



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive
DSpace Repository

Faculty and Researchers

Faculty and Researchers' Publications

2003-09

Direct Citizen Participation: Building a Theory

Robert, Nancy C.

Paper to be presented to the 7th National Public Management Research Conference,
October 9-11, Georgetown University, Washington D.C.

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/40260>

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. Copyright protection is not available for this work in the United States.

Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>

Direct Citizen Participation:

Building a Theory

Nancy Roberts

Professor of Strategic Management
Professor of National Security Affairs

nroberts@nps.navy.mil

Graduate School of Business and Public Policy
Naval Postgraduate School
555 Dyer Road
Monterey, CA 93943

September 30, 2003

Please do not duplicate or quote this paper without written permission of the author.

Paper to be presented to the 7th National Public Management Research Conference, October 9-11, Georgetown University, Washington D.C.

Direct Citizen Participation: Building a Theory

Abstract

The subject of citizen participation has a long lineage dating back to the Greek city-states. Two questions have been central to its history: Who is a citizen and how should the citizen participate in governance? Responses to these questions have varied depending on the political and administrative theory one champions. Those who value indirect citizenship participation, or representative democracy, cite the dangers, costs, and logistical difficulties of involving all members of a society. Those who value direct citizenship participation cite increased state legitimacy and the benefits of social learning when all citizens are involved.

The data on citizen participation in the U.S. come from “experiments” in different programs (e.g. Model Cities) and different sectors (e.g. education, social services, health). They also come from explorations of citizen participation at the individual, group, inter-group, and network levels. Citizens participate as individuals when they vote, respond to surveys and attend hearings. Citizens participate as group members when they join advocacy and voluntary groups and participate in citizen panels and advisory committees. Citizens participate as members of large groups when they join stakeholder collaborations that bring together competing interests groups, administrators, and politicians to craft and implement public policy. And citizens participate as members in a network, especially those reliant on the Internet and information technology, when they push issues on the political agenda that have been neglected or avoided by formal authority.

These experiments and their assessments have produced a few models and frameworks, but not a well-developed theory of citizen participation. Drawing on forty years of research, this paper lays out the basic elements of a theory, specifying the units and levels of analysis, and the conditions under which citizen participation is likely to be effective.

As soon as public service ceases to be the main business of the citizens, and they prefer to serve with their pocketbooks rather than with their persons, the State is already close to its ruin. Is it necessary to march to battle? They pay troops and stay home. Is it necessary to attend the council? They name deputies and stay home. By dint of laziness and money, they finally have soldiers to enslave the country and representatives to sell it.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau

Direct Citizen Participation: Building a Theory

Introduction

Citizenship participation is the cornerstone of democracy, but there is a deep ambivalence about citizens *directly* participating in their government. On the one hand, the active role of citizens in governance is an important ideal in American life (Box, 1998; Skocpol and Fiorina, 1999). Direct democracy keeps community life vital and public institutions accountable. It resolves conflict through “a participatory process of ongoing, proximate self-legislation and the creation of a political community capable of transforming dependent private individuals into free citizens and partial and private interests into public goods” (Barber, 1984, p. 151). Proponents argue that the United States has reached a point in its development when even more direct involvement is not only desirable, but it is feasible. Citizens have the knowledge and the ability to participate more fully in the political, technical, and administrative decisions that affect them. They have demonstrated this capability when they have been given the chance. Most important, it is their right to be engaged in the decisions that touch their lives (Barber, 1984; Box, 1998).

On the other hand, direct citizen participation is viewed with skepticism, even wariness. Representative democracy, or indirect citizen participation, has its advantages. It protects citizens from the dangers of direct involvement. It buffers them from uninformed public opinion; it prevents the tyranny of the majority; and it serves as a check on corruption. It also meets the needs of a complex, postindustrial society that requires technical, political, and administrative expertise to function. Unlike public officials, citizens do not have the time or the interest to deliberate for the purpose of developing informed public judgment. Given the size and complexity of the modern nation state, direct citizen participation is not a realistic or feasible expectation (Dahl, 1989).

The ongoing debate about direct versus indirect citizen participation has a bearing on administrative theory and practice (Cooper, 1984; Rohr, 1984; Stivers, 1990; Wamsley *et. al.*, 1987; Frederickson, 1997; King and Stivers, 1998; Warner, 2001). In the course of their work, public

officials and administrators make decisions and take action that land them on either side of the great divide. They can invite direct citizen participation and include citizens in developing bureau policy or they can discourage it, even prevent it, in the execution of their duties (Thomas, 1995). Administration thus becomes an important focal point, and some would say battleground, in the discussions over public involvement. As Camilla Stivers (1990) notes, "a key question in the history of the U.S. administrative state has been the extent to which the administration of a representative government can accommodate citizens actively involved in public decision making"(p. 88).

What makes this question even more intriguing for administrative theory and practice is the 'social experiment' that has been underway over the course of the last century, especially in the last fifty years. Citizen participation has been mandated in many public policies and programs. Citizens have been included more directly (either by law or administrative discretion) into administrative practice (U.S. Advisory Commission, 1979). Direct citizen participation is no longer hypothetical. It is very real and public administrators are central to the evolving story.

The first goal of this paper then is to document and describe where we are in this 'social experiment' and to identify some of the more notable efforts of direct citizen participation as reported in the literature. The second goal is to help the reader interpret the results of these social experiments and to build better theory about direct citizen participation. We need to understand what has succeeded and what has not, and under what conditions. This task is much more difficult than the first. There are the standard challenges of doing assessments and evaluations given value and goal conflicts, especially on such a complicated and "contested concept" as citizen participation (Day, 1997). This is not a trivial undertaking in and of itself. But there is more at stake. Assessments quickly land us deep into normative territory. Knowledge of results always begs the next question: Given what we know, should citizens be directly involved in government and administrative practice? Here things get very complicated. Let us use some hypothetical examples to illustrate the point.

Suppose we find 'failure' in some of these social experiments, either in terms of outcomes or in terms of the process. What exactly would that mean? There could be at least two interpretations. On the one hand, failure could 'prove' that critics were right in their cautions about direct citizenship participation. Citizens should not be directly participating in administration any more than they should be directly involved in setting legislative or executive policy. Citizen involvement cannot work and does not work as predicted and the consequences for participation are not good for the long-term health of the democracy. On the other hand, failure could document the 'success' of those who have structured a system in such a way as to limit direct citizen participation. Since the system discourages, or as some would say, to a large extent prevents substantive citizen involvement, it would be reasonable to conclude that when asked to participate, citizens either do not know how to, do not want to, or do not even care to try. Thus failures in direct participation could be attributed to learned helplessness and the 'success' of a system that prevents their substantive participation in the first place.

Alternatively, suppose we find some 'successes' in direct citizen participation. People actually did participate and the consequences were positive, assuming we could achieve a consensus on what positive means. How do we interpret these results? First, we would need to establish whether the study results could be generalized to all settings. Does direct citizen participation

function at all levels of government, in all sectors, for all issues, during all phases in the policy process, with all mechanisms of involvement? Or does direct citizen participation only function with certain kinds of people (both leaders and participants), in small face-to-face groups, on simple, non-technical issues? Finding answers to these questions is an enormous undertaking given the numbers of variables, levels and units of analysis in a federated system with three branches of government reliant on a growing involvement of business and nonprofits to operate. And the complications do not stop there. If we identify certain constraints and limitations on direct involvement, how do we interpret them? Are they the result of an institutional system that conditions behavior so that its removal or redesign would enable citizens to behave differently or are people likely to behave the same way no matter what the system's design? Sorting myths from reality becomes a major challenge under these circumstances (Reidel, 1972; Buck and Stone, 1981).

