Chapter 11
Conclusions

Frans Coenen

11.1 The Promises of Participation

In this volume we focus on the functional advantages for government of participatory processes for decision-making. These functional advantages are specific promises that participation holds. The key promise of participation in this volume is that it leads to better decisions. The main question this volume seeks to answer is *what limits and enables information in public participation to lead to better decisions*?

All chapters in this volume either focus on the use of a particular participatory method in environmental decision-making or on a particular type of environmental related decision-making using participatory methods. The analyses are used as a basis for a review and assessment of the central theme: the relation between the limitations of participation arrangements and decision quality.

Participation processes are constituted and regulated by rules. These rules arrange content, participants, information flows, decision mechanism, etc. in a particular participation process. Through the use of particular rules, the participation arrangements will differ in terms of the organisational set-up, information sought from the participants, and the mechanism through which this information is processed. These all depend on the purpose that participation has in the eyes of the organiser. This purpose in itself depends on the underlying perspective the organiser has on the nature of participation. In the introduction chapter we related the purpose and nature of participation with decision quality. It is very difficult to establish an empirical link between participation and outcomes in terms of decision quality (Beierle, 2000; Beierle & Cayford, 2002; Chess, 2000). From a rational methodological standpoint a (quasi) experimental design is the best way to demonstrate that participation leads to decision quality. This would mean that from an experimental logic we would have to compare cases with participation (experiment group) and cases without participation (control group) on their decision quality outcome

F. Coenen(✉)
University of Twente, School of Management and Governance,
Center for Clean Technology and Environmental Policy,
PO Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands
e-mail: f.h.j.m.coenen@utwente.nl

F.H.J.M. Coenen (ed.), *Public Participation and Better Environmental Decisions*,

© Springer Science + Business Media B.V. 2009

(Beierle, 2000). Regardless of this outcome, in policy practice it will be extremely difficult to demonstrate that the effects found are due to public participation efforts and not other variables such as simultaneous events (e.g., local elections), the social context in which the activity takes place (e.g., the composition of the community and the history of controversy), and/or the nature of the environmental problem (Chess & Purcell, 1999). In an experimental logic we need to assume that participation processes can be divided into two groups: an experimental group where participation processes are present and a control group where no participation processes are present. In practice it will be difficult to find a clear difference between the experimental and the control group. It will also be difficult to find clear examples of non-participation (Meadowcroft, 2004). There is also a difference between normal rules for participation and rules actually applied as Huitema shows in his chapter concerning Canada and the UK (see also Huitema, 2002).

The examples in this book are cases where some organiser is allowing for participation. This is in contrast to processes of social negotiation (Gregory, McDaniels, & Fields, 2001) that aim for negotiated or voluntary agreements. Organisers in this volume are government organisations, but also for-profit and non-profit organisations that establish or manage public utilities such as waste treatment facilities.

In Chapter 1 we discussed the instrumental functions of public participation for government. In this instrumental perspective public participation potentially:

- Raises the substantive quality of the decision itself, by adding relevant knowledge to the decision-making process (like good ideas and (lay) expertise by participants)
- Adds to the quality of the analysis, by engaging participants in the assessment and monitoring of alternatives
- Will broaden public support for environmental related decisions which will lead to time gain (shorter decision-making processes in the long term) and co-implementation
- Will reduce the level of conflict and facilitate action and implementation

Table 11.1 refers to the contributions of the authors on the relation between purpose and quality. In the next three sections we link the potential improvements to the purposes of functional participation directed towards decision quality, labelled as:

- Better substantive decisions
- Better analysis and decision making
- Better decision implementation

11.2 Better Substantive Decisions

The chapters in this volume show that participation potentially adds information to a decision making process. But does this mean there will be better substantive decisions through the availability of more information (Beierle, 2002)? We assume that the organiser is interested in this information, and that he or she actively seeks

Table 11.1 The relation between the participation function and decision quality

Chapter	Method/type of decision making	Instrument function	Decisions improve through
Welp, Kasemir, and Jaeger	Integrated assessment focus groups in climate policy	– Use ordinary knowledge in assessment – Bring together scientific and ordinary knowledge – Helping decision makers and scientist to perceive and understand the perspectives of lay persons – Perform a reality check, testing the acceptance	– The use of ordinary knowledge – Insight of decision makers in the perspectives of lay persons – Insight of decision makers in acceptability of decision
Halfacre	Group concern focus groups in nuclear waste clean up	– To assess the concerns of particular groups in society whose voices are seldom heard within traditional methods – Raise legitimacy of decisions for traditionally under-represented in decision-making	– The high quality identification and understanding of concerns across the population
Flynn	Citizen jury/planning cells in waste treatment	– Structured and substantive engagement between 'ordinary citizens' and policy experts or other 'insiders' – Empowers 'ordinary' citizens to be more flexible in determining the scope and scale of the agenda for deliberation – Good means for ensuring reflexivity among policy-makers, by revealing how ordinary citizens view and respond to policy problems or choices	– 'Ordinary citizens' really part of the process – Existing policy network can learn ordinary citizens view and response to policy problems or choices – One can see how a given policy problem can be meaningfully deliberated
Oels	Future search conference in LA21	– Create a shared vision for the future of a community – Bring all relevant information on a topic under discussion without a superiority claim for scientific knowledge	– Using all relevant knowledge (without validity or superiority claim for a certain form – Confrontation of different opinions – Facilitate knew local knowledge
Coenen, Huitema, and Woltjer	Participation in sustainable consumption policy making	– Contributes to the systematic identification of problems and their causes, and the consideration and assessment of alternative strategic options	– A greater awareness by consumers of the environmental impact of their purchases and behaviour

(continued)

Table 11.1 (continued)

Chapter	Method/type of decision making	Instrument function	Decisions improve through
		– Identification of sustainable consumption options based on local knowledge – Increase the legitimacy of decisions concerning consumption patterns, and reduce the level of conflict. people will learn of the environmental problems that society faces (e.g. due to unsustainable consumption)	– Alternative sustainable consumption patterns – Generating consumer power to stimulate environmentally-friendly production choices
Huitema	Participation in waste facility siting	– Overcome negative community feelings, channeled through legal and extra-legal means ('siting gridlock') – Gaining acceptance from surrounding communities	– Reaching a decision – Acceptance of the decision
Doak	Participation in regional sustainable planning	– Build consensus amongst some of the key stakeholder interests in the region – Structure and guide the policy-making process	– Different types of information and knowledge drawn upon and utilised during the different stages of the process – Innovative and holistic negotiated outcomes of the process
Woltjer	Participation in infrastructure planning	– A better foundation for decisions using for local knowledge that would otherwise not be available in the process – React quicker and more precisely to the needs and desires of society – Improve public confidence in government save money and time in the long run, and provide information about	– The generation of support and good will – The generation of relevant knowledge – Through the gaining of good will save time and money and more control in the long term
Coenen	Participation in LA21	– Provide the possibility of articulating the interests of the various stakeholders – Gives local government the information necessary to make decisions	– Shared responsibility for sustainable development – Systematic identification of problems and their causes – Consensus about appropriate action

information. What can we conclude from the preceding contributions about the evidence that information by participation contributes to the quality of decision? For instance the new traffic plan for Groningen did include many of the ideas and contributions of participants and the results of the discussions. Public participation has provided useful data and more information in the formulation of the respective LA21 plans discussed in Chapters 5, 6, and 10.

