

CHANGING THE WAY WE DO DEMOCRACY AROUND HERE

*Embedding Deliberative
Democracy Practices
in Organisations*

AUTHORS

Dr Ann Winstanley¹ and Dr Karen Cronin²

Report of a project led by Environmental Science and Research (ESR) Limited, New Zealand
in 20011-12,
prepared with the support of Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd, and the Australasian
office of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2),

For
The Centre for Citizenship and Public Policy, University of Western Sydney,
Sydney, Australia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the support of:

IAP2 Australasia including Kimbra White and Simon Wright and the IAP2 Australasia Office, in initiating and co managing this project, organising the 'Embedding DD' project researcher and practitioner workshop in Melbourne, December 2011, and contributing to the writing and production of this report; and

Rio Tinto, Australia in hosting the workshop in Melbourne, in December 2011.

¹ Senior Social Scientist, Social Systems Group, Environmental Science and Research, New Zealand.

² Science Team Leader , Governance and Policy, Landcare Research, New Zealand.

LIST OF CONTENTS

PROJECT SUMMARY.....	4
1 INTRODUCTION.....	7
2 FINDINGS of the Literature Review on Embedding Deliberative Democracy.....	9
3 FINDINGS of the researcher-practitioner Workshop on Embedding Deliberative Democracy.....	21
4 CONCLUSIONS.....	27
REFERENCES.....	29

PROJECT SUMMARY

The following outline of the “Embedding Deliberative Democracy” (DD) project and its findings was presented to the newDemocracy Foundation and the University of Western Sydney, in Sydney in March 2012 by Karen Cronin, on behalf of the project team. This report completed delivery of the contract between ESR and the University.

Project Team:

This is a joint research project between Environmental Science and Research (ESR) Limited, New Zealand, and the Australasian office of the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2).

Team members include:

Chief Investigator - Dr Karen Cronin, Science Team Leader Governance and Policy, Landcare Research, Wellington, NZ [formerly ESR]

Senior Social Scientist - Dr Ann Winstanley, Social Systems Group, Environmental Science and Research (ESR), Christchurch, NZ

Project Manager - Kimbra White, IAP2 Australasia, Melbourne

Project Administrator - Heather Barton, IAP2 Australasia Office, Melbourne

Practitioner Advisor - Moira Deslandes, IAP2 International Office, USA

Policy Advisor - Simon Wright, IAP2 Australasia and Senior Advisor, Consultation and Engagement Group, Wellington City Council, NZ

Research Advisor - Matt Leighninger, Deliberative Democracy Consortium Washington DC, USA.

Partnership group/workshop participants:

Jodi Cornish (Dept of Justice, Victoria), Vivienne Garde (South East Water, Melbourne), Annie Bolitho (Consultant), Penny Jaski (Rio Tinto), Nicole Hunter (Consultant)

Research Aim:

Enhance democratic governance through a scoping report to identify how DD can be embedded in decision-making organisations in government, industry and the community

Objectives:

1. Identify examples from the international literature of deliberative activities/processes in both the public and business sectors that have led to DD practices being embedded or institutionalised i.e. ‘changing the way we do business around here’
2. Analyse the examples to establish the key characteristics/conditions that may have created and embedded the change
3. Explore the opportunity to set up a fuller research project, involving a case study on the adoption of DD practices in a selected organisation

Research Strategy:

1. Set up project team and partnership group, to include researchers and practitioners from industry, government and community organisations
2. Prepare literature review to establish key concepts and definitions, and identify examples of embedded DD practices across a range of organisations

3. Hold research workshop with partnership group to analyse findings of lit review, share knowledge of DD at work in key organisations, and identify critical success factors for adoption and embedding of DD
4. Explore opportunities for future research
5. Final project report by end March 2012
6. Disseminate project findings through IAP2 Australasia by June 2012.

Findings on critical factors for Embedding DD:

- investing in time to build capacity for all participants – citizens, decision-makers, governance and other organisations.
- culture of deliberation and consultation within organisations
- champions, especially elected representatives
- driven from the top as well as from the bottom
- the experience of well-structured DD encourages continued use
- plans to replicate the process
- regularity
- entrenched expectation of ongoing, meaningful participation
- included in design and implementation of plans
- active networks and alliances within and between groups, communities, industries or governance organisations
- people and communities need to learn how to be citizens, to have effective input
- attention paid to the processes of deliberation
- making it work despite people's busy lives
- attention paid to where and when deliberation takes place and access for participants; enabling men and women and/or youth or children to participate
- resources : information, funding, sponsorship, skills, training
- communication and sharing resources between sections within the organisation
- up-skilling and training staff in deliberative techniques and facilitation
- tools practice guidelines policy documents legislation
- "You need deliberative practice inside the organisation before you even go outside"

Case Studies discussed at workshop:

1. South East Water infrastructure project community consultation
2. Rio Tinto community engagement, including with Traditional Owners/ indigenous people
3. Victorian housing estate engagement programme, using youth citizens jury and citizens committees
4. Victoria Neighbourhood Justice Centre combining justice service delivery and community development
5. Neighbourhood circles community engagement, St Paul Minnesota USA
6. NZ BioEthics Council consultation on novel human biotechnologies

Ideas for future research:

Some ideas taken from the workshop discussion, and arising from the literature review, include:

1. Develop a theoretical framework to distinguish between existing, well recognised public participation, community consultation practices and 'deliberative' engagement,

2. Explore the influence and role of champions of DD at elected or management level in organisations.
3. Work with legal /policy scholars to identify judicial principles, statutory precedents, case law that support embedded DD, and might be replicated in other jurisdictions.
4. Work with scholars of social change/organisational change and management theorists, e.g. McKinsey approach, to develop understanding of critical factors for embedding DD.
5. Develop evidence base on the brand value/ economic value to a company of enhancing its reputation and stakeholder trust through use of DD.
6. Prepare cost benefit analysis comparing outcomes of deliberative v non deliberative stakeholder engagement strategies e.g. early upstream engagement v fighting opponents in court.
7. Explore if DD will only become embedded where there is a statutory impetus or requirement.
8. Turning the tables – highlight cases where the developer/proponent/power holder participated in the community [and not the other way round].
9. Identify DD practices that deal specifically and effectively with underlying value conflicts.
10. Develop theory and methods at interface of deliberation and dialogue.
11. Identify DD practices where the key decision-makers personally take part, not just 'other stakeholders'.
12. Explore effects on DD outcomes arising from the design of deliberative spaces i.e. the influence of physical configurations on discourses and behaviour.
13. Strengthen our appreciation of "DD" practices in traditional cultures, and explore opportunities for cross cultural learning.
14. Identify non instrumental DD practices i.e. 'upstream' engagement, not simply 'getting people on board' to achieve pre determined project or technology outcomes.
15. Strengthen capacity in evaluation of DD processes.
16. Approach the Canterbury Earthquake Recover Authority to develop a DD approach to community engagement for implementing earthquake recovery plans.

