



Aleksandra Zubrzycka-Czarnecka

Department of Methodology of Political Science
Faculty of Political Science and International Studies
University of Warsaw
e-mail: a.zubrzycka@uw.edu.pl

DECISION-MAKING AT THE LEVEL OF A HOUSING COOPERATIVE IN WARSAW (POLAND). OLDER ADULTS' PARTICIPATION

Abstract

The paper discusses the issue of the involvement of older people in decision-making at the level of a housing cooperative in Warsaw (Poland) to examine the characteristics of older adults' participation in the democratic and deliberative process of housing policy. Using the qualitative methodology (case study, exploratory research visit, document analysis and in-depth interviews), the analyses suggest a considerable influence of older people over the decision-making in the selected housing cooperative. The gathered data are indicative of the antagonistic character of the housing policy process. This is due to several factors: diverse attitudes, the opinions and interests of different groups of older people, and communication problems between generations.

Keywords: direct democracy, housing policy process, local social policy, older people

JEL Classification Codes: P4

Introduction

There is a body of evidence showing that the ageing of the population is a challenge for the social policy and housing policy in many countries. Researchers note that it is important to provide older people with an opportunity to choose a housing strategy, including reinforcing them in remaining in their current place of residence. In such a situation, there is often a need to support the oldest residents by neighbours and building managers. However, it is also worth paying attention to the impact of the increasing number of older people in multi-family buildings on the housing decision-making process. Especially if the buildings (often blocks of flats) are 'co-governed' by residents as part of a housing cooperative. The article refers to this issue. It explores and analyses the involvement of older adults (understood as people aged 60+) in decision-making at the level of a housing cooperative in Warsaw. I consider the terms: 'older adults' and 'older persons' as synonyms. I pay attention to avoiding any practices of the language of ageism. For this reason, I prefer to use the neutral terms recommended by Summers (2018). I try not to use the terms seen as offensive (e.g. 'senior', 'senior citizen', 'elderly', 'retiree'). In order to analyse the topic, a pragmatic approach to the process of policy as a research strategy has been applied. The article is based on primary data (individual in-depth interviews, research visit, document analysis). It contributes to the understanding of social policy by making a diagnosis of (i) the image of older people, and (ii) the impact of that group on decision-making at the level of a selected Warsaw housing cooperative. My examination of social actors' involvement in the housing policy process (understood as in Gerston, 2010) adds to the existing literature in multiple ways. It provides new knowledge on the role of older adults in policymaking in the field of housing. The study completes the works concerning tenants' involvements in the governance of the social housing stock (Flint, 2004, pp. 171–186), the issue of participation (associated with the notion of deliberative democracy as depicted by Cohen, 1997, pp. 67–91) of social actors (understood as in Szmátka, 1998, pp. 15–17 and Birkland, 2011) in urban regeneration projects (Hastings, 1996, pp. 253–268), the influence of interest groups and lobbyists on the housing policy process (Jacobs, 2015, pp. 694–710), and the involvement of social actors in the participatory programmes of spatial planning (Connelly, 2009, pp. 185–195).

I begin by briefly outlining the issue of the decision-making process within the housing cooperatives in Poland and signal the possible impact of the ageing of the population on that process. Then, I discuss, through a review of empirical evidence, the residential environment as a context of older adults' participation in decision-making.

Subsequently, I move on to demonstrate the research strategy and the findings of an original empirical study. The paper ends with an overview of the most significant conclusions from the conducted research.