Thus, our examination of citizen participation in public administration research and practice has the potential of pushing us further into the normative debates about democratic and administrative theory. We might just end up where we started—enmeshed in the ambivalence about direct citizen participation and its expression. We will take our chances. The hope is that in more than fifty years of research, there will be something substantive to say about the status of direct citizen participation in American administrative practice. If nothing more, we can hope for better guidance on what directions we should pursue in the future.

To achieve these two goals, we divide this paper is divided into six sections. The first section, “The Challenges and Dilemmas of Direct Citizen Participation,” defines the concept and provides an overview of its history, its sources of ambivalence in democratic theory, and its dilemmas for modern societies.

Section two, “Administrative Theory and Direct Citizen Participation,” positions the topic of direct citizen participation within public administration theory. Competing public administration models exist, each with its own assumptions and expectations concerning the roles of administrators and citizens. Since direct citizen participation most often rests on the shoulders of public administrators for successful execution, it is important to know how the citizen and his/her direct involvement are viewed within a particular framework. If direct citizen participation is not seen as compatible or appropriate, and administrators discourage citizen involvement, then one would not expect to find many successful examples of it in practice.

Section three, “Arenas of Direct Citizen Participation,” provides a broad-brush view of the major arenas where direct citizen participation has been attempted. We document examples of it in various policy sectors and through all phases of the policy process (implementation, initiation, budgeting).

Section four, “Mechanisms of Direct Citizen Participation,” illustrates the many ways that have been utilized to include citizens directly in their governance. They range from public hearings and surveys to large collaborative planning meetings and citizen panels. The goal in this section is not to be comprehensive, but to illustrate mechanisms that appear to show the most promise in overcoming some of the major hurdles of direct citizen involvement. New mechanisms are evolving daily, and as is evident in the most recent research, there is a growing interest in the use of new information and computer technology to support direct citizen participation.

Section five, “Assessment of Direct Citizen Participation,” summarizes key studies that have evaluated the processes and outcomes of direct citizen involvement. Although there is little consistency in terms of research design, variables selected, methodologies employed, or levels and units of analysis chosen, taken as a whole, these studies give us an important status report on the effectiveness of direct citizen participation as it has been practiced.

Section six, “Building Theories of Direct Citizen Participation,” summarizes three approaches that illustrate the state of theory development. Although theory about direct citizen involvement is least developed compared to the other themes in this overview, these approaches are promising avenues that could be pursued in the future.

The final section, “Coming of Age of Direct Citizen Participation,” concludes this overview by returning to the six major dilemmas introduced in the first section and briefly summarizes the progress that has been made in overcoming them. It also summarizes the next steps in direct citizen participation and identifies the central elements needed to fully develop a more comprehensive and substantive theory of citizen participation.

Section 1: Challenges and Dilemmas of Direct Citizen Participation

Our first task is to define direct citizenship participation. Since it is a contested concept, the literature built up around it is complex and difficult. We start by acknowledging the differences between legal and the substantive definitions. We then chose a substantive definition that includes the important elements of power and decision making. Direct citizen participation is defined herein as the process by which members of a society (those not holding office or administrative positions in government) share power with public officials in making substantive decisions related to the community. Although participation inside organizations is considered to be an important component of the overall participatory process (Vigoda and Golembiewski, 2001), especially as it has a direct bearing on how citizens treat one another and interact with public officials, space considerations preclude its coverage in this review.

Next, we provide a brief history of direct citizen participation as it pertains to administrative practice. Administrators and researchers have amassed an enormous amount of knowledge about direct citizen participation. An overview of its foundations, especially the governmental interventions that have prompted its resurgence, provides a good backdrop for this theory-building exercise.

Direct citizen participation also provokes debates among democratic and administrative theorists. To help flesh out different perspectives, we include a brief summary of the reasons to be supportive and the reasons to be cautious about direct citizen participation. There are substantive arguments on both sides. The reader will find it easier to see linkages and make comparisons across studies with this general overview in mind.

Finally, we summarize the tensions over direct citizen participation provoked by the debates. The tensions are natural outgrowths of our competing perspectives on democratic and administrative theory and some of the contradictions inherent in modern life. Coping with them is a requirement for both researchers and practitioners. Researchers need to address the questions they prompt in

order to develop better theory, which at this point is not well formulated. Administrators, at the front line of daily contact with citizens, need to use the questions as a catalyst to improve administrative practice. For our purposes, we return to the tensions over direct citizen participation in the conclusion. They become our guideposts in determining what progress, if any, has been made and the extent to which direct citizen participation is a viable alternative in modern democratic societies to indirect representation.

Definitions of Citizen Participation

Research on citizen participation produces a complex and untidy literature (Kweit and Kweit, 1981). As a contested concept (Day, 1997), it is not surprising that it is plagued with definitional problems.¹ Citizen participation can refer to a range of different actions by different people (Pateman, 1970).

For some, citizenship is a legal concept. It is a political status or role conferred upon people (Cooper, 1984). Legal definitions emphasize the procedural aspects of involvement—the extent to which citizenship is defined in constitutions and statutes that prescribe the qualifications, rights, and obligations within a particular government’s jurisdiction (Cooper, 1984). Although the U.S. Constitution is virtually silent on the role of citizens in a democratic society, it is understood that citizens owe allegiance to the republic, must abide the laws, and risk their lives for the national defense (Walzer, 1980). In turn, citizens are guaranteed the rights of voting, universal suffrage, and formal equality. For proponents of legal definitions such as Schumpeter (1943), democracy becomes procedural, nothing more than an institutional arrangement used to arrive at legislative and administrative decisions with no particular goal or end in mind. Citizenship serves its purpose to the extent there are enough citizens to choose among leaders for the purpose of policy making.

For others, citizenship is more than a legal concept. It is a substantive ethical and sociological statement. “It is like John Dewey’s idea of community, Ernest Baker’s concept of duty, and Walter Lippmann’s emphasis on civility all rolled into one” (Dimock, 1990, p. 21). For example, the Greek philosophers viewed “citizenship as the main goal of life” (Dimock, 1990:23). Central to this ideal is the belief that government must be guided by a moral purpose—the realization of values in the lives of its citizens (Hart, 1984). The citizen’s primary responsibility is “to know what those values are, why they should believe in them, and what the implications for action might be”(Hart, 1984, p. 114). Furthermore, “each individual should act as an independent and responsible moral agent” (p. 115). If any situation should compromise regime values, the citizen has to act with civility in defense of those values (Hart, 1984).

This perspective on citizenship requires both collective and individual virtue and moral purpose. Its scope is broader than the legal definition and it extends not only to formal governmental arrangements, but it also includes voluntary organizations and community involvement. Its focus is on building and sustaining community—political, economic, and social—and the development of the community’s values, norms, and traditions (Cooper, 1984). Its requirements are a sense of responsibility and civic devotion to one’s commonwealth and a dedication to human and environmental betterment throughout the world (Dimock, 1990). A natural expression has been in various social movements throughout U.S. history—abolitionist, populist, labor union, feminist, civil rights, environmental, and neighborhood movements (Cooper, 1984). Indeed, the ethical tradition of

substantive citizenship has prompted changes in legal definitions. It has been credited with the democratization of the elitist form of government in the Constitution through the extension of the franchise to nonwhites and women, the abolition of slavery, the expansion of civil rights, the establishment of equal employment opportunities, and the mandates for citizen participation in public policy making (Cooper, 1984).