1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the research project

‘Deliberative Democracy’ (DD) is an approach that actively involved citizens in decision-making. Deliberative Democracy has been shown to provide practical solutions for difficult social problems and to improve policy. Many methods have been trialled in Australasia and around the world, but often they do not “stick” (Heath & Heath, 2007) – or, if done poorly, they can lead to a loss of trust and ineffective outcomes. Practitioners, researchers and academics point to a number of major issues relating to the uptake of deliberative democracy (DD) methods in organisational decision-making. More knowledge is needed on how deliberative democracy methods can be embedded in decision-making, and the factors that support organisational change.

This report presents the findings of a small social research project commissioned with ‘seed funding’ from the University of Western Sydney, Australia in 2011. It is aimed at both researchers and practitioners in the field of deliberative democracy, and at end users in government, industry and the community.

This project is one of a group of small studies commissioned by the Centre for Citizenship and Public Policy University of Western Sydney, with the new **Democracy** Foundation. This research arose from a meeting of DD practitioners and researchers organised with the support of the Deliberative Democracy Consortium at the University of Western Sydney in January 2011.³

The original concept was developed by Kimbra White [IAP2 Australasia] with the assistance of Dr Karen Cronin [formerly Environmental Science and Research (ESR) Ltd, New Zealand; and now Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd.]. A joint research project was set up through an MOU between IAP2 Australasia and ESR, with a wider project team involving experts from IAP2 International, and the Deliberative Democracy Consortium, Washington, USA. A full list of the project team members and their affiliations, and the project plan, are included in the appendices.

1.2 Aim and objectives

The project aim is to enhance democratic governance through a scoping project to identify how deliberative democracy can be embedded in decision-making organisations in government, industry and the community.

The project objectives were to:

³www.deliberative-democracy.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=section&id=12&Itemid=280

1. Identify examples from the international literature of deliberative activities/processes in both the public and business sectors that have led to deliberative democracy practices being embedded or institutionalised.
2. Analyse the examples to establish the key characteristics/conditions that may have created and embedded the change.
3. Explore the opportunity to set up a fuller future research project, involving a case study on the adoption of deliberative democracy practices in a selected organisation.

The two key project activities included:

- A literature review on embedding DD
- A workshop for DD researchers and practitioners in government, industry and community organisations.

The outcomes of both the literature review and workshop will be used to identify ideas for a fuller research project.

1.3 Content of the report

Chapter Two reports on the findings of the literature review.

Chapter Three reports on the workshop processes, and outcomes.

Chapter Four compares the outcomes of the review and workshop discussion, and identifies themes and research questions for future research.

2

FINDINGS OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 *Literature Review Method*

Google Search Engine was used with the prompts ‘Deliberative Democracy’ ‘Deliberative democracy in practice’ and ‘Embedding deliberative democracy’. These searches were also refined by relating them to specific countries (e.g. N.Z., Australia, U.S.A., Canada, U.K., and Denmark). The articles and papers accessed were also supplemented by (i) references passed on by other project team members, (ii) relevant references held in other related or complementary ESR end-note libraries. Another search for ‘Deliberative democracy organisations’ identified four major international organisations, each consisting of multiple networks and/or partners, and bringing together theoretical and practice-based individuals and groups. Their websites provided additional sources of information relating to case studies, training, research, as well as theoretically based papers.

2.2 *Defining ‘Deliberative Democracy’ and ‘Embedding Deliberative Democracy’*

‘Deliberative democracy’ can be understood as deliberation under *conditions* conducive to reflection and judgement, a willingness to *understand* values, perspectives and interests of others in a joint search for mutually *acceptable* solutions or actions.⁴ These three crucial ingredients are echoed by Mutchler (2011, p.5) who states that deliberative democracy “seeks public good *with* the public, not merely *for* the public.” This will, in turn, foster a more active and engaged democracy because of the acquisition of understanding different perspectives, and new knowledge, attitudes and skills to enable moving from deliberation to action. Thus, we would add the descriptor ‘transformative’ to a definition of deliberative democracy.

‘Embedded DD’ is a habit of deliberation among citizens (Fagotto & Fung, 2009, p.1). When that habit is embedded in a community’s political institutions and social practices, people make public decisions and take collective actions through processes which involve discussions, reasoning and citizen participation, rather than through the exercise of authority, expertise, status, political weight, or other such forms of power.

2.3 *Drivers for Embedding Deliberative Democracy*

Deliberative Democracy represents an evolution from conventional democratic practices and institutions based on the concept of representation. The literature identifies a number of drivers that

⁴ Cited from Sirianni and Friedland on the online Civic Dictionary (www.cpn.org/tools/dictionary/deliberate.html)

have led to nation states, regional and local governments turning to deliberative democracy approaches and methods. Additionally, DD practices are increasingly being used by industry and community organisations.

The interest in DD has arisen has been driven by many contemporary issues including: complex multi-stakeholder problems (often called ‘wicked problems’); citizen disenchantment; the need to regain governance legitimacy and trust; the need to build community/civic capacity and ownership of actions aligned to solutions; and the existence of multiple sites of expertise in both theory and practice of deliberative democracy. In other words, there are ‘needs’ and resources for achieving DD ‘solutions’. Each of these drivers will be discussed below.

2.3.1 ‘Wicked problems’

Carson (2011), Levidow (2007), and Ravetz (2004), among others, point to the complexity of contemporary problems, often referred to as ‘wicked problems’ that cannot be either understood or solved by one agency, but require partnerships, networks and often widespread community action to define the scope and implications of problems, and how they might be addressed. Some of the characteristics of ‘wicked problems’ include:

- There are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers to problems, just better or worse solutions.
- There is always more than one explanation and the solution depends on how the problem is framed.
- Stakeholders have radically different world views and different frames for understanding the problem.
- The constraints impacting on the problem and the resources needed for solutions change over time (Wikipedia).

Environmental policy and planning challenges often exhibit the characteristics of ‘wicked problems. For example, conflicts emerge over the use of, or access to, scarce resources, such as water, forestry, minerals. There are usually multiple stakeholders involved, with groups holding very different values and world views. A common dichotomy is the tension between those who recognise the economic advantages associated with resource use, and those who value the natural state of resources. For example, there is ongoing controversy in New Zealand about realising the economic gains from mining minerals in National Parks, while others argue to keep these areas pristine for eco-tourism and the rights of future generations. Natural resources, such as rivers, often cross jurisdictional boundaries and national borders, creating challenges for political and resource management authorities to create fair and consistent rules and policies, to ensure that upstream use – or misuse - does not impact negatively on those living downstream.⁵

2.3.2 Citizen disenchantment

There are numerous contemporary examples across the globe of citizen dissatisfaction with national and local governments. ‘Citizen issues’ cut across a wide range of government policies, responsibilities and practices (Nabatchi & Farrar, 2011). The following news stories provide illustrative examples of citizen disenchantment with current ‘democratic’ practices or decision in a range of countries.