1. Decision-making by older people at the level of Polish housing cooperatives

Housing cooperatives have a long tradition in Poland. The first Polish housing cooperative was established in 1890 in Poznań (*Adrian Zandberg*, 2019). In 1920, the first law on housing cooperatives was adopted, and in 1921, the Warsaw Housing Cooperative was created, one of the oldest housing cooperatives in Warsaw, which still operates today. In 1937, 252 housing cooperatives operated in Poland. They managed the stock of 16,000 apartments, in which 0.8% of the urban population lived (*Kukuryka*, 2008, pp. 20–28). The development of housing cooperatives in Poland, like in many other countries, was slowed down by World War II. In 1951, the socialist People's Republic of Poland authorities deprived cooperatives of the right to dispose of cooperative apartments. Then access to loans and cheap building materials was hindered. However, due to the housing crisis, after 1956, the socialist authorities' approach to housing cooperatives changed. The state began to support this type of housing. While in 1956 only 800 cooperative flats were built, in 1978 it was 157,800 flats in this type of construction (*Chyra-Rolicz*, 2008, pp. 8–19). In 1979, 1,133 housing cooperatives were active in Poland. Over 6,000,000 people lived in cooperative apartments (*Chyra-Rolicz*, 2008, pp. 8–19). From 1945 to 1999, over 1/3 of flats in Poland were built by housing cooperatives (*Chyra-Rolicz*, 2008, pp. 8–19). However, their importance on the housing market has diminished significantly since the 1989 political transformation. In addition, after 2008, the decline in cooperative housing deepened, caused by the liquidation of the National Housing Fund (an institution granting preferential credit to cooperatives). Currently, housing cooperatives on the housing market in Warsaw are only supplementing the housing offer, shaped mainly by developers. Few new residential buildings completed are provided by housing cooperatives (in 2005, 81 such buildings were provided, in 2010–29, in 2014–63, in 2015–6) (*Rocznik Statystyczny Warszawy*, 2016, p. 213). There are well-established research achievements, presenting the development and regression of housing cooperatives in Poland (*Kulesza*, 1993; *Piasecka*, 2005, pp. 253–265; *Prażuch*, 2008, pp. 29–37; *Jajszczyk*, 2008, pp. 47–49).

In each housing cooperative, there are: a general meeting, a management board, and a supervisory board. The general meeting is the highest body of the cooperative

and makes decisions on the most important matters for the cooperative. This body includes all members of the cooperative. The general meeting takes place at least once a year and is convened by the management of the cooperative. The general meeting has exclusive competence on many matters, such as, for example: adopting directions for the development of economic, social and cultural activities conducted by the cooperative; considering supervisory board reports; adopting amendments to the cooperative's statute, and the election of members of the supervisory board. The supervisory board is a controlling body which supervises and controls the cooperative's activities carried out by the management board. The executive body of each cooperative is its management board. It carries out the resolutions adopted by the general meeting and the supervisory board and conducts the cooperative's policy (Prawo spółdzielcze, 1982). Some researchers emphasise the impact of housing cooperatives on the dissemination of the self-government way of managing housing resources in Poland. As Stachowski (2008, pp. 38–46) argues, the democratic and deliberative way of making decisions used in the housing cooperatives promotes the integration of residents. It teaches democratic principles and promotes the idea of civil society (Stanowisko..., 2008, pp. 63–65; MacLaren et al., 2012, p. 137). However, many pathologies are observed in the practice of direct democracy in housing cooperatives. In some cooperatives, instead of a general meeting, there is still a meeting of residents' representatives (which limits the influence on the governance of the cooperative by other residents) (Statement by the Ombudsman, 2018). The management boards of housing cooperatives sometimes pursue their own policy using the information gap of members of the general meetings. In large housing cooperatives, the lack of civic control over management poses a problem. In small cooperatives, this is a question of nepotism (Glusman, 2014).

Changing the demographic structure of the residents affects the way decisions are made in this housing stock and creates new challenges for residents and managers as well as the local community and public authorities. There is a systematic increase in the share of people aged 65+ in Polish society. In 2016, there were over 6,303,000 older adults in Poland (16% of the population). The share of 80+ people in the older adults' population is increasing (in 2016 they constituted 25.6% of all older adults). Most older people live in cities. In 2016, they constituted 17.8% of the inhabitants of Polish cities (Sobczak, 2017, pp. 36–78). Over 351,147 people aged 65+ live in Warsaw (GUS, 2017). They constitute over 20% of the population of the city (2017). Most older people in Warsaw live in blocks of flats. Many of these buildings are managed by housing cooperatives.