If we adopt Webster's definition of participation as the means to have a share in common with others, to partake with others, then direct citizen participation would alternatively mean fulfillment of one's legal rights and duties as specified in the Constitution, or alternatively, active involvement in substantive issues of government and community. Sherry Arnstein's (1969) definition is illustrative of the latter when she incorporates substantive interests of the polity, such as race, class and gender, to define citizen participation as

a categorical term for citizen power. It is the redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the politics and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future. It is the strategy by which the have-nots join in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programs are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parceled benefits of the affluent society (p. 216).

The preference here is to adopt a substantive definition that is more inclusive and extends to both "haves" and "have-nots." Citizens come in many different stripes and colors; focusing on one type of citizen to the exclusion of others subverts the concept. Although redistribution of power may be an intention or an outcome of citizen participation, it should not be a limiting factor in its definition. The most logical differentiation among participants is between those who hold elected and administrative government positions and those who do not. In this sense, citizen participation would refer to those members of society who serve without pay and do not have formal governmental decision making authority in the formulation or implementation of public policy.

On the other hand, Arnstein's emphasis on power and decision making are central to the concept of direct citizen participation. In her work on the "ladder of participation," she clearly distinguishes citizen participation from manipulation and tokenism (Arnstein, 1969) as others have distinguished it from cooptation (Selznick, 1949; Drysek, 1990). What is implied in her definition is a reconceptualization of power. Direct participation requires power sharing among the citizens and public officials. It is not a form of control that enables those in authority to get citizens to do what they want them to do. Shared power is power *with* citizens as opposed to power *over* citizens (Follett, 1940; Roberts, 1991). Citizens are viewed as an integral part of the governance process and their active involvement is considered essential in the substantive decisions facing a community. Substantive decisions, in this instance, are defined as those that are important and critical in community life as defined by the members of the community.

Combining the expanded view of citizen, and the concepts of shared power and decision making, citizen participation is defined as the process by which members of a society (those not holding office or administrative positions in government) share power with public officials in making substantive decisions and in taking actions related to the community. The focus is on direct participation (when citizens are personally involved and actively engaged) as opposed to indirect

participation (when citizens elect others to represent them) in the decision process.

Brief History of Direct Citizen Participation

The concept of citizen participation has a long lineage. The first written record of direct citizen participation came from the Greek city-states and one of its earliest expressions was in the *Ecclesia* of Athens. The *Ecclesia* was an assembly open to all free, male citizens, 18 and older, for the purpose of debate, consensus seeking, and democratic decision making. Its policymaking power was checked by the council of 500 (elected members who screened the agenda), and by a court, (members chosen by lot who ruled on the constitutionality of the measures that were passed) (Cunningham, 1972; Fishkin, 1991). During the Middle Ages, after the decay and fragmentation of the Roman Empire, urban artisans formed associations to control public matters central to their work. They formed guilds, which were an oligarchy with some voting rituals and limited citizen involvement. Voluntary associations that provided charity, education, and other services also had limited participation (Cunningham, 1972). Eventually, direct citizen participation began to reassert itself in the city-states of Renaissance Italy, the popular assemblies of the ninth century English township, and in some Swiss cantons and communes in the thirteenth century.

Virginia and New England colonial settlements launched their own variants of citizen participation built on the Magna Carta in 1215, which guaranteed due process for all citizens and the self-rule of church congregations. Virginians assembled in 1619 to pass laws, and the Pilgrims established their own government when 41 adult males met aboard the Mayflower. The New England colonists also held town meetings, a latter-day successor to the *Ecclesia*, which enabled free, white, property-owning, adult male citizens to jointly hold certain decision-making powers. Although dominated by elite citizens, town government was democratic in form and neighborhood-oriented in practice. Other influences came from the Native Americans, who made important decisions during full councils of warriors, from the Spanish settlers, who used a *cabildo abierto* (open council), and from Black Americans, who were accustomed to village assemblies (Cunningham, 1972).

Beginning with the presidency of Andrew Jackson, the nineteenth century saw a broadening of democratic practice both at state and national levels. Property qualifications were dropped and self-educated citizens, rather than elites, became part of the civil service. However, as large urban areas developed, political elites—party and caucus leaders—became powerful and pushed direct participation in local government into the background (Cunningham, 1972). To deal with the increasing number of unattended city problems, people turned to voluntary associations such as churches, charity organizations, settlement houses, and trade unions. Rural areas also developed their own voluntary organizations such as the National Grange. Later the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 underwrote land-grant colleges to support agriculture and launch field demonstrations. The Cooperative Extension Service was set up in 1914 to enable county agents to educate farmers and their families. Working with county agents, local people were required to mutually agree on plans and to implement them (Cunningham, 1972).

The first three decades of the twentieth century witnessed the growth of other expressions of direct participation. They included voluntary city and regional planning, attempts to improve the environment through the City Beautiful Movement, and slum eradication (Day, 1997). At the

same time, tribal organizations dealt with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Division of the Public Health Service, citizens served on the Selective Service Boards, and tenants' associations formed in low-rent public housing projects (Stenberg, 1972). Later, farmers' committees would set production quotas and make decisions for agricultural programs associated with the New Deal (Cunningham, 1972).

By the end of WWII, when the federal government returned to its preeminent role in social and economic life that had been established in the 1930's, direct citizen participation received a growing number of endorsements, at least on paper. The Housing Act of 1949 required participation in urban renewal through public hearings. The Housing Act of 1954 (The Workable Program for Community Improvement) and Juvenile Delinquency Demonstration Projects involved citizen participation through citywide advisory committees composed of leading citizens (Hallman, 1972). The Urban Renewal Act of 1954 mandated citizen participation and called for the formation of advisory boards to be comprised of citizen leaders, such as contractors, bankers, and developers, who could make development "work" (Day, 1997). However, these participation efforts involved "non-indigenous, blue-ribbon citizens" in an advisory capacity with little or no direct participation by residents of affected areas (Stenberg, 1972).

The War on Poverty in the 1960s changed the requirements of citizen participation. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 established the Community Action Program that contained the very controversial "maximum feasible participation" clause. Although the actual origin of this clause has not been identified, the support for direct citizen participation emerged from a number of sources: the civil rights movement and its push for participatory democracy; the strategy of those working on a National Service Corps who believed the poor should have a voice in planning and administering local programs; and the political force of Robert Kennedy and the young people in the Kennedy administration who championed maximum involvement of the poor (Boone, 1972). The clause sought to include "residents of the areas and members of the groups served" in decision making. The vehicle of their participation became the nonprofit Community Action Agency (Stenberg, 1972). The national demonstration projects of Head Start and Legal Aid also attracted citizen participation in that local poor people were recruited to develop and manage the programs. In all of these programs, the type of participating citizen changed from affluent white to poor minority member. In the case of the Community Action Program, administrative guidelines decreed that a third on the Community Action Program boards of directors should be representatives of the poor.

The face of participation began to shift yet again with the Model Cities Program, established by the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 that combined urban renewal with the war on poverty. In an effort to avoid the political conflicts engendered by the 1964 act, it only provided for "widespread citizen participation" (Day, 1997). The ultimate authority was to rest with local governments that were given control so as to tailor the program to their needs (Hallman, 1972). Later mandatory participation was replaced with "adequate opportunity for citizen participation" in the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and the "encouragement of the public" in the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (Day, 1997). The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 instructed members of the President's Council on Environmental Quality to consult with the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality and other groups "as it deems advisable" (Day, 1997).

Despite this apparent shift in emphasis from mandatory to advisable involvement, the 1970s was marked by an “explosive growth” in federally mandated citizen participation. The Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 required citizen advisory boards throughout the Federal bureaucracy and encouraged the participation of organized interests. A symposium on *Citizen Participation in Public Policy* cited impressive statistics: 137 (61%) of the 226 public participation programs operating in federal agencies had been created during the decade (Rich and Rosenbaum, 1981, p. 439). The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (1979) presented similar data: 124 (80%) of the 155 federal grant-in-aid programs requiring public participation were adopted in the 1970s. A smaller surge appeared at state and local levels. Gormley (1981) estimated that 75% of state utility regulatory commissions had a high level of citizen participation. And Cole’s (1974) surveys of state and county governments indicated growing opportunities for citizen involvement.