⁵ See the Murray-Darling Basin Authority, Australia. <http://www.mdba.gov.au>

- **U.S.A**

Gallup poll findings 2010

- 57 percent of Americans don't trust the government to handle domestic problems
- 55 percent have little or no confidence in public officials
- 69 percent don't think Congress is able to do its job, and most believe the federal government wastes 51 cents of every dollar
- 49 percent say the federal government has become so powerful it threatens individuals' rights and freedoms. ⁶

- **South Africa 2011**

An Idasa survey shows that only one in ten citizens is satisfied with the quality of service delivery provided by their district and municipal council. This is a dramatic decline from its previous survey conducted in 2006 which showed four in ten citizens (39.5%) were still satisfied with service delivery of their local government. Idasa questions why citizen satisfaction levels are declining sharply when access to basic services like water, electricity, housing, etc has remained more or less the same over the past four years, and even improved marginally in some cases. ⁷

- **New Zealand (Christchurch) 2011**

Citizens have become frustrated with the governance of the Canterbury region following the earthquakes in 2010 and 2011, particularly regarding the zoning of properties for demolition or restoration. ⁸

Orange and White zones CERA* protest - 16th of October

Orange and White Zones Time To Be Heard!!

CERA PROTEST 2011

After constant delays, lack of transparency and lack of compassion, we do believe our communities will not be heard if we do not make it clear that we matter too! Please join us and be heard.

⁶ See <http://www.gallup.com/poll/143267/distrust-media-edges-record-high.aspx>

A similar finding was reported in 2011 <http://www.gallup.com/poll/149678/americans-express-historic-negativity-toward-government.aspx>

⁷ See http://www.idasa.org/our_products/resources/output/south_african_citizens_show/

⁸ <http://avonsidechch.blogspot.co.nz/2011/10/orange-and-white-zones-cera-protest.html>

- **Stuttgart (Germany) 2010**

Stuttgart 21 is a failure of deliberative democracy (*Andrea Römmele, guardian.co.uk, Sunday 24 October 2010*)⁹

“The lack of dialogue on plans to redevelop Stuttgart’s train station has led to a loss of faith in the political system ... Southern Germany, especially the state of Baden-Württemberg, is not known for being extraordinarily political or even rebellious, especially not when big infrastructure projects are planned. Its capital city, Stuttgart, is a very prosperous region with a strong automotive industry and a very strong economy in general, and it is now debating, fighting and demonstrating very hard and persistently on whether its train station should be completely restructured from a dead-end to an underground-drive-through train station. After 15 years of planning and democratic decision making, the multibillion-dollar project was about to start two weeks ago, outraging an unexpectedly large portion of local as well as regional citizens. They feel betrayed by political parties, the regional government as well as the German railway company, the Bahn, because the project costs are rapidly increasing. And they feel that they have not been consulted on the project. A brutal police intervention has eventually created the picture of a revolution-like situation where students, the elderly, doctors and workers face the iron fist of the executive. The acceleration of events has made it difficult for all to even discuss a way forward. It is a communicative disaster for the government as well as the Bahn and it is, more importantly, an indication of a true and deep systemic crisis.”

Brackertz (2006, p.4) argues that current democratic systems are increasingly inadequate in “providing diversified and responsive services efficiently and effectively.” She points to issues relating to the ‘practices’ of community engagement whereby citizens are “often recast as consumers” of public institutional services (p. 6); the outsourcing of consultation to consultants, resulting in a lack of consultative and methodological knowledge and skills in governance agencies; the potential danger of positioning communities to fill gaps in service provision; and the formalised (or legal) imperatives for consultation¹⁰ being seen as a means to a predetermined end. Fung (no date, p.17) outlines trends which suggest a “growing social gap between citizens and politicians”, manifested by: (i) declining public trust; (ii) declining party membership; (iii) low voting rates; (iv) citizen powerlessness and/or alienation; and (v) incapacity of governments that rely on their own resources and authority.

There are instances of federal and local government initiatives to address this growing public dissatisfaction, which suggests that public dissatisfaction is significant and requires action. Examples include the Western Australia, Geraldton initiative described by Hartz-Karp (2011); the Victoria (Australia) state policies (see Bracketz, 2006) ; initiatives and practices of the state of Alberta government, Canada, which is aligned with C2D2; and the New Zealand Environment Canterbury Regional Council instigation of a (collaborative governance) deliberative approach to water management in the region (www.ecan.govt.nz).

2.3.3 Governance legitimacy and trust

Brackertz (2006, p.3) outlines two drivers for local government consultation:

- Procedural legitimation, relating to the processes used to “secure the consent of the governed”. This is where representation – one vote per person – in the form of elected representatives merges with pluralist-based processes of lobbying and advocacy to influence decision-making.

⁹ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/oct/24/stuttgart-21-failure-deliberative-democracy>

¹⁰ In New Zealand this includes the Local Government Act 2002, and the Resource Management Act 1991.

- Democratic legitimization refers to “the government’s ability to deliver outcomes and address emerging issues and needs as they arise.”

Brackertz (2006, p.7) refers to the Victoria State Government’s (Australia) initiatives ¹¹ whereby the aim of bringing government, residents and community agencies together is not only to improve democratic legitimacy (and procedural and distributive justice) ¹², but also to strengthen communities and build social capital. She states that community strengthening draws on the currently influential idea that social capital and connectedness are linked to improved outcomes in terms of public health and public safety, economic strength and resilience and general community wellbeing.

2.3.4 Capacity and available expertise

A considerable number of national and international deliberative democracy organisations, agencies and networks have emerged. Many have strong links with their academic counterparts, providing a strong theoretical base which is also informed by empirical analyses of deliberative democracy in practice.

A number of examples of these networked organisations are outlined below.

Canadian Community on Dialogue and Deliberation (C2D2) (www.c2d2.ca)

This website provides a space for “gathering practitioners, researchers, scholars, policy analysts and policy makers, elected officials, trainers, consultants, artists, activities and students from all the various streams of practice that exist in this emerging field.” The website models commitment to positive change through providing learning, sharing and resourcing opportunities. Members of C2D2 are multi-disciplinary, and work across sectors such as government, universities, communities, NGOs and business ventures.

Deliberative Democracy Consortium (www.deliberative-democracy.net)

The mission of this consortium is to “bring together practitioners and researchers to support and foster the nascent, broad-based movement to promote and institutionalise deliberative democracy at all levels of government in the United States and around the world.” The consortium has: (i) developed new tools; (ii) assembled new networks; and (iii) assisted federal agencies. With more than 30 organisations working to renew democracy, the Consortium has the following goals:

- Help public leaders find examples and resources they need to engage citizens.
- Integrate research and practice in the field.
- Integrate online and face-to-face approaches.
- Articulate how democracy is changing.
- Help to build a permanent infrastructure for deliberative democracy.

International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) (www.iap2.org)

IAP2 is an “international network of members who seek to promote and improve the practice of public participation in relation to individuals, governments, institutions, and other entities that affect the public interest in nations throughout the world.”

¹¹ *A Fairer Victoria: creating opportunity and addressing disadvantage* (2005), backed by *Growing Victoria together: A Vision for Victoria to 2010 and beyond* (2005).

¹² See Hillman, 2005; Nancarrow & Syme, 2001.

Its activities include:

- Serving the learning needs of members through events, publications and communication technology.
- Advocating for public participation throughout the world.
- Promoting a results-oriented research agenda and use research to support education and advocacy goals.
- Providing technical assistance to improve public participation.