Participants could raise or prioritise issues that otherwise would be overlooked in the decision making. In the waste management case described by Flynn for instance, the citizen jury raised several issues, such as policies on waste legislation implementation or waste transport that were novel concerns and have been largely forgotten about as the controversy centred on the health risks associated with incineration.

It is clear that participants hold information that would otherwise not be available. In the first place, there is local knowledge (Fisher, 2000). People living in a specific geographic area directly use public services, or pay social costs which means the ordinary public may have its own type of particular 'local' knowledge to bring into the process. The explicit identification of the needs and wishes of the public can also contribute to better-balanced proposals. Woltjers research among planners in practice shows that the need for information about the needs and desires of society is recognised in policy practice. The planners in practice take a very pragmatic look by using participatory strategies as a way to discover and consider alternative solutions founded in local knowledge that otherwise would be neglected. This strategy is especially desirable in projects with a high technical complexity where participatory decision-making strengthens knowledge and mobilises innovative ideas.

These needs and wishes need not be actual objective needs but are often subjective and can therefore not easily be calculated by experts. Halfacre's chapter makes the case that it is important to understand not only what people perceive but also how and why such perceptions arise. This applies especially to minorities or other groups whose perceptions could be easily overlooked. According to Halfacre, policy-makers must look beyond 'objective' characterisations of risk to understand the origin of minority perceptions about those risks.

It is clear that this 'local' knowledge has a value of it's own in the decision-making process. The contribution of Welp et al. discuss participatory, integrated assessments as a way to complement scientific knowledge by relevant ordinary knowledge impregnated by the norms, values, and interests of the participants. But there is a difference between explicitly relying only on ordinary knowledge and integrating these types of knowledge. Relying on scientific arguments alone entails the danger that certain dimensions of a problem, important for the public, will be missed. Welp et al. signal the opposite danger of 'populist decision-making', where expert knowledge is disregarded. For complex environmental problems this can lead to short-sighted decision-making leading to long-term problems.

Where Welp et al. analyse integrated assessment focus groups that bring ordinary and expert knowledge together; the Future Search Conference method described by Oels rejects a privileged role of experts and refuses to give scientific

knowledge claims any air of superiority. The lack of any scientific back-up led in the cases described by Oels to the problem that many innovative ideas generated in the process were ill-thought through ideas lacking meaningful details, ignoring financial considerations, and failing to identify clear cases on sustainable consumption. The chapter by Coenen et al. shows that better information in the sense of the inclusion of local knowledge and creative ideas does not, by definition, imply that this outcome is more sustainable or even environmentally friendly. Sustainable consumption issues often refer to long term impacts, and impacts for large, cross-boundary geographical areas. It requires consideration of the consumption possibilities for other world citizens (particularly in less-developed countries) and for future generations, to consume equally.

Balancing expert and ordinary knowledge goes in both directions. In the Alberstlund case described by Coenen et al., much information is available about the consequences of policies for sustainable development through the use of the environmental latitude concept for the public. Through the integrated assessment focus group method, decision-makers as well as researchers, perceive and understand the perspectives of lay-persons on climate issues.

Not all information given by participants in a public participation process has to be directed towards the actual decision. Participation is closely linked with the acceptance of a policy proposal. In a social-psychological sense it is about the attitude of participants towards a policy proposal. We don't want to discuss social-psychological dimensions of participation reactions in-depth, but conclude from these very basic social-psychological notes that participants can have very different reasons to react to a policy proposal. Participants react not only because they want to see an upcoming decision changed, but also to express their support or disapproval, which can sometimes be relatively loosely connected to the decision at stake. From basic socio-psychological notions it follows that the input could also serve very different goals such as expressing disapproval or support for a decision or just voicing frustration with the decision. In theory, decision makers should not be led by emotion or irrelevant information, or abandon normal decision-making rules because of these emotional reactions; they should not be diverted from an objective appraisal. In Huitema's Canadian case some examples are given of extreme emotional reactions such as 200–300 people invading the county office and opponents making constant calls to the office.

On the other hand, administration is not just looking for relevant information for the decision process, but also for support and legitimacy of the decision. Here we are particular interested in the information component of the public participation and the complementary process of the administration's use of this information.

At one end of the information exchange spectrum are one-way flows of information from the government to the public in forms such as public education campaigns, the provision of right-to-know information, and public notices. At the other end are one-sided flows of information from citizens to government, such as filing complaints.

Most examples in this book are two-way flows of information, either through traditional mechanisms such as public hearing (Checkoway, 1981; Fitzpatrick &

Sinclair, 2003) and citizen advisory committees or methods with a stronger focus on public deliberation such as citizen juries/panels (Crosby, 1995) or Consensus Conferences (Rowe, Marsh, & Frewer, 2004). In some of the cases, e.g., the traffic discussion in Groningen or the Australian water saving case (both described in Chapter 6) there is a strong element of providing information to the public through non-deliberative mechanisms, public notices, or public education. One could argue that a one-sided information flow from government to the public contributes to better decision implementation through information provision.

The question of how much this information exchange is one- or two-sided is often asked in a normative way. The communicative action theory of Jurgen Habermas (Habermas, 1984) plays an important role in this discussion. Communicative action theory states that talk can have the result of binding us to one another in a mutually-shared pursuit of understanding. In this view, the organisation that offers the possibility to participate should, on a basis of arguments and ideally in a situation without a misbalance in power, come to a common view and commitment with the participants leading to shared understanding and binding. This is a narrow view of communication; it excludes strategic communication geared towards selfish ends. It insists that speakers and listeners make them particular truth claims when pursuing communication oriented towards understanding. They must be sincere, factually correct, and have the normative authority to say what they are saying. Some methods rely on a Habermas type of free dialogue that will not be there in practice. As Flynn points out, some advocates of citizen juries hold a certain naivety about the modern policy process. Policy-making may not be open enough to accept or manage the inputs from citizen juries. Instead it will be a process where interests, issues, and ideas (rational or otherwise) collide with one another. Brute political power, institutional inertia, or interests may all count more than argument, persuasion, or rationality.