Although the federal government did not pursue one policy toward participation (Stenberg, 1972), through its interventions, direct citizen participation became more of a feature in urban renewal, juvenile delinquency, poverty, manpower training, model cities, neighborhood health centers, and community mental health programs. There appeared to be a two-level process: the national level provided funds and guidelines and the local level executed. The locus of implementation was in the neighborhood with ordinary citizens exercising varying degrees of control depending on the community and its citizens. This trend was compatible with the ever broadening power of the citizen in the electoral process through political parties and their conventions, the direct primary, initiatives, referenda, and recalls, boards and commissions, and public opinion polls that are considered to be ‘unofficial’ referenda in minds of elected officials.

Demands for direct citizen participation in issues of basic welfare and quality of life expanded in the last two decades of the twentieth century. A confluence of voices from students, union members, working and middle-class whites, government workers, environmentalists, feminists, and consumers amplified the movement. Becoming more suspicious of the growing size of government, the power of experts, and the impact of technology, activists of all persuasions wanted more direct control and power in the decisions that affected them. To date, these voices and their demands have not shown any signs of abating.

Citizen Participation and Democratic Theory: Sources of Ambivalence

There are two central questions for any democratic system: Who should rule and how should that rule be configured in practice? For a good part of U.S. history, the answer has been that an elite group of citizens should rule through a representative system of government. In the *Federalist Papers*, for example, one finds an aversion to direct citizen participation. Hamilton argued that direct citizen participation would not be necessary, that a sound administrative system would keep people’s allegiance (Stivers, 1990). In Federalist 63, Madison explicitly rejected a direct role for citizens and called for exclusion of the people who needed protection against their errors and delusions (Rohr, 1984). Thus, the Constitution was drawn up to minimize direct citizen participation by relying on an educated and propertied elite to govern. Although there is now a universal franchise, the idea of representative government is very much alive as witnessed in the 2000 election when the electoral college and the Supreme Court, rather than the popular vote, determined who would be president of the United States.

The question of how well elites have ruled through a representative system has been widely debated. Some like Schumpeter (1943) believe representation works well enough as long as the masses elect their leaders and otherwise stay out of politics and do not attempt to influence or control their representatives. Others see representation as a malfunctioning system that endangers democracy, especially a representative system based on pluralism.² Critics of pluralism believe that vested interests often override public interests (Fishkin, 1991; 1997; Burnheim, 1985) due to the “mobilization of bias” (Bachrach and Baratz (1962) and the “spillover effect” (Fishkin, 1991). Groups with money often are advantaged over other groups who lack the knowledge, skills and resources to be heard in the political process.

Other advocates of reform push for greater citizen involvement to curb the abuses of a representative system (Pateman, 1970; Barber, 1984; Box, 1998). They propose direct rather than indirect citizen involvement. The following statements summarize some of the basic arguments in support of direct citizen participation.

Direct citizen participation is developmental. As first postulated by Aristotle and later elaborated by Jean-Jacques Rousseau (Pateman, 1970) and John Stuart Mill (Krouse, 1982; Warner, 2001), citizen participation is intrinsically valuable because it develops the highest human capacities and fosters an active, public-spirited moral character. The state exists to establish the conditions for the exercise of citizenship so members can live well—the ultimate aim of which is to achieve virtue (Stivers, 1990, p. 87). Thus, through direct participation people are able to realize their potential (Hart, 1972). Simply put, "good processes produce good people" (Hart, 1972, p. 613). Any obstacle to direct participation inhibits this self-development (Cunningham, 1972).

Direct citizen participation is educative. Rousseau and Mill believed that democracy has to be learned and it can only be learned through practice (Pateman, 1970). The more one participates, the more one develops the attitudes and skills of citizenship, and the more others will be drawn into the process, making the system more democratic. To sustain this virtuous cycle (Oldfield, 1990), all institutions in a society should be supportive of democratic ideals. Authoritarian conditions at work will have a detrimental effect, especially since people spend a great deal of time in their jobs. Thus, a participatory government requires a participatory society that reinforces and sustains it, especially at the local level (Pateman, 1970). Also, according to Rousseau (Pateman, 1970) and John Stuart Mill (Krouse, 1982; Warner, 2001), citizens need to deliberate to make good collective decisions. Instead of relying on one another's raw public opinion, citizens need to come to public judgment (Yankelovich, 1991). Public judgment evolves from taking into account others' interests, hearing competing arguments, objections, and counter-arguments before any collective decision is made. It emerges from face-to-face dialogue and deliberation (Drysek, 1990; Bohman and Rehg, 1997; Bohman, 1998; Elster, 1998) during which time citizens come to identify and share a common conception of what Rousseau calls the general will and Mills calls the common good (Pateman, 1970). Anyone outside the deliberative process is prevented from learning the norms by which this consensus is achieved, resulting in a divide between those who participate and those who do not. This divide ultimately can engender rifts and conflicts between participants and non-participants. By involving everyone who wants to participate, direct citizen participation has the potential to be a "solvent of social conflicts" (Salisbury, 1975).

Direct citizen participation is therapeutic and integrative. Most citizens suffer from

alienation and “only through participation will or can they be made well.” Direct citizen participation is “justified as therapy—a process as the healing of the sick” (Hart, 1972, p. 614). Participants achieve psychic rewards, a sense of freedom and control over their lives and strong feelings of political efficacy with higher levels of participation. They also gain, according to Rousseau and Mills (Pateman, 1970), a sense of belonging in their community.

Direct citizen participation is legitimating. As citizens participate in governmental affairs and give their consent to decisions, they legitimate those decisions and the regime that makes them (Pateman, 1970; Salisbury, 1975). This legitimacy produces stability within the system and the regime that makes the rules.

Direct citizen participation is protective of freedom. According to Rousseau, participation enables people to be and remain their own masters and ensures that no man or group is master of another (Pateman, 1970). Freedom comes from participation in decision making because people gain a very real degree of control over their lives and their environment (Pateman, 1970). The people themselves are the best guarantors of their rights, and it is the rule of law, not men, that will protect their freedoms. Direct citizen involvement also fosters more responsive policy and administrative systems that are more in concert with what citizens' desire, especially in the early stages of the policy process when the agenda is set.

Direct citizen participation is instrumental. It is necessary to obtain power and power is required to recoup losses, enhance gains, and enlarge the benefits for self or for one's group (Salisbury, 1975). Direct citizen participation is a mechanism for those without power to challenge those who have it. It is a lever for making changes, whether it is to ensure material or psychic rewards. Its intent is to give those without power a platform and voice for change (Arnstein, 1969) and to reduce the tyranny of the haves over the have-nots.

Direct Citizen participation is realistic. It is impossible to govern without the consent of the governed. Modern society is complex. People have to be included as a source of information and collective wisdom in order for society to use its resources wisely. Their direct participation can minimize delays and can be a source of innovative ideas and approaches (Barber, 1984). Centralized systems, even representative ones, do not have the capability to adapt quickly and flexibly, especially given the technological and social transformations taking place in postindustrial societies.

Many regard direct citizen participation with distrust (Dahl, 1989). They doubt the ability of the masses to make a positive contribution to governance; in fact, they are viewed as a potential threat to the system. The masses, says Schumpeter (1943), are “incapable of action other than a stampede” (p. 283). Such views are consistent with “a long-standing consensus in Western political thought: that substantive involvement by citizens in governance is unworkable, however desirable it may be” (Stivers, 1990, p. 87). Reasons against direct citizen participation rest on the following assumptions.