National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation (NCDD) (www.ncdd.org)

The NCDD website states that it “promotes the use of dialogue, deliberation, and other innovative group processes to help people come together across differences to tackle our most challenging problems. We serve as a gathering place, a resource clearing house, a news source, and a facilitative leader for the dialogue and deliberation community and beyond.

Other important groups include the Kettering Foundation www.kettering.org/ and Everyday Democracy www.everyday-democracy.org.

2.4 The diversity of embedded deliberative democracy initiatives

In this section we present examples of how DD has been adopted in different sectors and highlight some of the factors that contributed to embeddedness.

➤ **Sustainability**

Hart-Karp (2011) describes and analyses an Australian initiative in Geraldton, which focused on improving sustainability by implementing forms of deliberative democracy ‘as a way of life’ - and which included a three year university-led action research programme. Weymouth et al (2011) describe this as an attempt to create mutually agreed strategies and actions through several levels of public deliberation, from small-scale deliberations carried out by trained volunteers to large-scale public events and online interaction. Reflecting a degree of embeddedness, the overseeing and implementation of the outcomes of these engagements is being facilitated through an alliance of industry, government and NGO decision-makers. The authors state that, although further data needs to be gathered, anecdotal evidence suggests strong positive influences on those City of Geraldton

Greenough staff who attended deliberative events. “Conversations with staff members show decreasing levels of scepticism about citizens’ ability to balance planning decisions and an awareness of a responsibility to actualise any outcomes of public deliberation as soon as possible. Staff seemed to be strongly aware of the impetus to definitively link actions by Council to any public deliberation outcomes both through public relations as well as strategic indicators”(p.13).

➤ **Education Sector**

Mutchler (2011) outlines the promises and challenges for using a deliberative democracy approach for educational administrators to develop school-community partnerships. She carried out a simulation exercise with school students. Their feedback included personal benefits relating to interaction, such as how hearing other perspectives enabled self-reflection and analysis and finding ways to take collective action. Student views on the long-term impacts included strengthening relationships between public schools and the public, renewed public investment in school success and increased public partnerships to solve problems.

➤ **Urban Planning**

Dobson (in Fung, no date) and Miller (in Fung, no date) outline the use of innovative deliberative democracy initiatives to deal with urban planning issues. In addressing the urban blight problems in an area of Durban, Dobson highlighted the results of new forms of entrepreneurship and income-generating activities, resulting in the entrenched expectation of ongoing meaningful participation. The deliberative democracy model was earmarked for replication in other South African cities. Miller looked at the innovative deliberative democracy approach to the urban planning problem of neighbourhood flight, and subsequent disinvestment. This resulted in a plan for improvements developed by neighbourhood residents, representing a shift from “reliance on professional planners and government bureaucrats to engaging and empowering residents” (Miller in Fung, no date: 21). Results were more significant than expected: every neighbourhood participated; a new civic social infrastructure was created; the investment leveraged over \$1 billion; improvements were made in housing choices and availability; and a general sense of identity and connection to place for residents was created.

➤ **Technology Assessment**

The Danish Board of Technology consensus conference is another carefully structured deliberative democracy method used in a range of decision-making and policy development issues (Blok, 2007). In the past, this approach was strongly embedded in government approaches to technology assessment. The role of the Board was reviewed by the government in 2011. Consultation in Denmark, along with supporting endorsements internationally, has meant that there is an ongoing commitment to the DBT.

➤ **Disaster Recovery**

Millen (2011) carried out a literature review of the use of deliberative democracy processes in disaster recovery, in which he found community engagement was important in achieving sustainable outcomes. His literature review provides links to both project summaries and further resources. The adoption of DD processes across this sector is an indication that such practices are now recognised and increasingly common in the recovery phase.

➤ **E-democracy**

Many authors focus on the use of e-democracy initiatives. Fishkin’s (2011) describes how deliberative polling can provide the five conditions under which deliberative democracy processes occur. Dahlberg (2001) outlines two further internet-based approaches: the Minnesota E-democracy initiative provides e-mail based forums in which a wide range of participants engage with a wide range of political issues; and the Canadian ECommons project is exploring how to best build a public space on-line. Birdwill (no date) also argues that one of the barriers to civic participation is the busyness of people’s everyday lives, and that embedding the principles of democracy might therefore be enhanced via the internet. However, he does draw attention to the ‘digital divide’, and the possibility of exacerbating or entrenching inequalities. Marres et al (forthcoming: 3), using an actor network analysis, argues that “neither the implementation of ICT-supported consultation procedures by institutions, nor the networking activities of civil society organisations, can assure that a democratic process is taking place.”

2.5 Characteristics of embeddedness

From the list of examples above, a number of features of that contribute to embeddedness start to emerge:

- DD initiatives are established with multi-stakeholder governance oversight.
- Programmes have a long term i.e. multi year commitment, rather than one off event.
- Positive attitudes toward DD are shown by those with influence over decisions and outcomes, including a sense of personal benefit from engaging in DD.
- A connection is between DD initiatives and decisions.
- An entrenched expectation that DD will be the approach taken by the organisation.
- DD methods are used routinely in an organisation or sector.
- DD is formalised in legislation or through an institutional framework e.g. technology assessment board.
- Assessment and monitoring accompanies and supports the DD programme over time, e.g. through DD researcher observations.

Fagotto and Fung (2009) provide a comprehensive account of embedding deliberative democracy, based on their four year study of local public deliberations in nine communities across the United States. They provide the following definition of embedded deliberation:

‘Embeddedness is a habit of deliberation among citizens. When that habit is embedded in a community’s political institutions and social practices, people frequently make public decisions and take collective actions through processes that involve discussion, reasoning, and citizen participation rather than through the exercise of authority, expertise, status, political weight, or other such forms of power.’¹³

The following characteristics of embedded deliberative democracy attempt to capture the essence of the definition given above, although this is not an exhaustive list.

2.5.1 Deliberative democracy is a process not an event

Fagotto and Fung (2009) state that sometimes the embedding process takes place over a period of years. Fishkin (2011), in his discussion of deliberative polling, suggests that even though the application of this method is relatively short lived, its effectiveness for decision-makers means that it is used repeatedly over time for different kinds of issues.

As stated earlier, one of the drivers for the use of deliberative democracy processes is the increasing array of ‘wicked problems’; for example, seemingly intractable social problems such as trying to get traction on urban sustainability issues (Hartz-Karp, 2011; Carson, 2011); and the social and ethnic inequalities in education systems and urban neighbourhoods. Many of these issues have taken a long time to develop, or have been creating problems for particular groups of people over a significant time period, and they are not going to be solved overnight. The literature on embedding DD also highlight the need for an investment in time to build capacity for all participants – citizens, decision-makers, governance and other organisations.

2.5.2 Transformative social and cultural change

Social and cultural change is also a function of time. The social and organisational culture changes required for embeddedness have been described predominantly in the practice-based literature. One of the findings is that social and cultural change can be driven from the top as well as from the bottom; and that cohesion between ‘top’ and ‘bottom’ approaches can be achieved through a commitment to actioning outcomes.