Does the input from the public add information that improves decisions? The type of information we seek is related to our perspective on decision-quality. The starting point is that public participation can be seen as a means to increase the quality of decision making. Public participation holds the promise that it will add extra information to the decision making process. The assumption is that participants hold specific knowledge that can increase the decision making quality. As a criterion for quality, we use here 'competence'. In our operationalisation of competence worked out in Chapter 1, it relates to the use of information available at the moment of decision making. A 'good' decision does not neglect information available to certain groups in society. In other words, a decision is better if it considers the relevant views of other groups. Arguing for the use of all information available at the time of a decision, raises the question of how do we value information, and which type of information do citizens provide? Lindblom and Cohen (1979) make a distinction between scientific, ordinary, and interactive knowledge. Scientific knowledge owes its origin, testing, degree of verification, truth status, or currency to distinctive professional techniques. Ordinary knowledge owes its origin to common sense, casual empiricism, or thoughtful speculation and analysis. Finally, interactive knowledge is produced by participating actors during

the process; about the process as well as about other actors, their objectives, and related subjects. Although it cannot be known a priori which kind of actor possesses which type of information, it makes sense to assume that citizens are especially likely to inject ordinary knowledge into decision-making and that this kind of (often context-specific) knowledge can be a very helpful addition to increase decision quality.

Beierle (2000) notes that “there is a tendency to assume that the citizens participating in environmental policy decisions are laypeople rather than experts. Yet the capacity that participants bring to the table can often be quite impressive…”. In the 239 case studies he reviewed, he observes that

> [I]n roughly 40% of the cases for which data…[was] available, there was a significant level of technical capacity among most of the participants. In another roughly 45%, there were at least some participants with significant technical capacity who could act as internal technical resources for the rest of the group. In the remaining cases, participants had little overt technical or issue-related expertise. It is only to this last 15% that the label ‘lay public’ most appropriately applies (Beierle, 2000, Appendix 3: 16).

The expertise level expected from participants depends on the type of participation process and the knowledge need for this process. As Coenen points out, a bottom-up LA21 process depends very much on the quality and power of the actors involved. NGOs and other actors need to be well organised to play a role in Local Agenda 21, and municipalities generally find it difficult to find equal and relevant partners for the dialogue. To participate in the early stages of the planning process requires more than a single response to a draft plan. Constructively commenting on proposals demands a variety of ‘skills’, formulating alternatives, and counter arguments even more so. The effect of a lack of help in collecting and processing information on the citizens is that they are significantly handicapped during the entire process, unless they happen to have experts in their midst.

Welp et al. address the problem of ordinary knowledge versus expert knowledge as basically the contradiction between two ways of decision-making: populist and technocratic. The cases in this book show very different models of dealing with expert knowledge:

– Participants are considered as experts in their own right
– A rejection of expert input
– Integration of expert knowledge and ordinary knowledge

Welp et al. argue that the role of science and expert knowledge is changing. Major uncertainties, both in the science and the politics of environmental issues, mean that expert knowledge cannot provide a complete and incontestable description of the issues. Rather than offering clear and compelling advice to determine policy, such expert knowledge becomes only a part of a broader process of social learning.

In Future Search Conferences the idea of the privileged role of experts is rejected. The knowledge provided by experts is no longer automatically regarded superior to other ways of knowing. By bringing together a carefully selected spectrum of stakeholders to an issue, the Future Search Conference instead aims to bring the relevant information on the topic under discussion into the room and make it available to all

stakeholder groups as a basis for decision-making and action planning The Future Search Conference method encourages participants to draw on multiple ways of making validity claims, thereby refusing to give scientific knowledge claims.

The opinion of citizens is placed above expert knowledge in the NOP case described in Chapter 6. The USDA suggests that the will of the people should set aside the authority of scientific discourse. The argument for prohibition is not scientific. In fact the USDA states that there is no scientific evidence that the use of the excluded methods presents unacceptable risks to the environment.

Different types of information and knowledge are drawn upon and utilised during the different stages in a decision process. For instance in the siting cases described by Huitema, any citizen has access to the process during the consultation and inquiry stage of the process; citizens can listen to information and talk back. In the following stages they have much less participatory influence. In the regional planning process described by Doak, the Sustainability Panel facilitated the input of a selective range of mostly expert stakeholder groups in the first stage. A wider range of stakeholder perspectives due was addressed more fully during the public consultation stage when a much broader range of local and sub-regional interests became involved in focussed workshops, written responses, and locally-based events. In the Public Examination and subsequent report, business interests supported their competitive interest using research and information from planning and economic consultants.

11.3 Quality of Assessment

A second aspect of the functional advantaged of participation is that the involvement of the public raises the quality of assessment of alternatives. This presumed advantage has to be placed against the background of our perspective on decision-quality, which argues that all information available at the time of decision should be used when decisions are made.

The thesis is that better decision-making through the involvement of participants leads to better analysis and better assessment of alternatives in the decision making process.

That there are different views on this assessment is perfectly illustrated by the following citation from the Science Advisory Board Commentary of the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The commission states[1]:

Basing decisions on a careful consideration of all available science is a basic part of the EPA's mission. However, in the press of day-to-day operation even the Agency may be diverted from this mission. For obvious and legitimate political reasons, the Agency is interested in minimizing controversy. Especially in

[1] Appendix A – "Science Advisory Board Commentary on the Role of Science in 'New Approaches' to Environmental Decision-making that Focuses on Stakeholder Involvement," EPA-SAB-EC-COM-00-002, October 7, 1999.

newer decision environments, which involve a greater focus on consultation and negotiation among directly involved stakeholders, there is a risk that the broad public interest in assuring that decisions are based on a full consideration of all available science may receive too little attention.

A distinction is often made in literature between 'simple' consultation methods and methods that involve randomly selected groups with a direct impact on high level decision making, innovative methods like citizen juries, deliberative polling, and citizen panels. We believe that different methods provide different forms of information which are all valuable. Simple consultation methods such as hearings and public surveys often involve larger groups of the population, but this does not mean that these lager groups are representative. A second important distinction in addition to the representation of the participants from random selection is the attempt to make these randomly selected participants more knowledgeable on the issue up for participation so they can give a more informed opinion. The problem with the simple consultation methods is that this ordinary opinion from, for instance opinion polls or public hearings, only provides snapshots of relatively uninformed public views, not what people might think if they were allowed to deliberate. Deliberation raises the quality because participants from the general public are chosen in a way as representative groups of citizens through some appropriate random process (which excludes interested parties) and are given the time and resources to understand an issue before they are asked for advice. Experiences with the development and use of such methods in both the United States and Europe demonstrate that, given adequate time and resources, lay groups can perform extremely well in such advisory capacities (Crosby, 1995). In contrast, in Future Search Conferences educational inputs during the conference days are strongly discouraged as participants would feel less inclined to draw on their own resourcefulness.

Public participation can not only add to the quality of the analysis by engaging participants in the assessment and monitoring of alternatives, but also because of the interaction between participants who can learn from each other. In the first place, there is the confrontation between expert or 'insider' knowledge and ordinary knowledge. The chief argument that Flynn presents in his chapter on citizen juries is that they achieve a type of deliberation over policy options which is valuable because it forces engagement between the views, values, and information of ordinary citizens with those of policy experts or other 'insiders'. The hope is that experts realise there may be more views to the problem than just their own and a more genuine engagement between experts and citizens is achieved.

In her chapter, Halfacre alludes to the fact that the interaction between participants in focus groups illuminates the logic and assumptions of the respondents; interaction allows individuals time to rethink positions, arguments, and opinions. According to Halfacre, participants would agree with other participants' statements, or even rethink their own and other's arguments many times in the focus groups analysed in her chapter. Oels also reports from her Future Search Conferences that participants reported that they had learned a lot from each other over the course of the event.