Direct citizen participation is based on a false notion. “Human nature is flawed.” People are either “too passionate and selfish or too passive and apathetic” (Stivers, 1990, p. 87) to be directly involved. Studies have “demonstrated that the common man is not the rational, self-motivating, and

thoughtful democrat of the Jefferson ideal. Rather the picture that emerges is of a lethargic, irrational, and prejudiced individual who neither understands nor is particularly committed to democratic principles" (Hart, 1972, p. 610). Since individual citizens cannot realistically be trusted, they need "benevolent, but firm, guidance from an informed and politically active minority" (Hart, 1972, p. 611).

Direct citizen participation is inefficient. We live in a large, complex, bureaucratic society. Government is too big to support face-to-face relationships on which participatory democracy depends (Stivers, 1990; Fishkin, 1991). Mass involvement is undesirable because it would be too expensive, too slow and too cumbersome to try "to get everybody in the act and still get some action" (Cleveland, 1975). Moreover, the average citizen does not have the ability to comprehend the management of complex public affairs and institutions (Hart, 1972; DeSario and Langton, 1987; Fishkin, 1991). As society has become more culturally and technologically sophisticated, it needs to rely on more refined, expert decision making. Extensive participation implies a "negation of the expertise built up by the specialist" (Kaufman, 1969, p. 9). Elected officials and administrators have ultimate responsibility to formulate and execute public policy. We should rely on their professional expertise to do what they are 'hired' to do. Otherwise, decision making will be more difficult (protracted and contentious), if not altogether uninformed, when 'amateurs' are involved.

Direct citizen participation is politically naive. Governance should rest on an informed, knowledgeable elite. Only small minority needs to be actively and directly involved in politics. When given the chance, citizens will choose organization that provides security and well-being, even though it begets hierarchy and control. "Oligarchy is the outcome of organic necessity" (Michels, 1949, 402) and is indispensable in complex societies. It is not possible to have both complex organization and democracy. Besides, interest-group politics are too entrenched for the individual citizen to compete. Direct citizen participation cannot prevent powerful cliques from dominating the policy process nor can it eliminate differences in power that it is supposed to equalize (Kweit and Kweit, 1981). Not everyone is equally qualified to decide thoughtfully on all issues. Individuals differ and there are limits to eliminating the differences among them (Fagence, 1977).

Direct Citizen Participation is unrealistic. Direct citizen involvement is a luxury that modern societies cannot afford. It requires skills, resources, money and time that most citizens do not have (Grant, 1994; King, *et.al.*, 1998). Citizens are too busy making a living and supporting their families to be more actively involved. The assumption that people will participate if given the opportunity does not fit with reality. For the most part, relatively few people take advantage of opportunities that do exist (Almond and Verba, 1989). Furthermore, not all people want to participate and should not be coerced into participating, which then would raise questions of the inequality of participation that would favor some and exclude others.

Direct citizen participation is disruptive. Too much citizen involvement heightens political conflict and is dysfunctional. High levels of mobilization lead to disequilibria that destroy social stability (Barber, 1984). Public sympathies are almost without exception incoherent, incompatible with one another, of variable consistency, and imprecise (Fishkin, 1991). The increased "noise" in the system (Kweit and Kweit, 1981) makes it hard for decision makers to respond. Furthermore, heightened expectations for direct participation cannot be filled and as a result they are likely to breed low self esteem, alienation, and distrust—everything that citizen involvement is supposed to

prevent (Kweit and Kweit, 1990). In contrast, limited citizen participation has a positive function. It cushions “the shock of disagreement, adjustment and change” (Pateman, 1970, p. 7). Citizen apathy, in fact, helps maintain the stability of the system. In addition, citizens’ preferences or interests have a strong tendency to be expressed in terms of vested interests. There is no guarantee that common interests and the welfare of the whole will be addressed or protected. What is more likely is an emotional fragmentation that ends up polarizing people without any mechanism that brings them back together. Reliance on the bureaucracy to direct and execute strategies and programs of citizen participation does not reduce the concern. When some members of society participate and others do not, for whatever reason, then their lack of involvement creates a vacuum that can be filled too easily by bureaucracy’s preferred clientele (Fagence, 1977). This opening has the potential for corruption and the exploitation of public policy for private interest (Etzioni-Halevy, 1983).

Direct citizen participation is dangerous. It can lead to extremism as the totalitarian systems with their high rates of citizen participation have demonstrated during the twentieth century (Pateman, 1970). Data from large-scale empirical investigations also reveal that lower socioeconomic groups have non-democratic and authoritarian attitudes (Pateman, 1970). Their preference is to adopt anti-democratic or anti-social policies that value stability over uncertainty. Known injustices have been preferable under the conditions of unpredictability and change (Fishkin, 1991).

Dilemmas of Direct Citizen Participation

The critiques of direct citizen participation summarized above raise a number of dilemmas that have to be addressed if direct citizen participation is to be treated more seriously in a complex, technologically advanced society. We briefly summarize them here for two purposes. They are important themes that are raised throughout the literature. The reader will find it easier to sort through the myriad of perspectives and views if they are kept in mind. We also return to the dilemmas in the conclusion where they serve as guideposts in our assessment of how well direct citizen participation has fared to date and what its prospects may be in the future.

The dilemma of size. The modern administrative state is very large and complex. Direct citizen involvement will have to accommodate numerous groups and individuals. Direct democracy was formulated for small groups meeting face-to-face and operating in relatively constrained public spaces. How can direct citizen participation overcome the limitations of scale (Dahl, 1989; Fishkin, 1991)?

The dilemma of excluded or oppressed groups. There are disadvantaged citizens who have been systematically excluded from representative democracy (Dahl, 1989; Sanders, 1997). Will there be room in the participatory process for ethnic and religious minorities, indigenous peoples, women, the old, gays and lesbians, youth, the unemployed, the underclass, and recent immigrants? And who will speak for future generations?

The dilemma of risk. Many complex technologies pose substantial hazards and risks to individuals, communities, regions, or even to the entire planet. Imposition of risks on people without even their tacit consent is an act of tyranny (Ellul, 1964). Those exposed to risks

(chemical, radioactive, and biotechnological hazards) “are so numerous, and so capable of political mobilization, that they threaten the stability of the political-economic order, and thus place legitimation at issue” (Drysek, 1996, p. 480). How do we deal with these risks?

The dilemma of technology and expertise. Citizens find it difficult to compete with professionals in terms of their knowledge, information, and expertise (Drysek and Torgerson, 1993). Administrative and technical elites crowd out both citizens and their representatives in the participatory process. How can ordinary citizens participate in the decisions made about complex technologies, especially when there can be wide disagreements among the experts, and the costs of gaining the knowledge, information and expertise to stay current in these debates can be prohibitive?

The dilemma of time and crises. We are in an era of accelerating crises (Hart, 1972; Toffler, 1971). Decisions often have to be taken quickly without involving large numbers of people. There may not be time for large-group deliberations. Besides the decision costs involved in reaching agreements (Fishkin, 1997), citizens may not have a great deal of time to give to participatory processes (Grant, 1994). How will we deal with time constraints and crises?

The dilemma of the common good. Direct participation may not truly reflect the common good. The common good depends on deliberation not just assurance of political equality or the capture of public opinion through the latest polls, faxes, 800 numbers, computers and other technological marvels. Power to the people does not necessarily produce thoughtful deliberative power. Incentives have moved us toward direct democracy at the cost of deliberative democracy (Fishkin, 1991). How can direct democracy be more deliberative to enable people to think more seriously and fully about public issues?