2. Residential environment as a context of older adults' participation in decision-making

This section discusses selected approaches to the role of older adults in policy-making within the residential environment. Firstly, the participation of older adults in housing policymaking can be viewed from the perspective of an idea of ageing in place and with reference to the removal of barriers in the built environment. The topic of the residential environment in light of Polish older adults' experience is the subject of research of Frąckiewicz (1972), Turowski (1979), Synak (1982), Zaniewska (2001), Błędowski (2003, pp. 115–139), Niezabitowska et al. (2013), Szatur-Jaworska (2016) and Niezabitowski (2018). In the latest of these studies, Niezabitowski (2018) suggests that the priorities indicated by older people aged in place in relation to their residential environment include: silence and a sense of peace, and lifts. As Niezabitowski (2018) highlighted, very important for older people are: autonomy, intimacy, and privacy. Attention is drawn to the need for the social integration of older people. These insights were deepened by another researcher studying housing cooperatives. Peisert (2009) explained institutional changes of housing cooperatives in Poland and their impact on the development of the civic community of residents of housing cooperatives. His study was carried out at the beginning of the 21st century in four apartment estates 'co-governed' by housing cooperatives, operating in Warsaw, Gdańsk, Gdynia-Sopot and Lublin. Peisert covered the changes of housing cooperatives in Poland, connected with the socio-economic transformation of the 1980s and 1990s, and their influence on the vision of a 'democratic housing cooperative'. The scholar raised awareness of the influence that the ageing of the residents (living in blocks of flats) has on the methods of setting and implementing housing policy. He noticed that the problems of this age group (e.g. loud neighbours or issues of safety) dominate in the policy's agenda of housing cooperatives. The fundamental feature of the policy is conservatism and resentment towards change (Peisert, 2009). The study by Peisert is a partial response to the knowledge gap about non-conventional forms of political participation of older adults (Serrat et al., 2018, pp. 53–88). It is worth pointing out that Rose (1965, pp. 3–16), like Hochschild (1978), wrote about the benefits of the spatial concentration of older adults in certain parts of the city. An important aspect was, in their opinion, the ability of a large group of older people to influence local institutions. However, these findings should be combined with observations regarding the participation of older people in regeneration projects in the United Kingdom. They show that older adults often

“influence the implementation of policies for the entire local population, not just older people” (Barnes, 2005, p. 248).

Some researchers find that the participation of older people in the local public policy process can be considered as part of social connectivity, the feature attributed to ‘age-friendly’ cities (Lane, 2019; Rémillard-Boilard et al., 2017, pp. 146–159; Yuen, Soh, 2017, pp. 30, 49). The limitations of older adults’ involvement in policy-making can lead to the social exclusion of older people. However, while we know slightly more about the participation of older people, aged in place, in decision-making in their living environment, we still have little data on that kind of social activity of people living in residential care homes (Pau Le Low et al., 2017). As it seems, in these homes, older people should enjoy the same rights (including civil and political rights) as those living in the community. Meanwhile, research findings indicate that their position in the decision-making process requires support (Scourfield, 2007, pp. 155–179). One of the solutions in this direction are Residents’ councils (O’Dwyer, Virpi, 2010, pp. 762–771). At the same time, the concept of citizenship in old age is still not clear. Research indicates that policymakers understand it differently to older people (van Hees et al., 2015, pp. 178–189).

Finally, more is known about the participation of older people in the design and implementation of housing-related research. Some researchers addressing this topic refer to a participatory approach such as the co-productive approach. We can agree that this approach means solving problems related to older adults with their involvement. Sometimes, it is assumed that the co-productive approach means involving older people as co-researchers, co-investigators for the research process (Littlechild et al., 2015, pp. 18–35). But yet, some studies regarding the activation of older people do not include the issue of the impact of discussions, consultations (and their results, e.g., recommendations) on the decision-making process (Novek, Menec, 2013, pp. 1052–1072).

3. Methodology

This section examines what are the following: (i) the image of older people, and (ii) the impact of that group on decision-making at the level of a selected Warsaw housing cooperative. The search for the answers to these questions was conducted through the development of the following thesis: older adults are a heterogeneous group within which there are diverse attitudes and opinions on their image and involvement in the housing policy process at the level of a selected housing cooperative. Generally, they have a considerable influence over the decision-making. They

efficiently put forward postulates and take care of their interests. Sometimes, it results in an antagonistic nature of the political process in the housing policy (understood as in Angel, 2000, p. 11) at the level of a housing cooperative.

My method was based on the pragmatic approach to the process of policy developed by Zittoun (2017), which breaks the separation of discourse from action, and ideas from interests. I have drawn on the Reisigl's politolinguistic approach (2011, pp. 151–183), while selecting the criteria for gathering data. In the course of the research, data was collected via an exploratory research visit, document analysis, and eight individual in-depth interviews with older adults. The exploratory research visit took place on 11 April 2017. The analysed part of the estate comprises 28 accommodation blocks of flats for families (813 flats altogether). In December 2015, there were 1,600 people living there, and in 2017 – about 1,400. Currently, more than half of the analysed estate, which is 'co-governed' by housing cooperative 'N', is inhabited by people who are more than 60 years old (about 700 people), and many older people are over 80 years old.