¹³ Fagotto and Fung, 2009, p. 1 http://www.wcgmf.org/pdf/publication_31.pdf

Brackertz' findings - from her research with eight Victorian councils (Australia) (2009) - indicate that there are many drivers for maintaining a non-deliberative status quo in councils' community consultation activities. The key factor in councils' success in deliberative community consultation is whether there is a culture of consultation, based on: "skills and knowledge of staff, the lines of communication within council, and most importantly, the organisational culture and the attitude of elected representatives" (p.18).

In a New Zealand Ministry of Science and Innovation-funded project on scientists' non-peer communication, Winstanley (2012) cites an industry interviewee who described the organisational factors supporting his communication philosophy¹⁴ and activities with stakeholders, communities and iwi.¹⁵ Organisational culture factors included support from the top tier of managers to whom he was responsible, as well as opportunities to embed his communication philosophy with new engineers and technical people when they joined the industry. This example exemplifies a coherent top-down and bottom-up approach, to embed a communication culture within the organisation (Winstanley, 2012).

Following Brackertz (2009), other authors have highlighted the numerous disincentives for community members to participate in governmental consultative exercises, or to develop new social networks. However, once motivated to participate in initiatives to address a particular social/community issue or problem, those participating in well-structured deliberative democracy exercises often opt to continue the deliberative process - and have found ways of applying it to other issues or problems within their communities, thereby developing a social or civic culture of deliberation.

Fagotto and Fung (2009) highlight the recurrent use of study circles in Newcastle, Delaware, initially set up to deliberate on race relations, but used since then to tackle other issues including quality of life in a growing population, public school finance, and drug testing. They state that: "when a community uses deliberation with some regularity to address problems of weak social fabric, to transform individuals, or to inform public judgement, we say that they have embedded public reflection." Embedded public action is defined as translating public reflection into action, to "mobilise communities and resources to solve local problems, or to achieve collaborative governance" (p.26).

As identified above, Dobson (in Fung, no date) also provides evidence of cultural/social change. A deliberative democracy process to address urban blight in Durban (S.A.) resulted in the *entrenched* expectation of ongoing, meaningful participation, and plans to *replicate* the process in other urban areas.

Millen's (2011) literature review on deliberative democracy in disaster recovery adds another dimension. In many situations, recovery from disaster events is a long process involving, at least, central and local governments, NGOs, community groups and affected communities. Millen states that: "most importantly, governments have begun to heed the call of citizens who desperately want to be part of rebuilding their communities, who don't want to see inappropriate decisions being made over their heads, and are on track to improving 'community engagement' in disaster recovery" (p.3). Millen provides case study snapshots such as the *Unified New Orleans Plan: Community Congress 11*, where large scale deliberative democracy methods were used for disaster recovery, with a resulting culture change reflected by attendees wanting ongoing engagement in the process.

¹⁴ This philosophy was based on (i) communicating early, (ii) being open and honest, and (iii) ensuring ongoing and regular communication activities.

¹⁵ "Iwi" are formalised Māori tribal entities.

As Millen points out, rebuilding entire communities over time calls for good democracy; this is an impetus for embedding deliberative democracy in the planning and implementation of recovery plans. He also draws on Prosser's (2011) work which describes the City of Cedar Rapids process in dealing with the aftermath of an extreme flood event. Millen (2011, p.13) writes:

"A key element that enabled the rapid coordination of community engagement efforts was the Cedar Rapids governance structure, in which community engagement makes up a significant, popular, and valued component, and incorporates a comprehensive vision document developed just six months prior to the flood and that was supported strongly by residents and community organisations."

2.5.3 Active networks and alliances

Active networks and alliances may be between groups, communities, industries or governance organisations and/or within each of those entities. For example, Bracketz (2009) stresses the need for network structures within councils to ensure adequate information, resources and skills support deliberative democracy projects. Millen (2011), looking at State Recovery Plans and the ways in which they support deliberative democracy approaches, highlights the need for interagency coordination. Hartz-Karp (2011) described the 'structure' of the five year Geraldton deliberative process, which provides a lens on an extensive network of interdependent teams, including:

- The City government team.
- The design and research team (partnership between Curtin University and the City).
- The alliance governance group (a team of key government, industry and NGO regional decision-makers, and randomly selected interested local people).
- Indigenous groups.
- A special media alliance.
- Community champions (a group of forty community people).
- Implementation team (government, industry and community members).
- On-line deliberation/social media team.
- University and industry alliances (other research and industry groups in the region).

Fagotto and Fung (2009) provide an overview of a Hawaiian initiative *The Public Policy Forums*, which focused on issues related to children and youth. Deliberation was used as a collaborative governance tool, and brought together policy-makers, public agencies, service providers, NGOs, children advocate groups and others.

In Fung and Wright's (1999, p. 27) discussion of globally diverse experiments in deliberation, they use the term 'recombination' to describe the devolution of empowered deliberative democracy. This highlights that: "local units are by themselves unable to solve co-ordination and cross-border problems and would thus benefit from information-sharing connections to other units in the system."

Bracketz (2006) and Millen (2011) also focus on how deliberative democracy can contribute to building social capital. 'Social capital' refers to building or strengthening social - or community - ties and networks; and the community capacities and abilities that emerge from these. Representative deliberative processes bring together often diverse people within or across communities, and creates social ties and networks develop that might not ordinarily happen. Millen (2011, p.12) stresses the importance of these social networks, and their linkages with others, in disaster resilient communities. "Strong social networks and links between community leaders value the different strengths of individuals within the community, especially the relationships related to emergency services, and these links support community response during emergency."

2.5.4 Building citizen capacity

One important barrier to citizen involvement in decision-making, leading to citizen disengagement, is that people are too busy to participate. It is also hard to mobilize a society or communities where people do not know their neighbours (Greene, no date). In the ESR project 'Sustainable development – the Human Dimension', one of the key research 'sponsors' stated that people and communities need to learn (or re-learn) *how* to be citizens, in order to have effective input into local political decision-making.¹⁶

The literature review for this Embedding DD project highlights the importance of citizen capacity-building to effect change that will be supported by organisations and institutions. A key factor in embeddedness, then, is ensuring that the 'rules' that accompany deliberative processes meet the requirements of 'procedural justice' i.e. DD processes take account of the context of people's busy lives, their mobility and level of neighbourhood interaction. In other words, the ability of citizens to 'make a difference' is a key factor in embedding participation.

Deliberative approaches often focus on the importance of random representativeness in citizen representation, but equity issues also have to be considered. Examples in the literature include: Boelen's (2003) discussion of culture and ethnicity in his paper *Local rights and legal recognition: The struggle for indigenous water rights and the cultural politics of participation*; Semmen's (2005) discussion of gender-related issues in relation to women's environmental protection problems; and Staeheli's (2010) discussion relating to the spatial and place-based attributes of participation, and the common equation of deliberative democracy with urban populations. Equity is important as the equality of opportunity to be selected. Attention should be paid to where deliberation takes place and how access to these places advantages or disadvantages certain participants; and which meeting times enable men and women and/or youth or children to participate. For example, in the deliberative democracy/collaborative governance model of water resource management in Canterbury, New Zealand, meeting places and times of the water zone committees have been varied to enable a range of members of the public to attend.