Welp et al. in their chapter on integrated assessment focus groups argue that dialogues between the scientific community and the extended peer community, be it ordinary citizen or stakeholders with an interest in a specific problem or issue, provide a setting for mutual learning.

11.4 Better Decision Implementation

The chapters also give some proof that participation contributes to better or easier implementation. Better implementation can be interpreted as the avoidance of implementation problems. Implementation problems can arise from a lack of information. Implementation problems lie in time delay, costs, and conflict. They can follow from a lack of legitimacy of a specific decision or a general lack of trust in the organisation that makes the contested decision. Woltjer illustrates that in practice planners view participation as one of the means to save time and money in implementation. Participatory decision-making should lead to more control over the planning process and its outcome.

A general condition for successful implementation is building trust among policy target groups and gaining cooperation from co-implementing actors. Non participatory procedures could lead to conflict and a lack of legitimate decisions; particular siting decisions. In an American context, easier implementation can mean avoiding lawsuits. The absence of citizen input can hinder the implementation of laws and subsequently, can produce increased litigation over agency decisions such as the location of dangerous installations. Huitema shows that if negative community feelings are not overcome through participation, these feelings will be channelled through legal procedures and sometimes through extra-legal means ('siting gridlock').

But building trust and legitimacy is not only important for single issue or siting decisions. Including the views of citizens is also important for sustainable policies, which can only be effective and successful when accepted by the majority of affected people. This is particularly important if stakeholders are co-implementers or when behaviour change is expected from stakeholders. The participants not only include public parties, but also a variety of private actors that have the resources and means of power that can be decisive for the success of policies and plans. Especially a 'sense of ownership' of a plan or project can ease implementation. Methods can have a specific meaning for building trust. Flynn notes that more generally, distrust by many citizens of the modern policy process is also cited as a reason for citizen juries, along with the belief that decision-making is increasingly beyond their control or comprehension.

Building trust is not only important between stakeholders and government but among stakeholders themselves. Oels reports that Future Conference participants gave many examples of collaborative endeavours that had become possible as a result of these new or revived contacts during the conferences. If a conference climate is conducive to establishing rapport and trust between participants,

lasting networks are formed. Participants reported that their willingness to make a contribution to the local community had increased as a result of connecting with such a large number of people who seemed to care deeply about its future.

Some cases in the book show actual implementation success due to participation. In the traffic case described by Coenen et al., an indicator of the support gained through the participatory preparation of the traffic plan, the official public enquiry procedure after the plan was relatively short and no major adjustments were made. In the water consumption case in the same chapter, market research indicated very high levels of support (over 90%) for the overall directions of the water strategy after the participation process.

11.5 Limitations of the Instrumental Function of Participation

Many limitations of participation are discussed in the literature. Typical limitations mentioned are that participants are incompetent, only interested in their own personal interest, and not representative of the wider population. Participation processes would undermine existing (democratic) decision structures, be dominated by prevailing stakeholders, increase the probability of a conflict, and cost time and money.

Much of the discussions on limitations of participation are discussions on the limitations of specific participation methods. The methods described in the following table (Table 11.2) and discussed in the book all have in common that each raises objections against more traditional public hearing and public comment methods (e.g., public hearings or surveys). Typical limitations of these traditional methods mentioned would be:

1. The information gained through these methods is limited.
2. The information exchange is one sided.
3. Participants don't feel they are in a secure environment to express their ideas.
4. Participants have little control over the agenda for information exchange.
5. There is a bias towards certain opinions, either because certain interests are not present or through the dominance of certain interest in these traditional methods.

Here we are interested in what limits and what enables the instrumental function of participation to support better decisions through information. *What limits and what enables information in public participation to lead to better decisions*? Limitations of the contribution of public participation to effective decision-making through information lie in the organisational set-up of the participation process, the type of information sought from the participants, and the mechanism through which this information is processed.

We can ask about limitations for all three instrumental functions.

What limits and what enables public participation to raise the substantive quality of the decision by adding relevant knowledge to the decision-making process? In Section 11.6 we discuss examples of limitations in getting the correct substantive

Table 11.2 Strengths and weaknesses of the participation methods discussed (Abelson et al., 2003; Creighton, Priscoli, & Dunning, 1998; Halvorsen, 2001, 2003; IAP, 2003; Innes, 1999; Lawrence & Deagen, 2001; Petts & Leach, 2000; Rowe, 2000; Rowe & Frewer, 2005)

		Future Search Conferences	Planning cells/ Citizen juries	Focus groups	Public hearing
Additional source of ideas and information	Strengths	– Obtaining informed opinions from laypersons	– The small size of individual cells and its non-intimidating nature allows for innovative ideas and active participation – The approach creates informed, active, engaged citizenry. – Provides opportunities to introduce new perspectives and challenge existing ones.	– Good way to learn about the needs or opinions of a particular group	– It has the potential for improving decision-making and informing citizens.
	Weakness	– The process may set expectations that public bodies are unable to meet	– It is difficult to keep bias out of the information dissemination process.	– Risk that ideas expressed are influenced/ shaped by interactions with (dominant) participants	– Special interest groups may dominate the hearings which biases feedback
Adding to the quality of the analysis	Strengths	– Visioning emphasizes consensus building, collaboration and cooperation	– Encourages more careful examination of the issue. – Participants represent all citizens and not special interest groups. – All members of the population have an equal chance to be a part of this process.		
	Weakness		– The authority defines the problems. – Only useful for problems in need of unique decisions.	– Selection criteria and limited number of representatives can bias opinions. – Lack of informed participants produces superficial discussion	

(continued)

Table 11.2 (continued)

		Future Search Conferences	Planning cells/ Citizen juries	Focus groups	Public hearing
Adding to implementation (Broadening of public support, reducing the level of conflict)	Strengths	– Fosters connections /partnerships between different organization; a strong educative role.	– The process contributes to public trust in democracy because of the emphasis on making decision-makers more accountable. – Resulting decisions are frequently implemented.	– Informal, discussion of issues in a relaxed atmosphere can often lead to consensus and feeling of enrichment among participants	– If the hearings are transparent, presenting an "expert voice" may minimize conflict.
	Weakness	– Contrary visions may be irreconcilable.	Decisions are not always feasible	– Potential for revealing and reinforcing social divisions	– Often late in the process – The process does not generate a sense of ownership

(representative and unbiased) information and limitations in making sure that the information is used so that it is really added to the decision-making process.

What limits and what enables public participation to add to the quality of the analysis, by engaging participants in the assessment and monitoring of alternatives? In Section 11.7 we discuss examples of limitations in necessary resources, the type of decisions involved, and the right environment for the assessment.

What limits and what enables public participation to broaden public support, reduce the level of conflict and facilitate action and implementation? In Section 11.8 we discuss examples in this book of limitations that arise from a lack of trust and commitment.