In-depth interviews with older people were held on 27 May 2017 (on the occasion of an estate classical music concert) and on 3 June 2017 (on the occasion of a family picnic). Eight participants took part in the interviews (aged: 65–85; 6 women, 2 men). Most people were around the age of 70. Every participant knew well the housing estate under analysis.

The collected data was subject to a selection process. The research material was restricted on the basis of the following criteria (Reisigl, 2011, pp. 151–183): representativity/typicality, impact (intertextual or interdiscursive), validity, uniqueness, redundancy and originality of data.

In the analysis of the data, I focused on the description of meanings (relating to the image of older people in the decision-making process) and political argumentation (stressing the connection of identified arguments with certain values and interests) (Durnová, Zittoun, 2013, pp. 569–577). I assume that argumentation is regarded as a key aspect of housing policy and is 'epistemologically marked'. Social actors make arguments for adopting a certain interpretation of a social problem (the problems are frequently complex, sometimes ambiguous; dependent on the adopted perspective), and next for taking certain solutions to the problem (yet, there is no certainty as for the results of the solutions).

In the interpretation of the data, my aim was to provide an explanation of the 'production' of knowledge about such issues as constructing notions and meanings, and formulating arguments.

The thesis was supported using the case study method. The paper draws from the critical perspective. It indicates the problem of a conflict between groups of residents

of different ages living in buildings managed by the selected housing cooperative. The article presents only one of the parties to the conflict, the older adults. The collected data comes primarily from older residents (including all the interviews).

In the research procedure, I took into account the rules adopted in the Polish Sociologists' Code of Ethics.

4. Characteristics of older adults' participation in decision-making in a selected housing cooperative in Warsaw

The following section explores the issue of the involvement of older people in decision-making at the level of a housing cooperative in Warsaw. The section is divided into two parts. The first part concerns the topic of the image of older adults in decision-making at the level of the selected Warsaw's housing cooperative. The second part refers to the impact of the older people on decision-making.

4.1. Image of older adults

An analysis of the data obtained in interviews has shown that the image of older people varies significantly depending on the age of the older people. The oldest residents of the housing cooperative perceive themselves and are perceived by others as passive recipients of the activities of the housing cooperative management board. They do not present themselves as active partners negotiating with the managers of the housing cooperative in matters that are important to them. The oldest residents are primarily focused on receiving information about the building in which they live. They do not care too much about the way it is managed. As one of the oldest people stated: "In these meetings I am only a listener. And I don't get all that is being said anyway..." (Interview no. 1, 27 May 2017).

Sometimes, they are perceived by others as helpless older people who need support. It is about an image of people who are slightly clumsy and childish, from time to time in a bad mood, but generally nice: "There is concern about them [older people – A.Z.-C.], I have to admit. I have the best example – my mum is 98 years old. And she lives here. And of course, she has special facilities and different discounts, that is true. ...But she is not really cheerful and the neighbours are rather ... recently all the time ... she is simply grumpy, it comes with age. Perhaps I will be the same, I don't know..." (Interview no. 1, 27 May 2017).

However, this type of relationship between younger residents or the management board of the housing cooperative and the oldest residents can reduce the autonomy of older people. It was noticed that the representatives of the housing cooperative management board sometimes made some statements (towards especially the oldest residents) that came across as patronising and overly familiarising.

On the other hand, for the younger group of older people, we can observe a more active life strategy. These participants talk openly about their needs. They are more demanding of the management board of the housing cooperative. They put forward postulates and negotiate. They take care of their interests: “We would like to have a little cafeteria here in the estate for older people. We don’t have a place like that where we could go and drink a coffee, talk a little... And retired people can afford something like this after all” (Interview no. 5, 27 May 2017).

They participate in many social life activities, not only in initiatives meant for ‘older people’. They distance themselves from the age assigned to them and from the group of the oldest residents: “...I am a person who is very active, so I don’t really go to the older people’s club. But maybe I will try and look into it” (Interview no. 2, 27 May 2017).

In their statements, such activities were perceived as something positive. Such valorisation was connected to an argument of resourcefulness and independence.

4.2. Impact of older adults on decision-making

The exploratory research visit and the document analysis lead to a conclusion that in the selected housing cooperative, the residents participate to a small extent in decision-making. Therefore, at the general meeting of housing cooperative ‘N’, which is held annually in June, there are usually 120 people present out of the 614 members. The residents are not eager to engage in the work of housing cooperative ‘N’, but they are also unwilling to take up positions connected to ‘co-governing’ the estate. Out of 13 real estates created in 2009, which the whole housing estate is divided into, a real estate council has been established only in 5 of them. It is so despite multiple meetings and attempts to encourage the residents. Integration events which are supposed to create social bonds are not frequented. Christmas meetings are attended by about 30 people out of 1400 residents. More people participate in the summer meetings (concerts of classical music and family picnics). It is worth noting that the majority of residents involved in decision-making are older adults.