2.5.6 Access to resources

Embeddedness requires ongoing access to resources - and the range of resources needed is significant. Apart from peoples' time and capacity (across individuals, organisations and governance institutions), other resources are noted below:

- Information must available (it exists), and accessible (it is able to be understood). Brackertz (2006) states that councils must have access to demographic profiles and data that can be used to inform deliberative democracy initiatives. ESR's case study of participative decision-making on water shortages found that considerable 'translation' of information was also required: what is an 'aquifer', 'recharge', 'reliability of supply', 'water augmentation'?
- Funding is needed to enable the realisation of actions and outcomes. Miller (in Fung, no date), identified how participants in deliberation processes generated additional resources to achieve actions for neighbourhood revitalisation.

15

<http://www.esr.cri.nz/competencies/socialscienceandsystemsthinking/Pages/SustainableDevelopmentHumanDimension.aspx>

- Appropriate and accessible places and settings for DD events may require ‘sponsorship’ by different organisations or community groups.
- Trained people, who have skills in facilitation, are required to run deliberative processes. Fagotto and Fung (2010) studied a Kansas City initiative to develop study circles to deliberate on bridging the gap in trust and understanding between schools and parents. In this case, 150 adults were trained as facilitators, thereby embedding community deliberation that has, since 1999, been extended to other community issues such as crime and living conditions.

2.5.7 Institutional Champions

Much of the empirical literature accessed for this review focuses on deliberative democracy initiatives which involve state/local government and communities. The research emphasises the importance of embedding a deliberative culture within governance organisations. This culture depends on several factors: creating champions for deliberative approaches, especially from among elected representatives (Brackertz, 2006; Carson, 2011; Hart-Karp, 2005); communication and sharing resources between sections within the organisation (Brackertz, 2006; Fagotto & Fung, 2010; Millen, 2011); and up-skilling and training staff in deliberative techniques and facilitation (Brackertz, 2006; Hartz-Karp, 2011; Fagotto & Fung, 2010, Millen, 2010).

Hartz-Karp’s (2005) paper on the Perth case study in deliberative democracy describes how the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure was a key driver and champion for deliberative democracy. This initiative was aimed at getting past the idea of government as an arbitrator of opposing camps (a pluralist function), to the DD idea of government providing opportunities for inclusive community participation to build trust, respect and confidence in democratic processes. In Canterbury, consultative processes employed by the Regional Council (for water resource management) and the Christchurch City Council (for earthquake recovery rebuilding in the CBD), have included internet-based tools - Open Strategy, and UEngage respectively - to get as much public input as possible.¹⁷ While these represent important steps to involve the Canterbury community, further monitoring is needed to establish how deliberative these processes have been in practice, and the extent to which they have been institutionally embedded over time.

In addition to creating public expectations for involvement with online tools, deliberative processes can be enshrined in policy documents and practice guidelines – such as in the Cedar Falls planning process (cited in Millen, 2010).

¹⁷ www.openstrategies.com;
www.objective.com/products/communityandcollaboration/uengage).

3

FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCHER-PRACTITIONER WORKSHOP ON EMBEDDING DD

3.1 Workshop process and outcomes

3.1.1 Purpose

The workshop was held on the 7th December, 2011 in Melbourne, Australia and kindly hosted by Rio Tinto. It brought together 10 researchers and practitioners from industry, government, research and community organisations, to examine and discuss the findings of the above literature review - and to share and analyse 'deliberative democracy stories' as related by practitioners. The purpose was to: (i) identify critical factors for embedding deliberative democracy practices in organisations, and (ii) explore opportunities for a further project/s for embedding deliberative democracy.

3.1.2 Structure and attendees

The workshop structure included: (i) welcome, introductions, and purpose; (ii) connecting with the issues; (iii) presentation of literature review findings; (iv) to identify differences between deliberative democracy (DD) and embedded DD attributes; (v) stories of embedded DD experiences, and discussion; (vi) analysis of organisational change required for embedding DD, based on the McKinsey 7S's model¹⁸; and (vii) further research, final reflections and closing.

Attendees included: Kimbra White (IAP2 Australasia and Facilitator) Ann Winstanley and Karen Cronin (Institute of Environmental Science & Research, N.Z.), Simon Wright (IAP2 Australasia, and Wellington City Council, N.Z.) Jodi Cornish (Dept of Justice, Victoria), Vivienne Garde (South East Water, Melbourne), Annie Bolitho (Consultant), Penny Jaski (Rio Tinto), Nicole Hunter (Consultant), Matt Leighninger (Deliberative Democracy Consortium) via skype.

3.2 Relating DD to attributes of Embedded DD

Many practices might be said to be deliberative democracy, but what attributes would we look for to say that the practice was embedded? The table below reflects the outcomes of a brainstorming session with workshop participants, based on their research and practice.

¹⁸ The McKinsey 7S's model is most often used as a tool to assess and monitor changes in the internal situation of an organisation. It is based on the theory that, for an organisation to perform well, these seven elements need to be aligned and mutually reinforcing.

Deliberative Democracy	Embedded DD
<p>Participatory processes need to pay attention to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting people to the decision-making table • Representativeness- the number/diversity of people involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision maker recognises that citizens can give smart input. • The attitude is: “citizens have a right to be at the table.” • Citizens are seen as capable and needed for good decisions.
<p>Attributes of DD process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full complexity of issues addressed • Process has influence on decision making • We won’t go ahead with this project if the community doesn’t want it. • “Getting it right” = project on budget, on time AND accepted by the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an attitude among decision-makers such that “even if it is a great project, a great technology and great \$ value, it falls over if we don’t communicate with the community. • The community drives the decision-making organisation into finding new ways to do things.
<p>Engagement practice is dialogic and deliberative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community conversations with mutuality, reciprocity • Thoughtful reasoning, • Assisted by facilitation • Practice has moved beyond the public deficit model • Practice includes important stakeholder groups, not just ‘the public’ • Avoiding adversarial debate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DD is embedded when participants think they’re having normal conversations i.e. it is expected that DD is how we do things
<p>Building Community Capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to increase the capacity of people to work with issues. • Community development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an understanding among the staff and the community i.e. “that’s the way we work” • DD embedded from bottom up too as well as top down i.e. impetus from community or stakeholders, as well as from the decision-making organisation. • People are prepared to fight for it, from the inside and from outside
<p>Learning organisations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some corporations traditionally just did risk assessment – but now they realise the biggest risk is inadequate community engagement. Companies are changing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growing what happens well and taking it into institutional settings. • Not a one off, part of continued process, adapted into new contexts.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An organisation and community have realised that the old ways are not working and have actively sought better ways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation can describe its internal model of embeddedness.
<p>Outcomes of DD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transformational change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The values of DD are held even when other pressures are going on in organisation or when the original DD champions may have moved on. DD is seen as a core part of your work DD is a habit, not reflected on [it is just done]. Someone from outside would say “They’re different” - they always do it this way. Committed leadership - this is the way we do things.
<p>DD formalised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflected in organisation policy and has legislative backing. DD not seen as an event but rather a process that can become embedded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflected in public documents & policies – transparently. Legal impetus - compliance with DD needed to make decisions, implement projects Rules also require evaluation of DD and consequences.