Section II: Administrative Theory and Direct Citizen Participation

What is the role of the citizen in a democratic society (Held, 1996; Box, 1998)? This question is a central one in democratic and administrative theory. Answers to it are many and have varied over the years depending on context and historical circumstances. Responses define not only what is appropriate citizen behavior, but they also outline what constitutes appropriate administrative behavior. Citizen and administrator roles are intimately intertwined in an advanced postindustrial society—citizens need administrators and administrators need citizens (Box, 1998). Compatibility between role definitions is the ideal in order for interactions between citizens and administrators to be mutually supportive and reinforcing.

Periods of change can disrupt role definitions of citizens and administrators (Herbert, 1972; Van Meter, 1975). Role definitions once thought to be a good ‘fit’ with each other and the environment can be questioned and disputed. Alternate ‘theories’ of administrative and citizen behavior can surface and compete for acceptability, each claiming the right to set expectations and standards of behavior. Ideally, changes in one role definition would co-evolve with the other. If citizens were to become better ‘consumers,’ then administrators would be expected to become better ‘brokers’ and ‘contract negotiators’ for government services. However, change does not proceed with such precision and order. Deeply ingrained beliefs and role expectations are not transformed overnight nor do they move in parallel. Administrators can be caught in a vortex of competing ‘theories,’ each with different claims about administrative and citizen behavior.

We are in such a period now. A confluence of historical forces, economic trends, and changing political preferences has provoked a reexamination of public administration theory and practice. Different models about what it means to do the public's business have emerged. Direct citizen participation needs to be understood within this context because it sets the terms and conditions not only for citizenship—how we define it, how we express it, and how we judge its affect—but also how we view the administrator's role in support of it. Table 1 provides an overview of some of the better-known models of administration and the roles that citizens and administrators are expected to play in each of them.

(Insert Table 1 About Here)

*Citizen as Subject in an Authority System.*³ This model is the oldest among those on the list. The assumption is that there is an authority (could be religious or political) that rules through a direct connection with the divine. The administrator serves as a link between the ruler and the ruled. His duty is to carry out the ruler's bidding. The citizen's duty is to obey both the ruler and his administrative voice.

*Citizen as Voter in a Representative System.*⁴ This model calls for an expanded role for the citizen. It is centered on the electoral process that enables the citizen to vote for candidates who will represent him/her in the legislature. It also includes activities such as party involvement and political contributions, as well as other formal 'constitutional' obligations such as serving in the military and on juries. Administrators are directly accountable to the elected representatives. Their role is to be the implementer of legislative will as expressed through laws and mandates.

*Citizen as Client in an Administrative State.*⁵ The administrative state rests on the following assumptions. The prime value in decision making is efficiency, defined as the greatest output at the least cost. Administrators who staff public bureaus are professionals, selected and promoted competitively on the basis of competence and merit. They are experts at making rational and value-free decisions. Politics and bureau administration are separated as values and facts are and should be separated. To ensure accountability to politicians, bureaus are organized hierarchically, on the basis of merit and expertise, specialization of function, standardization, and the clear delineation of responsibilities and duties. Good public decisions depend on planning and centralized fiscal management. The elected chief executive, who represents the interests of all the people, energizes and coordinates all parts of the political and bureaucratic system. Citizens are clients in this model. They are to respect and defer to the expertise and neutral competence of professional bureaucrats who are responsible to politicians for implementing policy, making rational decisions in the public interest, and ensuring equal and equitable processes and outcomes. Since citizens do not have the specialized skills, knowledge, or ability to be directly involved in government decision making, their role is to provide the required input and support to administrators so programs and activities can be properly designed, implemented, and evaluated.

*Citizen as Interest-Group Advocate in a Pluralist System.*⁶ Pluralism rests on the assumption that democracy is best achieved through collective action. Citizens are expected to promote their interests more effectively in groups rather than working as individuals. Multiple, diverse, and autonomous advocacy groups exist to represent the wide-ranging interests of society. Taken as a whole, since each group tends to focus on specific issues within the broad electoral

mandate, the groups are believed to serve as the best watchdogs of the greater good. Furthermore, through interest-group conflicts, the full diversity of affected interests can be represented and a reasonable approximation of responsive policy can be developed. For its part, government ensures competing interest groups multiple access points and means of participation in the political process. Dispersed centers of power are arranged both vertically and horizontally enabling active and legitimate groups the opportunity to be heard at critical stages of the decision process. Bargaining, competition, compromise, and power sharing among power centers are necessary to get anything done. In this system of adversarial democracy, ambition counteracts ambition and absolute power is checked. Citizens are expected to be knowledgeable about their interests, support the creation and maintenance of interest groups to protect their interests, elect public officials who represent their interests, and rely on the courts to adjudicate disputes among competing interests. The administrator's role is to be a referee and broker in this system to ensure that all interest groups have equal access and treatment in the administrative system.

*Citizen as Consumer/Customer in a Political/Market Economy.*⁷ In this model, individualism and the pursuit of self-interest are valued. It is assumed that the best way to reflect individual preferences is to rely on the political marketplace much the same way consumers/customers rely on the economic marketplace to signal their preferences. If bureaus do not meet citizen needs, then citizens should be free to use other options in government or in the private and nonprofit sectors. Threatened by loss of business, bureaus then have incentives to change and adapt in order to retain their consumer/customer base. To enable these arrangements, the 'steering' and production functions of government are separated. Steering encourages entrepreneurial leadership and management responsibility in meeting customer needs. Production of public services then can be shared with nongovernmental units (private and quasi-private). In fact, competition among service providers is encouraged to give customers the best service at the least cost. Relationships among providers can be based on formal contracts, cooperative arrangements, informal agreements, and partnerships. These extensive relationships produce a set of associations often described as networks that become a new form of organizing. Managing these relationships adds to the complexity of the administrative function. In such a complex system, administrators act as liaisons, brokers among service vendors, and contract monitors. They are expected to understand and apply business management that is assumed to be generic for both public and private organizations as well as nonprofits, especially the use of pay-for-performance and other private-sector techniques. In terms of the government design, smaller, decentralized, deregulated and flexible government units are preferable to pick up and reflect customer preferences.

*Citizen as Volunteer and Coproducer in Civil Society.*⁸ This model focuses on civil society—those institutions separate from the state and the private sector. As Drysek (1996) notes, civil society is important because it “can constitute a site for democratization...it can be a place where people choose to live their public lives and solve their joint problems” (p. 482). Civic engagement creates two roles for the citizen. The first is the role of volunteer in nonpaying activities to support improvements in neighborhoods and communities and civic life in general. For example, volunteers participate in conventional law enforcement through neighborhood watches and citizen patrols and in public education through the maintenance of school facilities, participation in clean up campaigns, and as classroom aides and student tutors. The second is the role of co-producer. Citizens and administrators cooperate with each other through neighborhood associations, community organizations, and other client groups to redesign and deliver government services.

Their mutual goal is to improve the quality and quantity of service outputs. Citizen-agency collaborations in the production of services occur at all levels of government, but the most prevalent are at the local level. Coproduction has emerged as an attractive option during budget cutbacks, mounting service demands and stretched resources. Its virtue also lies in the creation of network ties that are essential for building strong communities and maintaining a healthy democratic system.