Based on the interview data, it can be seen that when asked individually, older residents take a passive attitude towards the housing cooperative management board. They express full affirmation to the activities organised in the housing area. In their

statements, one can find arguments of utility (care of the housing cooperative management board towards the estate) and arguments of acceptance of the status quo: "...Sir, we have wonderful chairmen and a deputy, who have been working for us for seven years – yes it is seven years that they have made our estate so beautiful ... The chair-persons look after everything. I am absolutely in awe of this estate – as you can see. I live here like in a botanic garden. ... Yes, as I told you, the Chairman and Chairwoman, they are very nice people. The Secretary, Agnieszka, is also very kind and helpful. So, as you can see, we are in a very good administrative, so to say, environment..." (Interview no. 2, 27 May 2017).

A few people spoke openly critically about the members of the housing cooperative management board and about the power relations in the estate. One of these statements was about a resident of a younger group of older adults who was quite experienced in the 'co-governing' of the estate: "... We had a Chairman, with whom there was a problem (Interview no. 8, 6 June 2017). ... I cannot say that the management board of the housing cooperative frittered away the money, but I believe ... you know the headquarters, so to say, should be the apple of your eye" (Interview no. 8, 6 June 2017).

The oldest residents do not directly criticise the decisions of the housing cooperative management board but put pressure on them. Generally, older adults actively participate in the meetings of housing cooperative members. Older people express their expectations and needs and defend their vision of development of the housing area and their interest. Older adults sometimes took on a privileged position in the housing policy process, which they would justify by the longer time they had inhabited the studied housing area. It can be noticed that existing discourse practices (e.g., general meetings of housing cooperative members) increase the possibility for older people to influence the shape of the housing policy. Residents belonging to younger age groups (not older adults) often do not participate in these meetings due to their professional or family responsibilities. However, the influence of older people on the housing policy process at the level of the analysed housing cooperative is limited by the differences in interests between the younger group of older adults and the oldest of them, and furthermore, between the old and young residents. This is reflected in the arguments formed by the participants, along with problems in finding compromises which would pursue the common good of all of the residents: "... Unfortunately, we have many divisions here. ... As the first generation of people gets old, people become... blind-folded by their own interest, you know they say, what I have left of life, not much, so I will only worry about myself, and I am not interested in the others, so I want this, or I want that and the other people can just adjust to me" (Interview no. 8, 6 June 2017).

The problem of divisions and generational conflict among the residents was also observed during the exploratory research visit. It had a negative influence on the meetings of the members of the housing cooperative: "...I would change maybe, but it's impossible, I would change the old people, who are not as positive towards life as I am. Because I am very positive. And these old people in meetings, you know they are, they are just not feeling too good. The fact that we have little gardens ... And then there are old people who don't like anything..." (Interview no. 2, 27 May 2017).

This situation is reflected in the impossibility of taking decisions regarding costly investments, important especially for the selected age groups. The younger residents (not older adults) do not agree to install lifts in multi-storey blocks of flats: "...The residents would like that [lifts – note: A.Z.-C.]. There are fewer and fewer of those who would want it. The voices are divided about who is to pay for it" (Interview no. 8, 6 June 2017).

The older residents would like to rent or sell utility spaces such as the laundry rooms and the rooms for strollers and bicycles. It seems that this problem could be alleviated by better preparing residents to participate in the decision-making process. It would be important to determine the values and issues that are most important for all the residents. A consensus should be sought upon the final allocation of funds and investment hierarchy.

The findings of the study were verified by consulting an expert from one of the Polish associations of rental property owners. In addition, I compared them with entries (regarding the course of decision-making at general meetings in housing cooperatives in Warsaw) on the Internet profiles of selected Warsaw housing activists. Still, this does not change the fact that the article discusses a qualitative short-range study, the conclusions of which cannot be generalised. The data obtained is preliminary and should be verified in more explorative research.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have given empirical evidence for selected aspects concerning the involvement of older adults in the housing policy process by (1) pointing out the issue of the image of older people as participants in decision-making, and by (2) shedding light on the impact of older adults' agency for the features of decision-making at the level of a selected housing cooperative in Warsaw.