11.6 Limitations in Using Participants Information

The first instrumental purpose of participation we distinguish is raising the substantive quality of the decisions by adding relevant knowledge to the decision-making process. What limits public participation to raise the substantive quality of the decision by adding relevant knowledge to the decision-making process? We discuss here limitations in getting the right substantive (representative and unbiased) information and limitations in getting the information used so that it is really added to the decision-making process.

11.6.1 Getting the Right Information

A general concern with participation is that participants are not representative of the wider population, and the information they produce depends on the views, goals and insights of these particular participants. Whether this non representation forms a problem depends on what one expects from the participation process. For generating innovative ideas or adding local knowledge, the participants don't have to be representative, although one would have to realise that the information is potentially biased. It can also be the case that one explicitly wants to hear the voice of a certain group. Halfacre's example discusses the possibility of focus groups to target traditionally under-represented groups including minorities and lower income individuals who have historically had a limited or no voice at all, in the political process. But these focus groups can also target citizens that are 'disproportionately effected' by certain decisions; often minorities and low income groups.

For getting information, views, and needs, governments have traditionally relied either on focus groups, public advisory committees, or opinion polls. These traditional public comments methods are limited due to technical problems. Halfacre points out that these traditional methods clearly discriminate against the participation of certain groups. Telephone surveys for instance, have low minority response rates and are hindered by an absence of phones in many low-income households.

No matter how representative the citizens' input in all three methods may be, only a small number of citizens really contribute. The use of new communications technologies in public involvement in policy-making, often referred to as digital government, can change this dramatically as shown in the example of the input by consumers in national policy-making described by Coenen et al. Only a small number of citizens could be reached without these new information technologies. If the issue at stake occurs in a geographically small area, traditional methods reach a larger share of the population. Only a very limited number of citizens would be directly involved in national policy-making, notwithstanding how representative of the whole population this number would be.

In some of the other cases, even if the participants are not representative of the wider population, the share number of participants is sometimes impressive. Huitema mentions in the UK siting case 35,000 signatures against the BFES proposal. These 35,000 signatures are still nowhere near half of the population; and the reactions came mainly from people living near the proposed site. In the organic rule proposal described by Coenen et al. more than a quarter of a million reactions were received, but this is still only a fraction of the US population. Larger numbers can also exclude certain groups. In the Groningen mobility case described in the same chapter the municipality received nearly 10,000 suggestions on how to deal with the traffic problems from about 6,000 respondents. The respondents were biased towards membership of organised interest groups and higher educated citizens. Only about 20% of the participants in the open planning process were from out of town; most commuters and visitors did not participate.

Bias and potentially manipulation can be caused by how the process is organised and the methodological limitations of the participation methods used.

Sometimes the problem lies in the method itself. Even if the participation process starts with a group of citizens representative of the wider population, as Flynn points out, in citizen juries these 'ordinary citizens' are transformed from passive into active participants in the policy process. They are no longer a faithful representative set of what Flynn calls sometimes 'rationally ignorant/indifferent' voters and consumers. In his opinion all we can then learn from a citizen jury is how ordinary citizens might respond if a wider policy debate utilises certain types of evidence, arguments, and persuasion akin to a citizen jury. As a result the jury verdict of citizens in the end may not relate to those of a wider electorate, who wouldn't have the benefit of several days of carefully managed deliberation.

Some participation methods are not meant to be representative at all. As Oels analysis shows, access to the Future Search Conference is always highly restricted. Participants are selected from a range of those affected by the outcomes, those with information on the local key issues, and those with resources to facilitate action. There was no process by which a sector could nominate their own candidates or by which those who felt they would be affected by the outcomes were given a right to participate. In the Future Search Conferences studied, a local elite of committed people was gathered, but they failed to attract a cross-section of 'ordinary' citizens. This bias is implied in the Future Search guidance which emphasises the importance of getting the local 'movers and shakers' into the conference room – in

addition to the citizens. In one of the case studies, the business sector and young people were under-represented at the conference.

But whether under – or over-representation of certain groups presents a danger to the quality of decision-making, depends on the function of participation. As pointed out in the chapters on LA21 the function of participation was to involve as many citizens as possible in direct interaction. If in practice individual LA21 participants are limited to an elite group used to participating in societal activities, this function is threatened. Some methods claim that it offers a solution for the problem that specific interest groups dominate the process (Hendriks, 2002). Flynn argues that citizen juries may be a viable way of guarding against this and ensuring that special interest groups are not engaged excessively.

How representative the information is, is not only influenced by the chosen method but also by the institutional arrangements and how the process is organised (Peelle, Schweitzer, Munro, Carnes, & Wolfe, 1996). How the process is organised determines who is in the process and the decision-making phase that the participants are involved in. An example is the dominance of existing environmental NGOs in LA21 processes in the so-called 'external forum' LA21s. In these LA21s the forum takes over the process. The 'LA21 forum' becomes a meeting place for drawing up alternative plans and policies based on anti-establishment (i.e., anti-Council) attitudes among local activists and NGOs. The problem is that other groups such as business are clearly under-represented.

These examples show that early involvement is often restricted to a limited and invited group of citizens or organisations. The local authority is also very influential in LA21s in terms of the representativeness of the participation, since they can decide which actors to involve in the process. Doak shows in his chapter the differences between the phases in the process. Certain stakeholders dominated certain phases, particularly business interests (or their hired planning consultants). The decision of the Panel to use SERPLAN as a surrogate or representative for the local authorities of the region also meant that SERPLAN was often left without the 'usual' wall of local authority support to help them argue the case against business organisations objecting to the submitted strategy.

Some form of manipulation in the participation process is always possible. Huitema describes the attempts to influence the community by approaching certain local leaders, selected on the basis of 'power structure analyses', to become active local proponents of the facility. Flynn mentions that experts in the citizens' juries process may subtly influence the views and opinions of the jurors. An interesting aspect of the NOP rule case is the role of the media. The media can focus on certain opinions, scientists for instance, and give less attention to others such as business interests.

Welp et al. mention that there is a potential risk of manipulation of IA Focus Groups. For example, if the method is adapted to include broader policy advice, the moderator can to some extent, have an impact on the discussions and outcomes by selecting certain information to be presented and by choosing certain models. They think that the possibility of abusing the method must be taken into account. Rather than using this as a reason for not applying the method, careful application is needed.

11.6.2 The Information in Decision-Making

Getting the right information is only one factor that potentially hinders the instrumental function of participation to improve the substantive quality of decisions by adding information. Information has to be used so that it is really added to the decision-making process.

There is a difference between using information and changing the decision. In line with the criterion of competence when talking about effective participation, the question is not if the information from the participation changed the decision, but whether the information from the participation process is used and plays a role in the decision-making process. In many cases there is no major decisive role for the outcome of the participation in terms of decision outcomes.

An example of non-use is offered by Flynn. This citizen jury report was circulated to all elected members of the two local governments, planning staff of the local governments, and all the local media. However, a response from the elected representatives was almost entirely absent, and that from the local governments' environmental policy staff was minimal. In fact no formal feedback was offered and the findings were simply left to one side as the fruits of a limited and experimental jury seen as a pilot type approach.

