stages of ageing which, let's remember, is the first of the five key principles of active ageing. For example, incorporating the "territory" vector acts as a lever for developing new participation routes where links can be created between people regardless of their age, thus adding a cross-generational element and encouraging new social relation networks, essential for tackling unwanted loneliness. That requires versatile methodological instruments capable of taking root in different contexts. The social action groups of the "Siempre Acompañados" programme are an example of how to organise responses from the community by creating cooperation frameworks (Yanguas *et al.*, 2018). The "territory" vector's leverage function is reflected in various actions in the city of Barcelona. In the area of loneliness, the Radars project, which is analysed in this journal, is an emblematic example. The examples cited also have an added value: they are initiatives that help to reduce stereotypes.

The third element which needs highlighting relates to the importance that building alliances and developing cooperation strategies has in the friendliness perspective. Emphasising the different actors, levels of action or competences, brings us to the coordinates of network governance. It also includes different ways of involving older people, such as developing projects or co-research. Although these are not very widespread, they indicate new opportunities that I will deal with further on (Buffel, Rémillard-Boilard and Phillipson, 2018). These are new avenues that introduce new

statuses for older people in participation, alternative statuses to those of consumers or service users. In my opinion, both forms of involvement nurture a conception of the position of older people in participation; more than that of social players who contribute, that have a position as political agents. This is an important question in a period where cities play a central role in creating well-being, among other things.

At the same time, the two forms of involvement cited above give shape to important resources in the coordinates of the new urban agenda, such as building the commons. Coordinates where the neighbourhood level, co-production of urban policies, impetus for community action, resident involvement in management and citizen-produced innovation are becoming key strategies (Blanco, Gomà and Subirats, 2018).

Some notes for promoting new participation routes for older people

Any reference to ageing requires us to highlight the heterogeneity which characterises that sector of the population we call older people. Longer life expectancy means a longer life course in which changes, and therefore transitions, occur. Changes in relationships, in health, in the places where people live, in the ways they live in environments that may be more or less favourable to their ageing process and the transitions that each person has to face and go through[3]. Therefore, the key question we pose is how can we make progress on the diverse forms of participation. The civic participation of older people in Barcelona is expressed in many different ways in the form of institutional participation mechanisms, projects and organisations.

When we look into institutional participation, we see how the plurality focus has been inscribed in the new approach and ways of doing things. A good example to illustrate this is the experience of "The Voices of Older People", a series of conventions first held in 2003 as an alternative to the conference model. They are organised by the Older Persons Advisory Council, backed by Barcelona City Council, with two aims: to renew the participation dynamics in order to broaden the range of participants and the types of expression, and to increase their influence on municipal decision-making bodies. They are held every four years before the end of the Council's term of office[4].

Some criteria applied or learnt that can be transferred to other initiatives:

a) Hold participation processes closer to people. Meetings must be held on a district or neighbourhood level and the dynamics need to be geared towards encouraging exchanges. The material conditions of these spaces must be comfortable and the materials easy to use.

b) Think about the issues to be dealt with and the contents. Discussing both points provides an opportunity to exchange points of view, recognise various interests, confluences and divergences and, in that way, avoid simplifying the way issues are dealt with or creating a homogeneous group image. The design of the participatory processes (in the form of discussions, workshops, working groups) prioritises the aim of learning, proposing or questioning; the experiences of older people must show diversity; presentations of public actions must be quick and concise, and specialists need to gear their contributions towards providing information as well as encouraging reflection and discussion, facilitating all kinds of exchanges (questions, clarifications, comments, proposals, etc.).

c) Draw conclusions and draw up work plans. Council members are aware that when a convention finishes, the next one is already beginning. Drawing conclusions and drawing up

3. Pilar Gómez offers a thought-provoking take on the changes in old age: "Changes gradually become more difficult on reaching old age. And the capacity for adapting to change is an indicator of vitality. Capacity to adapt to change does not mean submission suffered but the admission of that and relocation that allows the best move for living well" (p. 103)

4. Detailed information on the five conventions is available on the Barcelona Older Persons Advisory Council's website.

work plans underpins its influence on the decision-making bodies on the one hand, and guides the Council's agenda on the other. That course involves establishing "who we are going to do... with" in the future, helps to prevent disengagement and enables possible associations, partnerships and fields of cooperation to be identified.

One of the challenges for making headway on pluralism is the participation of older people when they suffer from situations of fragility or dependence, and are often service users. In studying the actions undertaken in Barcelona, we have analysed some of the actions carried out at the conventions and outside that framework. We have also made clear the importance of public action in building identities and subjectivities (Pérez Salanova and Verdaguer, 2018). Making progress on developing the urban dimension of well-being, promoting local well-being, calls for an in-depth exploration of the opportunities, "the little windows of opportunity", in order to recognise or encourage the participation of older people when they rely on care services at home. For example, transforming a support product reinvented by the person who uses it, or connecting people in the same neighbourhood which serves as a transition to shared activities or solutions, and so on.