The participation of older people in the housing policy process is partly conditioned by the image of older adults, which is constructed by other participants in the process and by older people themselves. The collected data indicated a differentiation

of the image of older adults depending on their age. Older people of the blocks of flats 'co-governed' by a selected housing cooperative in Warsaw, belonging to a slightly younger age group, emphasised their activity and distanced themselves from the group of the oldest residents of the studied housing cooperative. The oldest residents perceived themselves (and were perceived) to a greater extent as persons in need of support, persons with disability. This contributed to taking greater care of them by the management board of the housing cooperative, and, on the other hand, to adopting attitudes characterised by patronage and excessive familiarisation towards the oldest residents.

It seems that the authorities should counteract such phenomena. An information campaign sensitising the need to respect the autonomy of the oldest residents within the housing cooperatives policymaking process could be helpful.

The study found that older adults play an important role in the housing policy process at the level of the housing area 'co-governed' by housing cooperative 'N' in Warsaw. They constitute a large group of residents. Sometimes they take a demanding stance and conflictive attitude towards other groups of residents. It affects the conflictive nature of the decision-making process in the field of housing. It seems that greater importance should be attached to making residents able to reach a consensus. I would like to underline that due to the adopted research strategy (case study), it is not possible to determine whether the conclusions obtained in the study could be true for all housing cooperatives in Warsaw or Poland. The study by Peisert (2009) may suggest that similar problems also occur in other Polish cities. However, there is no recent research on the topic.

Finally, as this article utilised the pragmatic approach to the process of policy in the research strategy, it is pertinent to ask about its advantages and limitations for social policy research. The selected research tool was useful for obtaining data through the analysis of arguments formulated by participants. I found that it facilitates further consideration of the opinions (expressed in discourse) of older people about their participation in the housing policy process and illustrates the impact of the older people's activity on the characteristics of decision-making at the level of a selected housing cooperative in Warsaw. The pragmatic nature of the approach enabled to identify problems related to limiting the autonomy of the oldest residents in the decision-making process and regarding the impact of older people on the potential for conflict in this process. This was made possible by linking the arguments with the wider social context in which the participants were immersed. However, this strategy does not allow for the formulation of generalisation. Its use is limited to small-*n* research. Some researchers (Dupuy, Faure, 2014, pp. 129–132) highlight the fact that the approach proposed by Zittoun, based

on in-depth interviews, participatory observations or discourse analysis, differs insignificantly from other discursive approaches developed within the framework of political sociology.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Science Centre, Poland, under grant number 2016/23/D/HS4/00527 [Project entitled: *D-Housing. Democracy of housing policy*, Agreement number UMO-2016/23/D/HS4/00527].

Bibliography

1. Adrian Zandberg chwali PRL za politykę mieszkaniową. O własne „m” nie było jednak łatwo. Retrieved from: <https://businessinsider.com.pl/finanse/adrian-zandberg-o-mieszkaniach-w-prl-jak-dzialaly-spoldzielnie/ddqfpf6> (accessed: 14.3.2020).
2. Angel, S. (2000). *Housing Policy Matters: A Global Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Barnes, M. (2005). The same old process? Older people, participation, and deliberation. *Ageing and Society*, 25(2), pp. 245–259. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X04002508>
4. Birkland, T.A. (2011). *An Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, Concepts and Models of Public Policy Making*. London: Routledge.
5. Błędowski, P. (2003). Gospodarstwa domowe i sytuacja mieszkaniowa ludzi starych. In: *Polska starość*. B. Synak (Ed.). Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, pp. 115–139.
6. Chyra-Rolicz, Z. (2008). Rozwój i efekty spółdzielczości mieszkaniowej w ostatnim półwieczu. *Nowiny PTM*, 7, pp. 8–19.
7. Cohen, J. (1997). Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy. In: *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*. J. Bohman, W. Rehg (Eds.). Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 67–91.
8. Connelly, S. (2009). Deliberation in the face of power: Stakeholder planning in Egypt. *Policy and Society*, 28(3), pp. 185–195. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2009.08.003>
9. Dupuy, C., Faure, A. (2014). Philippe Zittoun: La fabrique des politiques publiques. *Gouvernement & Action Publique*, 3(3), pp. 129–132.
10. Durnovà A., Zittoun Ph. (2013). Les approches discursives des politiques publiques. Introduction. *Revue française de science politique*, 63(3), pp. 569–577. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3917/rfsp.633.0569>