The question is how much the participation process is institutionalised and related to the actual decision-making process. Problems lie in the built-in mechanism of transferring outcomes to the political decision-making process in the participation methods and the institutional arrangements around the use of the information from the participation process. The difficult problem with the institutionalisation for the participation process in the actual decision-making is the tension between participatory and representative democracy (Lafferty & Meadowcroft, 1996) The other side of the coin is management of the expectations that the participants hold about decision influence.

Several of the methods (IA Focus groups, citizen juries, future conferences) have no clear integral mechanism of transferring outcomes to the political decision-making process. Instead, it is a case-by-case decision whether the outcome reaches political decision-making. Sometimes the organiser of the participation voluntarily commits himself to using the outcomes of the participation process. Flynn reports on citizen juries that although the jury outcome is almost never legally binding for decision-makers, authorities usually agree to honour some of its findings. Huitema describes in his Canadian case the addition of a local veto to the normal decision procedures. How and by whom such a local veto should be exercised was not clear, but the intention was that in the event of local opposition, the facility would be located elsewhere. These institutional arrangements could be described as a voluntary binding referendum.

If there is no integrated mechanism to transfer the results of the participation process into some form of voluntary binding agreement by the organiser, there are other ways to raise the issues that established policy actors will use the participation outcomes.

One arrangement is that some politicians become directly involved in the participation process, such as in the Future Search Conferences. Another involves policy insiders with connections to conventional policy networks, such as Flynn's proposition for effective citizen juries.

If there is no built-in mechanism to transfer the outcomes from the participation process into the decision-making than the participation process runs the risk of being disembodied from the actual decision-making context or even being seen as a 'rival' process. For instance, LA21 proposals do not find their way into land-use plans and budgets, and community visions are not implemented in any way.

Oels talks about a double institutional problem in dealing with Future Search Conferences and the LA21 process. This problem is caused because LA21 processes in general tend to have weak links with Council decision-making, and Future Search Conferences have a weak link with the rest of the LA21 process.

Another problem is the level of government where formal decision-making takes place. In many issues the decision power is not found with the government that organises the participation but lies in the hands of a higher institution, for instance national or European level government. As Coenen points out, this is particular a problem in LA21s as the constitutional position of local authorities is very weak and/or the municipalities in LA21 processes are very small.

Limitations also lie in the decision power of the organisation that arranges the public participation. Participation only influences a part of the whole constellation of decision-making. A participatory phase in the whole decision-making process can't turn the whole constellation upside down. For instance, in siting decisions, power lies in the hands of the private companies, especially the site selection and the choice of technology. The local authority must decide on the acceptability of the proposal but is strongly checked by central government and thus does not have space to decide on the basis of local considerations. The participation process is embedded in these existing rules. The two cases described by Huitema show an interesting difference. The Canadian siting process in Swan Hills was not written down in law, but slowly emerged from the work of various advisory committees and temporarily set aside the Canadian rules, whereas in the UK case the 'normal' decision rules continued to apply.

Participatory decision-making in sustainable consumption policies is limited without the government power to carry out final decisions. Many decisions in the field of sustainable consumption are private, and only when the government has some form of responsibility over these decisions can they be subject to indirect participation.

This disembodiment also has to do with the acceptance of the participation method. Welp et al. mention that the contribution of IA Focus Groups to better decision-making not only depends on how decision-makers are involved in the process and informed about the outcomes, but if they are aware of the benefits of the IA Focus Group method. In Oels case Olching, the fact that only 5 out of 30 councillors were invited led to open hostility by the majority of councillors towards the Future Search Conference project. The acceptance can also be a matter of culture and experiences with participation in the past, such as how different LA21 implementation is in different countries.

This acceptance relates to by whom and why participation is introduced in the decision-making process. This does not have to be initiated by the organiser of the participation. If a law, an international treaty, or donor organisation obliges some form of participation in the process, this it does not mean that practice in a certain country or organisation will be ready for these ideas.

Tension between participatory and representative democracy is another aspect of the acceptance of the outcomes of the participation process in the decision-making because participants want real influence. Participants want to believe that their input will have consequences in decision-making. On the other hand, civil servants and politicians do not always have high expectations of the value of participants' input. The Groningen example is a typical illustration of the tension between participatory decision-making and representative democracy. Citizens expect real influence in decision-making, and then find out that it is the responsibility of elected politicians. In the organic food case many commentaries raised questions about the influence of the NSOB board on the first proposed rule. In the end the overwhelming opposition had real influence on the final outcome. Formally, the final decision was taken by means of representative democracy. In practice, representative democracy gave in to direct democracy because of the overwhelming opposition to the proposed rule.

11.7 Limitations of Participation to Add to the Quality of Assessment

The second instrumental purpose of participation we distinguish is that public participation potentially adds to the quality of the analysis by engaging participants in the assessment and monitoring of alternatives. What limits and enables public participation to add to the quality of the analysis by engaging participants in the assessment and monitoring of alternatives? In this section we discuss examples in this book of limitations in necessary resources, the type of decisions involved, and the right environment for the assessment.

11.7.1 Resources

One of the limitations to the improvement of the quality of analysis by engaging participants are the resources necessary for the assessment and monitoring of alternatives both from the organisers' side and from the participants' side. Organising a participation process leads to costs compared with decision-making without participation. But if participation is legally prescribed these costs can not be avoided. Modern IT-methods can save money on legal requests. For instance, the electronic document management system in the Organic Rule case described by Coenen et al. eliminated the need to make three copies of each comment and saved the USDA $300,000 in copying and labour costs.

Costs for the more innovative participatory methods can be higher than for traditional public comment and hearing methods. But costs can only be compared if the same gains are achieved. Against the costs of an IA Focus Group effort, including preparation, moderation and documentation, there is the gain of group discussion on complex global and/or regional issues giving a multitude of perspectives, providing insights which would not be acquired using non-dialogic methods.

There are also costs of non-participation in decision-making (Busenberg, 2000). For instance, UK planning legislation prescribes that an 'award of costs' against an authority is possible if applications are refused for improper reasons; in Huitema's case local government feared this possibility was real. In the US there is always the fear of legal suits. Gains from investments in reaching out to different target groups may be considerable; there is no assurance that resources invested will necessarily yield a high political return in a better informed, more acquiescent, or supportive minority community as Halfacre reports.

Flynn points out the relation between the resources an authority puts into a participatory process and influence of the participation process. In a number of citizen jury cases in Germany a great degree of resources have been given by the federal and state governments which permitted more time and larger numbers to be involved (up to 25 jurors over 5 days as the norm). As a result there was much more interest from these authorities in the findings as well as an increased likelihood that they will respect them.