*Citizen as Co-learner in a Social Learning Process.*⁹ Solutions to public dilemmas and problems have to be discovered through social learning. They are not ‘givens.’ Social learning occurs through collaborations among citizens, public officials, and employees who are required to make value judgments and tradeoffs among competing problem definitions and solutions in order to get anything done. It is nurtured through dialogue—enabling participants to respect and listen to one another’s opinions, and through deliberation—enabling competing perspectives to be aired and considered before decisions are made. In their roles as stewards of the public trust, public executives and administrators serve as facilitators of the learning process. They also promote the restructuring of political institutions so that supportive political cultures can be built and sustained. They advocate learning in smaller, decentralized and flatter government units to encourage citizen and employee involvement and they develop new techniques to accommodate collaborative problem solving and decision-making in large groups. Ultimately, the goals of social learning are to develop citizen identity, increase civic virtue, build learning communities, and harness the energy and talents of all members of a democratic society.

Summary. Citizen empowerment, a fundamental tenet of direct citizen participation, is an important element in six of the seven models summarized above. Citizens can be empowered in their roles as voters, advocates, consumers, customers, volunteers, coproducers, and co-learners. However, only the social learning model puts citizens on an equal footing with public officials. As co-learners and full partners, it requires them to be fully engaged in the democratic enterprise by being directly involved in problem solving and decision making about the public’s business.^{10 11 12}
^{13 14} Other models require limited citizen participation, such as those focusing on the economic benefits of citizen participation when citizens are active in the roles of coproducers, owners, and co-investors.^{15 16 17 18}

Section III: Arenas of Direct Citizen Participation

Direct citizen participation is manifest at all levels of government, although it tends to be more evident locally and regionally due to problems of scale. We find its expression in programs¹⁹ and policy areas such as education,²⁰ policing,²¹ health²² and social services,²³ justice and environmental systems,²⁴ economic and community development²⁵. Citizens also are involved throughout all stages of policymaking—analysis,²⁶ initiation, formulation,²⁷ implementation²⁸ and evaluation. The earliest forms of direct citizen participation focused on policy implementation—the initial entry point for federally mandated citizen involvement. Since interventions during the implementation phase were believed to occur too late in the policy process for citizens to have a positive impact (King, Feltey, and Susel, 1998), proponents began to recommend opening up citizen involvement during policy analysis, initiation, and eventually budgeting.

Regardless of the arena of direct citizen involvement, we find tension between experts and citizens. As society becomes more modern and bureaucratized, professional administrators and

experts begin to dominate the policy process. Experts have the education, skills, and time to devote to policy concerns. In contrast, citizens lack the special training and resources needed to be cogent about complex policy problems, especially those involving highly sophisticated technology (Aron, 1979; Hadden, 1981; Morgan, 1984; DeSario and Langton, 1984; Cohen, 1995; and Zimmerman, 1995). As a consequence of these disparities, professionals and experts gain in power, while citizens, unable to participate as coequals, decrease their involvement.

Struggles among experts, professionals and citizens become an even greater source of tension when experts and professionals are not attuned to the issues of the poor, minorities, or those left out of the policy process. Under these conditions, reformers often call for institutional change (*e.g.*, decentralization of services, local control and direct citizen participation) as a means to redistribute power between experts and citizens and to give citizens without voice and representation a chance to be heard. Thus, direct citizenship participation in a democratic society comes to be viewed by many as a major vehicle of social change and transformation (Korten, 1980; 1981). The extent to which it is espoused and practiced (*e.g.*, Gitell in education) or the extent to which it is opposed or found to be of questionable value (*e.g.*, Myren in policing), appears to depend on the level of citizen dissatisfaction with a particular government service. As we see below, the greater the dissatisfaction among citizens within a policy domain, the louder the calls for direct citizen participation.

Section IV: Mechanisms of Direct Citizen Participation

Citizens have numerous ways to participate in their government (Verba and Nie, 1972; Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1980; Verba *et. al.*, 1995). Citizens can make political contributions, write or phone their representatives, work and vote for political candidates. Citizens also can support and join lobby groups to champion their causes (Weber and Khademian, 1997; Berry, 1981; Gormley, 1981; Schuck, 1977). Reliance on elected officials and lobbyists to represent citizen interests are examples of indirect forms of citizen participation. They have been studied extensively in the political science literature. Our focus here is on the mechanisms that directly involve citizens in problem solving and decision making about issues of public concern.

Conventional mechanisms are many (Burke, 1968; Arnstein, 1969; Langton, 1978). They include such things as serving on juries,²⁹ attending public hearings,³⁰ participating in advisory boards, commissions, and task forces,³¹ responding to telephone polls and newspaper ‘clip out’ questionnaires, contacting and meeting public officials, and writing letters to the editor expressing interest or opposition to some governmental action. Unfortunately, these conventional avenues tend to involve only a small percentage of the citizenry.³² Most are one-way transmissions of information from public official to citizen or from citizen to public official rather than citizen engagement in dialogues and deliberations over public policy with fellow citizens and public officials.

This section examines some of the innovative mechanisms designed to facilitate greater deliberation among the citizens. They are grouped by level of analysis. Individual-level participation³³ enables citizens to present their views and preferences directly and interactively to their representatives. Group-level^{34 35} participation involves citizens working in groups ranging in size from three to 75. Large-group^{36 37 38} participation brings hundreds of citizens together to

deliberate about some issue or problem. And electronic participation³⁹ opens up the possibility of cyber-democracy that enables deliberations online in virtual democratic communities.

The decision to sort mechanisms by level of analysis was done deliberately to underscore the tension surrounding the problems of scale. As citizens directly participate in increasing numbers and in more complex formats, the inevitable question arises: How do we get larger numbers of people involved and yet retain the ideal of deliberation that is best enacted in small, face-to-face groups (Cleveland, 1975)? Deliberation is not ‘the aggregation of interests.’ It requires thoughtful examination of issues, listening to others’ perspectives, and a coming to a public judgment on what constitutes the ‘common good.’ Public judgment differs from public opinion, in the sense of the typical opinion poll. Public opinion is “uninformed, superficial and transient” and not a reliable basis for policy (Yankelovich, 1991). Public judgment comes from people to working together, face-to-face, in a shared search for effective solutions to their community problems. It requires information about an issue, knowledge of the basic elements of a problem as well as an understanding of the relationships among the elements and the consequences and tradeoffs associated with different policies. The larger the number of people involved in direct participation, the harder it is for public judgment to emerge.

Mechanisms at each level of analysis offer innovative solutions to deal with the problems of scale. These solutions differ from earlier attempts in a number of ways. Rather than relying on a subset of the population, they all make efforts to be more inclusive, in some cases drawing random samples of participants from all of the major constituencies, including the poor and minorities. They also provide citizens with extensive information about the nature of the policy problem and attempt to engage them in the same problem-solving context that elected officials experience by using the same rigorous approaches in data collection and analysis.

Careful attention also is paid to process issues, not just the content of citizen deliberations. Process is concerned with questions about who participates and how, sponsorship, facilitation, leadership, decision making, sequencing of activities, timing, support and responsibility for implementation. The more people become involved in problem solving and decision making, the more attention to process is warranted. The topic has become so important that a whole sub field devoted to process issues has developed (Bunker and Alban, 1997; Bryson and Andersen, 2000).

We also should note that process becomes even more critical when intractable issues such as growth, allocation of environmental resources, and planning for the future drive the agenda. Recommendations on these topics drawn from public deliberations are more likely to be accepted by the wider public and by elected officials if people have confidence in the process used to produce them. In fact, faith in the deliberative process has enabled some communities to use public deliberations for time-sensitive issues. Most importantly, we find evidence of cases of deliberations to address community budget problems, challenging the belief that deliberations are inappropriate in crisis situations.