11. Flint, J. (2006). Maintaining an arm's length? Housing, community governance and the management of 'problematic' populations *Housing Studies*, 21(2), pp. 171–186. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673030500484695>
12. Frąckiewicz, L. (1972). *Warunki i potrzeby mieszkaniowe ludzi starych w miastach województwa katowickiego*. Warszawa: Instytut Gospodarki Mieszkaniowej.
13. Gerston, L.N. (2010). *Public Policy Making: Process and Principles*. London: Routledge.
14. Glusman, J. *Ułomna demokracja w spółdzielniach mieszkaniowych*. Retrieved from: <https://liberte.pl/ulomna-demokracja-w-spoldzielniach-mieszkaniowych/> (accessed: 10.8.2019).
15. GUS (2017). *Ludność. Warszawa w liczbach 5-letnie grupy wieku*. Retrieved from: <https://www.um.warszawa.pl/o-warszawie/warszawa-w-liczbach/ludnosc> (accessed: 7.8.2019).
16. Hastings, A. (1996). Unravelling the process of 'partnership' in urban regeneration policy. *Urban Studies*, 33(2), pp. 253–268. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420989650011997>
17. Hochschild, A.R. (1978). *The unexpected community. The portrait of an old age sub-culture*. London: University of California Press.
18. Jacobs, K. (2015). The Politics' of Australian Housing: The Role of Lobbyists and Their Influence in Shaping Policy. *Housing Studies*, 30(5), pp. 694–710. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2014.1000833>
19. Jajszczyk, R. (2008). Spółdzielczość mieszkaniowa w polskim mieszkalnictwie. *Nowiny PTM*, 7, pp. 47–54.
20. Kukuryka, S. (2008). Spółdzielczość mieszkaniowa wobec wyzwań XXI w. *Nowiny PTM*, 7, pp. 20–28.
21. Kulesza, H. (1993). *Koncepcje spółdzielczości mieszkaniowej. Stan i propozycje zmian*. Warszawa: IGM.
22. Lane, A. (2019). *Urban Environments for Healthy Ageing: A Global Perspective*. London: Routledge.
23. Littlechild, R., Tanner, D., Hall, K. (2015). Co-research with older people: Perspectives on impact. *Qualitative Social Work*, 14(1), pp. 18–35. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325014556791>
24. MacLaren, C., Landsberg, G., Schwartz, H. (2012). History, Accomplishments, Issues and Prospects of Supportive Service Programs in Naturally Occurring Retirement Communities in New York State: Lessons Learned. In: *Housing for the Elderly: Policy and Practice Issues*. Ph. McCallion (Ed.). London: Routledge, pp. 127–144.
25. Niezabitowska, E., Bartoszek, A., Kucharczyk-Brus B., Niezabitowski M. (2013). *Środowisko zamieszkania polskich seniorów w badaniach interdyscyplinarnych*. Katowice.
26. Niezabitowski, M. (2018). *Środowisko zamieszkania w doświadczeniu osób starszych. Wybrane aspekty psychospołeczne w ujęciu socjologicznym*. Gliwice: Wydawnictwo Politechniki Śląskiej.