Table One: Deliberative Democracy and Embedded DD

3.3 Learning from experiences of DD

In the next phase of the workshop there were a number of shared stories offered for discussion, as follows:

Vivienne Garde (South East Water): public participation with the community on water supply.

Penny Jaski (Rio Tinto): engagement with aboriginal communities re mining.

Jodi Cornish (Dept. of Justice, Victoria): developing a community justice centre which housed not only the court but also other justice-related services.

Simon Wright: consultation on issues (like xenotransplantation) by *Toi te Taiao*, the Bioethics Council in New Zealand.

Matt Leighninger: institutional DD in St Pauls, Minnesota, USA using study circles.

The workshop then conducted a structural analysis of the stories of embedded deliberative democracy approaches. This was led by Simon Wright using McKinsey’s 7 S’s approach – with the addition of an 8th factor of ‘Situation’.

The McKinsey 7S’s model is most often used as a tool to assess and monitor changes in the internal situation of an organisation. It is based on the theory that, for an organisation to perform well or

create and/or manage change, the following seven elements need to be aligned and mutually reinforcing: Staff, Strategy, Shared Values, Structure, Style/Culture, Systems, and Skills/Capabilities.

In the following table we align the comments from workshop participants about the different organisational stories to the McKinsey factors, to highlight how DD could be seen as ‘embedded’. The comments in the right hand column reflect both what had happened in the organisations we reviewed - and what is seen as necessary for embedding DD in future.

<p>Staff – the people/ human resource management</p>	<p>People appointed for community engagement skills –e.g. manager for community and stakeholder engagement. Ability to carry out organisational interviews to analyse understanding to identify what education was required. We established a new unit to meet the needs for the community – education, job skills etc.</p>
<p>Strategy: engagement strategy integrated into organisational strategy</p>	<p>Linking of documentation, evidence, and evaluation is essential to establishing and maintaining credibility of DD internally (as practitioners - and as members of a deliberative community of practice). Commitment to document and evaluate [the company project]. Strong direction ongoing messages [from the top]. Resources put in place to establish a framework for participation. DD Strategy – framework relates to core areas of business. Ritualise reflective practice to enable people with very different professional approaches to develop collaborative, joined up organisational practices. Use of evaluation as an advocacy tool for DD.</p>
<p>Shared values: guiding concepts</p>	<p>‘Participating in community’ is how we work. Not too directing/controlling, but a long term commitment to dialogue and relationships. The ‘bottom up’ approach showed benefits to management initially, now there is ‘top down’ impetus too. Internal commitment to highlighting the value proposition of public participation. Build shared staff values on approach, through training (several days, intensive). Support organisation views and keeping process going as a collaborative effort. Willingness to explore others’ values. The CEO’s solution may not have worked – internal advocacy of DD saved the reference group.</p>
<p>Structure: to support engagement practice.</p>	<p>Clarity about role of the community engagement team - not implementation, but providing frameworks, monitoring, mentoring, organisational capacity building. Lots of new teams and processes have been developed and institutionalised to support negotiations and agreements (for engagement). External partner agencies are seen as key to service delivery. The building design was based on the principles of participatory architecture. We hold 3 year audits of the outcomes of engagement/agreement. Communication team was supportive and interdependent with engagement</p>

	<p>team. Recognition that P.R. communication was not sufficient. Support for DD from independent evaluations (authority of the office of auditor general) when political change could have derailed process. Economic evaluation useful to support DD because these arguments count with decision makers. Evidence counts! Legislation enacted, which reflected practices of DD.</p>
<p>Style/culture: dominant values & beliefs, norms, which develop over time and become relatively enduring features of organisational life –</p> <p>Management Style: what managers do rather than what they say.</p>	<p>New CEO appointed with community engagement background, and saw DD as imperative. CEO undertakes a public communications strategy to support engagement in [seen as contrast to other organisations in the sector]. An ‘authorising environment’ for DD was created. Effective, dynamic, courageous leadership. CEO and Community Engagement Manager scope projects together. Resources are not a problem. The organisation is prepared to consider a wider range of measures as a result of engagement. Arrogance must give way in the face of societal change. DD is seen as relevant to everyday decisions – decisions should be informed by information from the people. Direct line between deliberators and decision makers. Possible to reframe issues - who is affected and should be involved? Changing the terms of reference e.g. community engagement not seen as just marketing and communication. Recognition by business areas in the organisation of our dependence on participation expertise. Interaction between ‘hard’ ‘technical’ service providers, and ‘soft’ ‘humanistic’ contractual partners. Representation of decision makers in the DD process itself. DD language being taken up more widely – and taken out to other organisations. Practices are picked up and valued by others. Language! Reflecting values, beliefs. Internal approval or commitment to DD.</p>
<p>Systems: Formal and informal procedures that support the strategy and structure.</p>	<p>Board approval for framework was critical. Clear procedures in organisation (projects must go to the community engagement = CE manager) Clear responsibilities for doing DD. CE team – had authority therefore power to approve projects with DD. Service delivery model for CE team – not <u>do</u> the engagement but plan/oversee/evaluate. CEO message about the importance of DD saturated the organisation. (But embedding was also threatened by organisational fatigue about the CE message!) Independent evaluation/ and positive outside reviews supported DD. Audits and standards for community programmes Fatigue lead to a review of CE framework. This review consulted DD resisters, but result is widespread support.</p>

	<p>Outside support was useful for fighting for continued DD inside the organisation.</p>
<p>Skills/ capability: engagement competencies – and ways of expanding or developing competencies</p>	<p>We explored models of organisational culture change to develop a framework and areas to focus on. Safe spaces for discussions so can we learn about real underlying issues. Designed the overall DD model with the help of locals (interested and affected people). Applied model in a place/situation likely to succeed. Good diagnosis. Cumulative benefits of DD identified. A good experience – “knowing that there is a better way”. Relied on the CE manager’s expertise. Reflective practice in the ‘organisation’, across disciplines. Training done before going into practice. People in our organisation began educating themselves about ‘the public’.</p>
<p>Situation – The political, social and cultural world the organisation is situated in.</p>	<p>New legislation reinforced ‘engaging’ as a better way to get projects done on time, in budget. Community support for model of DD. Public conscientiousness of DD. Social movement led to pressure on government to consult. Expensive court processes led the organisation to decide to ask the community what they wanted. A public problem led to DD capacity building for the organisation. Public outcry – Royal Commission – Public Inquiry led to new DD initiatives. People want to help the DD team, because of reputation concerns for the wider organisation. DD is part of external advocacy for the organisation and its way of operating. High rates of crime – high diversity – inequality led to complex social problems that required new approaches to developing solutions. The organisation had a huge project – big risk to delivery if there was community outrage. Long term negotiations with community stakeholders, involving multiple \$M- showed need for a process to resolve disputes. Discussions also showed there was other knowledge and new experts to bring in. Cost of walking away from engagement was too high for the organisation and its community. Reputation and social backlash influenced DD practice [understanding participation in a risk management framework].</p>

The following ideas / proposals for future research were expressed at the workshop:

- What leads to ‘stalled’ DD approaches - and how can these be addressed?
- A longitudinal ethnography of how an organisation/s embeds or reproduces DD practices.
- Longitudinal evaluation on the impact and outcomes of good DD practices (e.g. past and current IAP2 award winners).