From the friendliness perspective, the situation of people with fragility is regarded as a priority from two angles: the relationship between the urban environment and the body and the environment-diversity relationship. The former leads us to reflect on age-related needs, to recognise the fragility of the human body and to incorporate contributions rooted in the spacial practice of women. In fact, incorporating contributions developed from the gender perspective or feminist theory strengthens both the analysis of the environments and the design of the proposals. Whatever the state of the city and its neighbourhoods – from deindustrialisation to gentrification – in every case it is necessary to visualise what the life of physically or psychologically fragile people is like (Buffel and James, 2019). The second angle concerns ageing and diversity. It refers to people with health problems and also ethnic diversity, and poses questions relating to coexistence, maintaining that the environments must be capable of sustaining and reflecting the diversity of a world that is ageing.

Making progress on participation involves propitiating or developing new or little-known and sometimes, therefore, hardly credible ways of involving older people. One of those ways is co-research, already mentioned in the section on the Friendly Cities and Communities project. Research carried out with the collaboration of older people is appreciated for its contribution to a better understanding of situations or problems, especially health or social ones, experienced by older people themselves. The results of research on social isolation carried out in Manchester by a group of older people acting as researchers provide arguments for promoting this kind of participation. The researchers value the fact that it has served as a link, a bridge, between their working life and retirement because, on the basis of their interviewing skills and also through the training workshops, they have been able carry out the reflection following the data gathering and dissemination of the results.

At the same time, they recognise in positive terms the contribution the project could make in bringing about changes in the community (Buffel and James, 2019). Starting from the principle that no form of participation is applicable to everyone, co-research looks like an interesting option for those involved in an experience of training, reflection and collaborative learning. Moreover, it projects an alternative image of older people and introduces new opportunities for generating knowledge and disseminating it.

The issues mentioned depict an array of challenges to which we could add others, such as the need to provide spaces and projects open to generational diversity that involve older people. In this sense, the life course of the baby boom generation, which played an active role in demanding rights, provides for an active role in the transformations required to adapt organisations and policies, as well as in the opportunities for social participation (Majón-Valpuesta, Ramos and Pérez Salanova, 2016). In this context, we might ask ourselves how can we promote spaces or projects where people from different generations come together? How can we highlight projects in which that coming together is based on some actions but is inconspicuous? These are questions that

arise when faced with the challenge of groups of people interested in improving certain aspects of any of the domains of city life, from education to care work, mobility or urban ecology. In practice, it is a matter of associating the cross-generational plane to the issues, whether they arise from one generation or another. That plane could be projected in a chess or video-game workshop – both offer a cognitive or relational opportunity – or translated into initiatives for applying technology, whether it is in the care of people, in the transformation of services in the home, in caring for public spaces or in mobility.

In order to tackle any of those challenges, it is necessary to include the professional dimension, whether or not the professionals are involved in participation spaces or projects. Their training and the focus of their action are factors that act as stimuli, favourable or otherwise, for involving people. It is therefore key to support their theoretical and practical training, as well as generate spaces to reflect on the practices.

Likewise, we cannot leave aside the challenges relating to participation dynamics. Participation spaces must be internally inclusive (Barnes, 2005). To achieve this it is necessary to promote exchanges that take into consideration particular forms of expression – for example, deferential expressions – recognise rhetorical expressions – which are usually more dramatic and emotional – and include a narrative or historical account. There is no model for participation dynamics that is applicable or suitable for all situations.

The status of older people in participation spaces is also determined by how the processes or mechanisms work. Let's put ourselves in the context of an activity workshop or a meeting to promote an anti-rumour project. Older people can feel integrated or ignored, appreciated or reified by means of the dynamics or based on the methods. The way the participation functions can restrict the kind of person likely to take part. In other words, people interested in an issue might be attracted if a meeting is called but feel uncomfortable and ignored, or out of place, due to the way the meeting is run.

With regard to experiences of being ignored or excluded in participation settings, it is useful to consider the contribution offered by Correa and Domènech (2012), who propose constructing an image of the ideal citizen, someone who participates putting aside their own interests, who puts the general interest first and forms their opinions on the basis of rational arguments. That image leads to the creation of a "non-citizen" in line with modern. male, heterosexual, independent, rich, white authority. This is a construct that encourages the exclusion from participation of people affected by policies that they are trying to influence. In a complementary way, it should be pointed out that the position of the ideal citizen can be reproduced in any participation setting. That happens when the principles of communication relegate personalised expression, which includes emotions and unconventional forms of expression, on the one hand, and advocates a descriptive or proactive construction similar to the contributions that come from institutional and professional spheres on the other.