27. Novek, S., Menec, V.H. (2013). Older adult's perceptions of age-friendly communities in Canada: A photovoice study. *Ageing and Society*, 34(6), pp. 1052–1072. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X1200150X>
28. O'Dwyer, C., Timonen, V. (2010). Rethinking the Value of Residents' Councils: Observations and Lessons from an Exploratory Study. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 29(6), pp. 762–771. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464809348002>
29. Pau Le Low, L., Wah Lam, L., Kim Pong Fan, K. (2017). Decision-making experiences of family members of older adults with moderate dementia towards community and residential care home services: a grounded theory study protocol *BMC Geriatrics*, 17(120). Retrieved from: <https://bmcgeriatr.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12877-017-0510-8> (accessed: 12.8 2019).
30. Peisert, A. (2009). *Spółdzielnie mieszkaniowe: pomiędzy wspólnotą obywatelską a alienacją*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
31. Piasecka, K. (2005). Spółdzielczość mieszkaniowa w nowej rzeczywistości. In: *Przeszłość i przyszłość polskiej polityki mieszkaniowej*. L. Frąckiewicz (Ed.). Warszawa: IPiSS IGN, pp. 253–265.
32. Prawo spółdzielcze, Ustawa z dnia 16 września 1982 r. Prawo spółdzielcze. Retrieved from: <http://prawo.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/download.xsp/WDU19820300210/UD19820210Lj.pdf> (accessed: 8.8.2019).
33. Prażuch, J. (2008). Ewolucja zasad funkcjonowania spółdzielczości mieszkaniowej w Polsce i jej skutki. *Nowiny PTM*, 7, pp. 29–37.
34. Reisiągł, M. (2011). Analiza retoryki politycznej. In: *Jakościowa analiza dyskursu w naukach społecznych*. R. Wodak, M. Krzyżanowski (Eds.). Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Łośgraf, pp. 150–183.
35. Rémillard-Boilard, S., Buffel, T., Phillipson, C. (2017). Involving older residents in age-friendly developments: From information to co-production mechanisms. *Journal of Housing for the Elderly*, 31(2), pp. 146–159. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763893.2017.1309932>
36. *Rocznik Statystyczny Warszawy* (2016). Warszawa: Urząd Statystyczny w Warszawie, p. 213.
37. Rose, A.M. (1965). The subculture of the aging: a framework for research in social gerontology. In: *Older People and their Social World*. A.M. Rose, W.A. Peterson (Eds.). Philadelphia: F.A. Davis, pp. 3–16.
38. Scourfield, P. (2007). Are there reasons to be worried about the 'caretization' of residential care? *Critical Social Policy*, 27(2), pp. 155–180. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018306075707>
39. Serrat, R., Warburton, J., Petriwskyj, A., Villar F. (2018). Political participation and social exclusion in later life: What politically active seniors can teach us about barriers to inclusion and retention *International Journal of Ageing and Later Life*, 12(2), pp. 53–88. DOI: 10.3384/ijal.1652–8670.18395

40. Sobczak, I. (2017). Bilans ludności Polski. In: *Sytuacja demograficzna Polski. Raport 2016–2017*. A. Potrykowska., M. Budziński (Eds.). Warszawa: Rządowa Rada Ludnościowa, pp. 36–78.
41. Stachowski, T. (2008). Spółdzielczość mieszkaniowa a integracja i rozwój społeczności lokalnej. *Nowiny PTM*, 7, pp. 38–46.
42. Stanowisko uczestników XVIII Konferencji Spalskiej na temat roli i miejsca spółdzielczości mieszkaniowej w polskim mieszkalnictwie (2008). *Nowiny PTM*, 7, pp. 63–65.
43. Statement by the Ombudsman. *Wystąpienie RPO do Ministra Inwestycji i Rozwoju ws. spółdzielni mieszkaniowych.* (2018). Retrieved from: <https://www.rpo.gov.pl/pl/content/rpo-upomina-sie-o-zasady-demokracji-bezposredniej-w-spoldzielniach-mieszkaniowych> (accessed: 14.8.2019).
44. Summers, P. (2018). *How to Challenge Ageist Language*. Retrieved from: <https://www.silvercentury.org/2018/01/how-to-challenge-ageist-language/> (accessed: 14.3.2020).
45. Synak, B. (1982). Migracja i adaptacja ludzi starszych do środowiska miejskiego. *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego*.
46. Szatur-Jaworska, B. (2016). *Polska polityka społeczna wobec starzenia się ludności w latach 1971–2013*. Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa.
47. Szmatka, J. (1998). Hasło: aktor. In: *Encyklopedia socjologii*. A. Kojder, K. Koseła, W. Kwaśniewicz, H. Kubiak., J. Mucha, J. Szacki, M. Ziółkowski (Eds.). Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa, pp. 15–17.
48. Turowski, J. (1979). *Środowisko mieszkalne w świadomości ludności miejskiej*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
49. van Hees, S., Horstman, K., Jansen, M., Ruwaard, D. (2015). Conflicting notions of citizenship in old age: An analysis of an activation practice. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 35, pp. 178–189. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaging.2015.09.001>
50. Yuen, B., Soh, E. (2017). *Housing for Older People in Singapore: An Annotated Bibliography*. Cham: Springer.
51. Zaniewska, H. (2001). *Mieszkania starszych ludzi w Polsce. Sytuacja i perspektywy zmian*. Warszawa: Instytut Gospodarki Mieszkaniowej, Wydawnictwo A-ZET Sp. z o.o.
52. Zittoun, Ph. (2017). *The pragmatic approach to the policy process*. Retrieved from: <https://www.dmu.ac.uk/documents/business-and-law-documents/popp/ipa-conference-2017-book-of-abstracts.pdf> (accessed: 2.3.2017).