4

CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Comparing the literature review with the workshop findings

There is marked congruency between the findings of the literature review and the outcomes of the workshop, especially the analysis of key characteristics of embeddedness in the practice-based stories about organisational approaches to DD. These can be summarised in terms of: (i) significant drivers for doing something different; (ii) recognising and valuing the benefits of a DD approach for organisations and affected communities; (iii) enabling organisational change and developing an organisational culture to embed new DD practices; (iv) ensuring appropriate resources are provided, and (v) 'future-proofing' through appropriate evaluation processes; policy and legislative support, and building an organisational culture. Future-proofing ensures the longevity of DD approaches despite changes, such as management and staff changes.

4.2 Significant drivers for doing something different

These drivers can originate within communities and/or within organisations. A common theme across the literature and the workshop is that 'the need to do something different' is most often connected to the need to find alternative ways for both communities and organisational decision makers to work together to explore achieve outcomes, or find solutions that are mutually beneficial. The literature drew attention to the nature of 'wicked problems' and the characteristics of these, such as complexity, no one solution, multiple actors/agencies involved, and diversity of views and needs, and these were also illustrated as key drivers in the stories relayed in the workshop.

4.3 Recognising and valuing the benefits of a deliberative democracy approach for organisations and affected communities

Transformative change is a key feature of DD approaches as outlined in the literature, and the workshop stories provided evidence of the ways in which DD approaches improved community-organisational interactions and outcomes; increased organisational and community confidence in decisions; and built trust. Early positive experiences, reinforced by subsequent experiences, are important for embedding DD approaches within both organisations and communities.

4.4 Enabling organisational change and developing an organisational culture to embed new practices.

Both the literature and the workshop stories highlight the need for organisational champions, most often at CEO or management level. These people have considerable power to effect organisational change, by employing staff with the appropriate knowledge and skills, and ensuring appropriate resourcing. One of the workshop stories also highlighted the advantages of being able 'research' organisational understanding and to consequently develop educational resources to inform everyone

in the organisation. In this case, DD was not seen as a 'silo' but incorporated into roles and responsibilities across the organisation. Workshop participants referred to this culture change as a habitual practice whereby it is taken-for-granted in processes for organisational-community problem-solving – a characteristic of embeddedness also identified by Fagotto and Fung (2009).

4.5 Ensuring appropriate resources are provided

The range of resources required for embedding DD varies considerably across different contexts but the literature and stories identify commonly needed: time (*DD is a process not an event*); adequate financing or budget; appropriate places for meetings; and training for those involved (e.g. facilitation). The story about the integrated community justice centre was based on the need for a 'tailor-made' building that could house a courtroom as well as the multiple services required for justice services, *and* ensure that people using the services were 'safe' (e.g. victims were not confronted by those who had harmed them).

4.6 'Future-proofing'

Both the literature and the workshop stories identified different forms of 'future-proofing' as a requirement for embeddedness. 'Future-proofing' enables the continuation of DD practices, despite organisational changes such as staff turnover or key people (champions) leaving the organisation. Two key ways of future-proofing identified in both the stories and literature are: building an organisational and community culture whereby DD practices become an established habit; and developing policy and/or legal means to ensure the continuation of DD practices. Workshop participants also pointed out the importance of appropriate and ongoing evaluation of DD practices and outcomes. This is a gap in the literature, and indeed across much of the literature about participatory decision-making. There are two probable reasons for this gap: (i) the time-lag between processes and outcomes, and (ii) the relative influence of other factors on decision-making. Theoretically, DD approaches should be easier to evaluate than many other forms of participatory decision-making given the ability to identify drivers, process and outcomes. Embedded DD should be even easier to evaluate because there is not a finite end to organisational practices, but on the other hand any reviews need to include a longer time frame to observe change over time.

REFERENCES

Blok A. (2007). Experts on trial: On democratising expertise through a Danish consensus conference. *Public Understanding of Science*, **16**, 163-182.

Brackertz N. (2006). *Hard to reach? Engagement, governance and community consultation in Victoria local government*. Paper presented at the Governments and Communities in Partnership conference, Centre for Public Policy, University of Melbourne, 25-27 September, 2006.
www.public.policy.unimel.edu.au/conference06/

Carson L. (2011). *Dilemmas, disasters and deliberative democracy*. Griffith REVIEW Edition 32, 'Wicked Problems, Exquisite Dilemmas'.

Fagotto E., Fung A. (2009). *Sustaining public engagement, Embedded deliberation in local communities*. An Occasional Research Paper from Everyday democracy and the Kettering Foundation.

Fishkin J. (2000). *Virtual democratic possibilities: Prospects for internet democracy*. Paper prepared for Internet, Democracy and Public Goods conference, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, November 6-10.

Fung A., Wright O. (2001). Deepening democracy: Innovations in empowered participatory governance. *Politics and Society*, **29**, (1), 5-41.

Fung A. (Ed) (no date). *Innovations in participation: Citizen engagement in deliberative democracy*, 17-25.

Greene J. (no date). *Does deliberation work? A summary of the usefulness of deliberation in professional and civic organisations*. An overview of findings of two workshops conducted by the Kettering Foundation.

International Association for Public Participation Australasia (2010). *The best of practice: community engagement in Australasia*. 2005-2009, p.73.

Levidow L. (2007). *European public participation as risk governance: Enhancing democratic accountability*. www.oro.open.ac.uk/10273/1/Levidow_fulltext.pdf

Mutchler S. (2011). *Deliberative democracy: A promise and a challenge for preparing educational administrators*. U.S.A.: Connexions Content Commons.
<http://cnx.org/content/m36756/latest/>

Nabatchi T., Farrar C. (2011). *Bridging the gap between public officials and the public*. A report of the Deliberative Democracy Consortium.
www.deliberative-democracy.net

Ravetz J. (2004). The post-normal science of precaution, *Futures*, **36**, 347-357.

Rayner S. (2003). Democracy in the age of assessment: reflections on the roles of expertise and democracy in public sector decision-making. *Science and Public Policy*, **30** (3), 163-170.

Semmens A. (2005). Engendering deliberative democracy: Women's environmental protection problems. *Human Ecology review*, **12**, (2), 96-105.

Sirianni C., Friedland L (no date). *Deliberative Democracy*, Civic Dictionary entry, Civic Practices Network. www.cpn.org/tools/dictionary/deliberate.html

Staeheli L. (2010). Political geography: Democracy and the disorderly public. *Progress in Human Geography*, **34**, (1), 67-78.

Weymouth, R.; Hartz-Karp, J.; and Armstrong, R. (2011) *Meeting Challenges through Empowered, Deliberative Participation: A case study of a WA regional local government*
A paper for the ACELG Local Government Researchers Forum December 2011.
<http://www.acelg.org.au/upload/Participation%20WA%20case%20study%20R%20Weymouth.pdf>

Winstanley A. (2012), Research into scientists' views and preferences for communication activities with non-peers. Report for the Ministry of Science and Innovation, Wellington.