There are not only costs for the organisers but also for participants in terms of time and resources (Marinetto, 2003). Participation can be a time-consuming process. The time that participants have to spend depends on the length and type of the process. Some of the innovative methods such as citizen juries described by Flynn involve serious time commitments in a short period. In the Groningen mobility plan the total process took 18 months and therefore some people dropped out and lost interest. Second, there is the problem of information overload. In the Groningen case the participants judged the quality of information as good, but sometimes the amount was excessive. This could have discouraged participants during the process, especially lower-educated ones. It is remarkable that the participants themselves reported that they did not see the information overload and time requirements as much of a problem, nor the duration of the total process.

Some processes expect participants to continuously participate in decision-making. In the Albertslund case the so-called user group is a form of binding citizen involvement in policy-making, within structures overseen by elected or appointed officials. In overseeing and reacting to all proposals before they are passed on to the municipal council, it is probably unrealistic to rely on non-binding, ad-hoc participation by individuals. As Woltjer put forward for infrastructure planning, people simply do not have the time, or find it unnecessary, to continuously participate in decision-making. But Coenen et al. conclude that what in fact is created in Albertslund through this user group is a new form of representative democracy, that at best, is a form of more direct democracy.

There is a clear difference in how demanding processes are for participants. But these demands not only depend on the time commitments but also on how

demanding the process is. For instance, thinking about the sustainable development agenda of one's own community described in the chapters that deal with LA21 is more demanding for participants than reacting to a siting decision. It asks participants to constructively comment on proposals requiring a variety of 'skills', and the ability to formulate alternatives and counter arguments. Further participatory decision-making on strategic issues requires knowledge and time generally not available to individual citizens. The organic food rule from Chapter 6 illustrates that a relatively easy manner of obtaining information and reactions through the Internet raises the number of participants involved quite spectacularly. The ACT case from the same chapter illustrates how a less traditional participation approach can be less demanding on citizens.

Woltjer concludes that a broad-based participation strategy may not always be desirable if a process in infrastructure planning is too complex, requires too much specialised knowledge and a high degree of homogeneity of interests. If people simply do not have the time, or find it unnecessary to continuously participate in decision-making, than the type of participation strategy chosen can influence representation. Authorities can influence representation through the way the participation process creates demands for the participants, in terms of time and the issues addressed.

11.7.2 Types of Decisions

The type of decision further limits the improvement of the quality of analysis by engaging participants in the assessment and monitoring of alternatives. Different types of decisions ask for different analysis and therefore different participation methods and institutional arrangements. In the perspective of environmental related decision-making, we have seen examples of:

- Single issues such as infrastructure projects
- The sustainable development agenda of one's own community
- Locally-unwanted land uses such as hazardous waste treatment facilities
- Choices that affect the lives of the members of the community

We see a difference in decisions that directly affect participants and decisions about strategic goals, norms, and values. In these strategic decisions it is not clear what is at stake for the participants, and decisions on these issues are not of immediate interest to the participant. Decisions that directly affect the participants can range in terms of technical complexity, controversy, and conflict of interest.

The second category of more strategic decisions creates social dilemmas. As Coenen et al. discuss, this is particularly relevant to sustainable consumption. Many decisions to consume may be very rational from the perspective of the individual consumer but not from collective interests with respect to sustainable development and the prevention of environmental degradation. The experiences with LA21 in the chapters by Coenen and Oels show it is difficult to get citizens and interest groups

involved in abstract, strategic, issues. It is easier to attract citizens to concrete discussions on the 'here and now' and liveability, than to involve them in the 'there and then' discussion of global and future problems. The case of the sustainable water strategy described by Coenen et al. proves that community involvement can be used to show that a water supply strategy involves choices that affect the lives of the members of the community. For locally-unwanted land uses such as the hazardous waste treatment facilities described in Huitema's chapter, a major problem is gaining acceptance from surrounding communities. Participatory processes can play a role here.

Woltjer analyses of conceptions of planners in practice, notes that it is typical for infrastructure planners to want to gear participatory decision-making towards specific, ad hoc, and piecemeal decision-making; emphasising individual projects rather than using participation for coherent, comprehensive plans. We can conclude that the range of application and employment of these methods is limited. They are not simple panacea that can always be used; it really depends on the purpose of public participation and the type of decisions.

Planning cells and citizen juries have been applied mainly to local or regional single-issue problems. Citizen juries often deal with fairly specific decisions. Flynn puts forward that the citizen jury approach seems better equipped to cope with value issues, although jurors are also quite capable of coping with highly complex technical issues. Citizen Juries are less appropriate for solving especially difficult environmental disputes; in these cases Meditation or Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) could be better approaches. Oels also states that mediation might be a more promising method to use for issues involving conflicting interests.

A focus group approach discussed in the chapter by Halfacre can be used to get a better insight into how controversial and problematic a particular site is for different groups of citizens. If participation deals with complex policy issues such as global climate change then, as Welp et al. point out, procedures are needed which allow ordinary citizens to access expert knowledge and make informed judgements. Conventional focus groups are not well suited to providing information for integrated assessments, but IA Focus Group procedures allow ordinary citizens to become involved in assessment processes for highly complex environmental issues such as global change.

11.7.3 Create the Right Environment for the Assessment

What further limits the improvement of the quality of analysis by engaging participants in the assessment and monitoring of alternatives is the environment in which this assessment takes place. Many of the examples in this book are not the more 'simple' traditional consultation methods like public hearings but methods that involve selected groups like focus groups, citizen juries and Future Search Conferences. These more innovative methods are supposed to create a better environment for participants to discuss alternatives and add to the quality of the assessment

because deliberation plays a more important role. Deliberation raises the quality because dominant interests are excluded or balanced and participants are given the time and resources to understand an issue before they are asked for advice.

The problem in the more traditional methods is a bias towards certain opinions, either because certain interests are not present or through the dominance of a certain interest. Because of these dominant actors, participants don't feel they are in a secure environment to express their ideas. Participants also have little control over the agenda for information exchange which makes real deliberation difficult.

Buzz words are empowering, informing, and build trust among participants. Halfacre shows that focus group sessions provide a secure environment for discussants to express their concerns. The focus group method empowers individuals to express themselves freely, and expand upon points and arguments. This 'empowering' is important for individuals from marginalised groups who may not feel confident in expressing their opinions. Flynn argues that citizen juries' deliberation is arguably much more extensive and far ranging than focus groups, as it empowers 'ordinary' citizens to be more flexible in determining the scope and scale of the agenda for deliberation. What IA Focus groups distinguish from other types of focus groups is bringing together expert knowledge and the views of ordinary citizens.

Oels reports on both investigated Future Search Conferences that they established an over all collaborative mode of deliberation which struck conference participants as exactly the opposite of the adversarial rituals of party politics. Participants at both conferences showed themselves impressed by the level of responsibility and commitment displayed by their fellow participants. They reported that they had treated each other with a previously unknown amount of respect.

Who organises the participation process is important for the creation of the right environment. In the German case study, those who organised the Future Search Conference as volunteers decided that it was time for the Council's professional staff to take over the burden of coordination. In the absence of capable Council staff, this created a leadership vacuum.