Participation and its multiple forms in the urban era need to be rolled out on local scales and, at the same time, incorporated into shared frameworks of a global character where age is not the organising axis that includes or excludes issues, questions and responses.

Bibliography

BARNES, M. (2005), "The same old process? Older people, participation and deliberation", *Ageing & Society*, 25(2), pp. 245-259.

BLANCO, I., GOMÀ, R. AND SUBIRATS, J. (2018), "El nuevo municipalismo: derecho a la ciudad y comunes urbanos", *Gestión y Análisis de Políticas Públicas*, 20, pp. 14-28.

BUFFEL, T. AND JAMES, H. (2019), “Working with older people as co-researchers in developing age-friendly communities”, *Geron*, 21(2). Advance publication online.

BUFFEL, T., RÉMILLARD-BOILARD, S. AND PHILLIPSON, C. (2018), “Pour des villes amies des aînés: programme d’action en faveur du viellissement en milieu urbain”, *Retraite et societé*, 79, pp. 43-60.

CORREA G. AND DOMÈNECH, M. (2012), “Hackear la ciencia y la democracia. Decodificación y recodificación de un mecanismo de democracia deliberativa”, *Eä - Revista de Humanidades Médicas & Estudios Sociales de la Ciencia y la Tecnología*, 4(2), pp. 1-26.

GÓMEZ, P. (1994), “Espacio y comunicación intergeneracional. Construcción de vínculo, identidad y autoestima”, in Fernández J. and Pérez Salanova, M. (coord.), *Cooperación intergeneracional. Nuevas perspectivas de desarrollo social*, Barcelona: Fundación “la Caixa”, pp. 85-14.

GUISSET-MARTINEZ, M. J. (2008), “Peut-on innover en matière d’accompagnement des personnes atteintes de la maladie d’Alzheimer?”, *Gérontologie et Societé*, 31(126), pp. 77-89.

MAJÓN-VALPUESTA, D., RAMOS, P. AND PÉREZ-SALANOVA, M. (2016), “Claves para el análisis de la participación social en los procesos de envejecimiento de la generación baby boom”, *Psicoperspectivas*, 15(2), pp. 53-63.

PÉREZ SALANOVA, M. (2016), “Cinco elementos clave del envejecimiento activo”, in Ezquerra S., Pérez Salanova, M., Pla, M. and Subirats, J. (dir.), *Edades en transición. Envejecer en el siglo XXI*, Barcelona: Ariel, pp. 159-163.

PÉREZ SALANOVA, M. AND PLA, M. (2016), “La participación plural de las personas mayores en el siglo XXI. Desafíos y respuestas”, in Ezquerra S., Pérez Salanova, M., Pla M. and Subirats, J. (dir.), *Edades en transición. Envejecer en el siglo XXI*, Barcelona: Ariel, pp. 95-114.

PÉREZ SALANOVA, M. AND VERDAGUER MATA, M. (2018), “Comment impliquer des aînés en perte d’autonomie fonctionnelle? Le cas de Barcelone”, *Retraite et societé*, 79, pp. 61-81.

RAYMOND, E., SÉVIGNY, A. AND TOURIGNY, A. (2012), *Participation sociale des aînés: la parole aux aînés et aux intervenants*. Institut National de Santé Publique du Québec. Retrieved on 9 December 2019 from https://www.inspq.qc.ca/publications/1466

SERRAT, R, SCHARF, T., VILLAR, F. AND GÓMEZ, C. (2019), “Fifty-five years of research into older people’s civic participation: Recent trends, future directions”, *The Gerontologist*, vol. XX (XX), pp. 1-14. Advance publication online.

VIRIOT DURANDAL, J.P., MOULAERT, T., SCHEIDER, M., GARON, S. AND PARIS, M. (2018), “Adaptation des territoires au viellissement: politiques publiques et formes d’agencement démocratique. Les exemples de la France et du Québec”, *Retraite et Societé*, 79, pp. 17-41.

YANGUAS LEZAUN, J., CILVETI SARASOLA, A., HERNÁNDEZ CHAMORRO S., PINAZO-HERNANDIS, S., ROIG I CANALS, S. AND SEGURA TALAVERA, C. (2018), “El reto de la soledad en la vejez”, *Zerbitzuan: Gizarte zerbitzuetarako aldizkaria - Revista de servicios sociales*, 66, pp. 61-75. ISNN. 1134-7147. Murcia: Editum. Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Murcia.

WALKER, A. (2007), “Why involve older people in research?”, *Age and Ageing*, 36(5), pp. 481-483.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION (WHO) (2002), “Envejecimiento activo: un marco político”, *Revista Española de Geriatría y Gerontología*, 37(2), pp. 74-105.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION (WHO) (2007), Global Age-friendly Cities: A Guide. Retrieved on 9 December 2019 from http://www.who.int/ageing/age_friendly_cities_material/en/index.html