In Local Agenda 21 the role of local authorities changed from that of director to facilitator. Municipalities are not supposed to play a dominant role in LA21 environmental processes, but act as a facilitator and partner in an open dialogue. However, the appeal in Chapter 28 clearly expects a leading role for municipalities in organising the dialogue. This results in LA21 processes having to find their own way in regular decision-making processes. Without adequate and serious involvement by local authorities this will not work.

11.8 Limitations in Improving Implementation Through Public Participation

The third instrumental purpose of participation we distinguish is broadening public support, reducing the level of conflict, and facilitating action and implementation. *What limits and enables public participation to broaden public support, reduce the level of conflict, and facilitate action and implementation*?

In Section 11.4 we interpreted better implementation as avoiding implementation problems. Implementation problems can arise from a lack of information, legitimacy of a specific decision, or a general lack of trust in the organisation that makes the contested decision.

Innovative methods such as the Future Search Conferences facilitated a new local knowledge base amongst the conference participants that can contribute to action and implementation after the conference. What limits this function is that this knowledge base is not extended beyond the conference room and was therefore not drawn upon by the local Council for their formal decision-making processes. Both conferences only involved a tiny proportion of councillors and officers. Therefore, the conference offered little opportunity for the formal holders of political power to learn.

A general condition for successful implementation is building commitment and trust among policy target groups and gaining cooperation from co-implementing actors. The legitimacy of a specific decision depends on the type of decisions. Woltjer shows that project managers are often reluctant to allow interest groups and citizens to take part in decision-making. When confronted with a technically complicated project, project managers aim their participatory processes towards improving the use of knowledge and new ideas. In situations dominated by process complexity, project managers aim at support and acceptance.

There is a difference between commitments reached within the conference or jury room. Oels argues for her cases that the constructive conference atmosphere was only possible because it did not threaten anyone's interests.

Flynn points out that participation methods are restricted on reaching commitment compared with the outside world. A citizen jury does not tell us how the actual disputants can be reconciled, nor does it provide a suggested area of consensus for the protagonists. If any consensus is reached it is merely that of 'ordinary citizens' under tightly controlled conditions, which might not be representative for the world outside the jury room.

It may also be the case that consensus and commitment is only reached in a particular decision-making phase. In the regional planning strategy for Southeast England, each phase involved different approaches and styles of engagement with varying configurations of interest. During the process there was an increasing 'opening-up' of the policy-making process to business interests and a 'closing-down' of participation opportunities for local interests that occurred at the Public Examination.

References

Abelson, J., Forest, P. G., Eyles, J., Smith, P., Martin, E., & Gauvin, F. P. (2003). Deliberations about deliberative methods: Issues in the design and evaluation of public participation processes. *Social Science & Medicine, 57*(2), 451–482.

Beierle, T. C. (2000). *Quality of stakeholder-based decisions: Lessons from the case study record.* Resources for the Future. RFF Discussion Paper 00–56.

Beierle, T. C. (2002). The quality of stakeholder-based decisions. *Risk Analysis, 22*(4), 739–749.

Beierle, T. C. & Cayford, J. (2002). *Democracy in practice: Public participation in environmental decisions*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

Busenberg, G. J. (2000). Resources, political support, and citizen participation in environmental policy: A re-examination of conventional wisdom. *Society and Natural Resources, 13*(6)/ September, 579–588.

Checkoway, B. (1981). The politics of public hearings. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 17*, 566–582.

Chess, C. (2000). Evaluating environmental public participation: Methodological questions. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management, 43*(6), 769–784.

Chess, C. & Purcell, K. (1999). Public participation and the environment: Do we know what works? *Environmental Science and Technology, 33*(16), 2685–2691.

Creighton, J. L., Priscoli, J. D., & Dunning, C. M. (1998). *Public involvement techniques: A reader of ten years experience at the institute for water resources*. IWR Research Report 82-R1, Alexandria, VI: The Institute.

Crosby, N. (1995). Citizen juries: One solution for difficult environmental questions. In O. Renn, T. Webler, & P. Wiedemann (Eds.), *Fairness and competence in citizen participation: Evaluating models for environmental discourse*. Boston, MA: Kluwer.

Fischer, F. (2000). *Citizens, experts and the environment: The politics of local knowledge*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Fitzpatrick, P. & Sinclair, A. J. (2003). Learning through public involvement in environmental assessment hearings. *Journal of Environmental Management, 67*(2), 161–174.

Gregory, R., McDaniels, T., & Fields, D. (2001). Decisions aiding, not dispute resolution: Creating insights through structured environmental decisions. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 20*(3), 415–432.

Habermas, J. (1984). *Theory of communicative action – volume 1. Reason and rationalization of society*. London: Heinemann.

Halvorsen, K. E. (2001). Assessing public participation techniques for comfort, convenience, satisfaction, and deliberation. *Environmental Management, 28*(2), 179–186.

Halvorsen, K. E. (2003). Assessing the effects of public participation. *Public Administration Review, 63*(5), 535–543.

Hendriks, C. (2002). Institutions of deliberative democratic processes and interest groups: Roles, tensions, and incentives. *Australian Journal of Public Administration, 61*(1), 64–75.

Huitema, D. (2002). *Hazardous waste facility siting in the UK, the Netherlands and Canada. Institutions and discourses*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands/Boston, MA: Kluwer.

International Association for Public Participation. I.A.P.2. (2003). *Public participation toolbox*. www.iap2.org

Innes, J. E. (1999). Evaluating consensus building. In S. S. Lawrence, S. McKernanan, & J. Thomas-Larmer (Eds.), *Consensus building handbook: A comprehensive guide to reaching agreement* (pp. 631–671). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lafferty, W. M. & Meadowcroft, J. (Eds.) (1996). *Democracy and the environment: Problems and prospects*. Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar.

Lawrence, R. L. & Deagen, D. A. (2001). Choosing public participation methods for natural resources: A context-specific guide. *Society & Natural Resources, 14*(10), 857–872.

Lindblom, C. E. & Cohen, D. K. (1979). *Usable knowledge. Social science and social problem solving*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Marinetto, M. (2003). Who wants to be an active citizen? The politics and practice of community involvement. *Sociology, 37*(1), 103–120.

Meadowcroft, J. (2004). Participation and sustainable development: Modes of citizen, community, and organizational involvement. In W. Lafferty (Ed.), *Governance for sustainable development: The challenge of adapting form to function*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Peelle, E., Schweitzer, M., Munro, J., Carnes, S., & Wolfe, A. (1996). *Factors favorable to public participation success*. Report for U.S. Department of Energy. Oak Ridge, TN: Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Petts, J. & Leach, B. (2000). *Evaluating methods for public participation: Literature review*. R&D Technical Report E135. Environment Agency, UK.

Rowe, G. & Frewer, L. J. (2005). A typology of public engagement mechanisms. *Science, Technology & Human Values, 30*(2), 251–290.

Rowe, G. (2000). Public participation methods: A framework for evaluation. *Science, Technology & Human Values, 25*(1), 3–29.

Rowe, G., Marsh, R., & Frewer, L. J. (2004). Evaluation of a deliberative conference. *Science, Technology & Human Values, 29*(1), 88–121.