Section V: Assessments of Direct Citizen Participation

There are many questions that can be addressed in evaluating direct citizen participation (Chess, 2000). Should summative or formative evaluations be employed? Are long-term or short-

term impacts better to assess? What should be evaluated—process or outcome variables? Should goals be evaluated or should evaluations be goal-free? Are user-based or theory-based evaluations more appropriate? Who should evaluate—outsiders or participants? What evaluation designs are most appropriate and should qualitative or quantitative methods be utilized? And what are the uses of evaluation and the implications for agency and citizen use? These and other questions are standard for evaluative researchers to consider (Suchman, 1967; Weiss, 1972; Herman, *et.al.*, 1987; Stecher and Davis, 1987).

Of the many alternatives open to evaluators, one is particularly important for direct citizen involvement. As we saw in section two, administrative theories carry different assumptions about the citizen's appropriate role in a democratic society. The pluralist model, for example, is concerned about the outcomes of participation and the extent to which the benefits and burdens are distributed throughout society. In contrast, the learning model focuses on processes and their educational and psychological effects on participants. Using criteria derived from the pluralist model to judge direct citizen participation based on the learning model would not be appropriate. Not only would we miss what want to measure, we likely would introduce distortion to the results. 'Failures in direct participation' could just as easily be understood as failures in evaluation design.

Along these same lines, evaluators must take care that their own models and views of citizen participation do not cloud their assessments. Administrators have been accused of "cooptation" and "manipulation" because they have given citizens the appearance of delegating authority and responsibility while still retaining control over processes and outcomes (Arnstein, 1969; Arnstein, 1972). Alternatively, citizens have been charged with "overdramatization, hyperbole, and shrillness" in their tactics and style. Their "questionable activities, including exploitation and abuse of the mass media" are said to "more closely approximate guerrilla warfare than normal political activity" (Cupps, 1977, p. 482).

An alternative interpretation of the above statements about administrative and citizen behavior is that evaluators disagree on the roles that citizens and administrators are expected to play. If one assumes the administrative state model, for example, it is reasonable to believe that administrators are professionals who should retain their authority because of their expertise and their accountability to democratically elected representatives.⁴⁰ This point was made by the Reagan administration when it called for a return to the 'state model of administrative responsiveness.' It believed that federally mandated citizen participation had caused the bureaucracy to become unresponsive to elected officials, and was therefore anti-democratic (Berry *et.al.*, 1989, p. 209). Likewise, citizens' use of confrontational tactics as described above could be considered to be consistent with advocacy and interest group politics. In the role of advocate, citizens compete with other interest groups to push their ideas onto the action agenda. Their aggressive behavior could be viewed as appropriate and necessary to promote their ideas in the corridors of power and to win out over competing views.

Thus, evaluation designs, especially given the competing perspectives on citizen participation, need to make clear which administrative model informs their analysis. Otherwise, results can be misinterpreted and the underlying tensions surrounding direct citizen participation can obscure what is really going on. The following research provides good examples on how to assess direct citizen participation and avoid the pitfalls of evaluation research. They also illustrate an

impressive array of designs and methodologies that range from surveys to comparative case studies. Most notable are their efforts to build theory by identifying the conditions under which direct citizen participation fails or succeeds.

For example, “Resident Participation: Political Mobilization or Organizational Co-optation?” by David Austin (1972) presents findings from the Study of Community Representation in Community Action Agencies (CAA).⁴¹ Central to the study is an assessment of citizen participation, especially as it concerns the congressional mandate requiring one-third of the CAA policy boards be composed of target-area residents. Researchers identified a cross-community randomly selected sample, stratified by region, of 20 Community Action Agencies (CAA) to explore citizen participation and its consequences. In general, due to federal and program constraints, they found that target area residents had little or no part in the initial organization and decisions of the CAAs, and they had very little impact on the major program strategies and mix of programs. Resident participation in 17 out of the 20 CAAs was characterized as advisory, although resident participation in four out of the 17 was able to change the advisory process into a confrontation process within the CAA. Resident participation in the remaining three out of the 20 CAAs had a political function that engaged target-area residents in pluralistic power conflicts in the larger community. Thus, to a large extent, citizen participation was built around a model of advisory and co-opted participation that was shaped by local circumstances. Variations in participation patterns depended on a number of factors: the extent to which there was stability in the social system, accepted patterns of power, the presence of organized political and social movements agitating for community action to benefit low-income or ethnic minority citizens, the percentage of the population that was black or minority, the belief that poverty was a consequence of individual failure, and city size.

Erasmus Kloman (1972) in “Citizen Participation in the Philadelphia Model Cities Program: Retrospect and Prospect,” offers a retrospective evaluation of the Philadelphia program and an appraisal of its future prospects. The Model Cities Program was a congressionally mandated and a HUD-implemented initiative that sought to empower inner-city residents and organizations so they could deal better with the problems of urban poverty. The article demonstrates the difficulties of conducting evaluation in highly charged political environments. Disagreements arose over the meaning of citizen participation, on the role of citizens and neighbor associations, on the oversight responsibilities of local and national agencies, and on the criteria to judge policy outcomes. Disputes adjudicated in court between government agencies compounded the difficulties. The article, the first of three in a symposium on Philadelphia case, illustrates the challenge of reconciling multiple perspectives when conducting an assessment on a contentious topic. The second article in the series offers citizen council members perceptions in “Maximum Feasible Manipulation” (Arnstein, 1972) and the third summarizes public officials’ perspectives in “Views from City Hall,” (City Hall, 1972).

Judith Rosener’s (1978) advocates an approach that she believes avoids some of the major difficulties of evaluation. In “Citizen Participation: Can We Measure Its Effectiveness?” she creates a two-by-two matrix that describes four types of evaluation environments for citizen participation. Quadrant I (the healthiest evaluation environment) finds agreement on participation goals and objectives and whose goals and objectives they are, and agreement on the criteria by which success or failure is measured. In addition, there is knowledge of cause/effect relationship between a program activity and the achievement of specified goals and objectives. In contrast, quadrant IV at the other extreme has no agreement on goals and objectives, criteria, or the cause/effect relationship

between a program activity and the achievement of goals and objectives. Using a case study from the California Department of Transportation, Rosener illustrates how an evaluator can use the matrix to move the evaluation environment from quadrant IV to quadrant I. She also demonstrates how to conduct a program evaluation even when the evaluation has to be “done after the fact” and includes a certain amount of subjectivity in the analysis.

“Making Bureaucrats Responsive: A Study of the Impact of Citizen Participation and Staff Recommendations on Regulatory Decision,” is an evaluation of citizen participation during public hearings held by the California Coastal Commission. Judith Rosener’s (1982) hypotheses-testing study of 1,816 public hearings found that citizen participation changed commissioners’ voting outcomes independent of staff recommendations. Furthermore, when citizen opposition was linked with staff recommendations for denial, the two variables acting together became a strong predictive variable significantly increasing the probability that a commission would deny a permit. In contrast to conventional wisdom, Rosener finds that citizen participation can be effective in public hearings, although she cautions that the relationship among staff recommendations, citizen participation and voting outcomes is complex and needs more study.

Cheryl King, Kathryn Feltey, and Bridget Susel (1998) in “The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration” ask how citizen participation can be improved. Using interviews of subject-matter experts and focus groups (of public administrators, activists and citizens), their study sought to identify the barriers to citizen participation and strategies for overcoming them. Their findings indicate that effective, or authentic, citizen participation requires dialogue and deliberation.⁴² Three barriers to citizen participation are identified: the nature of life in contemporary society; administrative processes; and current practices and techniques of participation. According to the authors, overcoming barriers to citizen participation requires a learning process built on citizen empowerment and education, reeducation of administrators, and enabling administrative structures and processes that change the way citizens and administrators meet and interact.

Xiaohu Wang (2001) also searches for a better understanding of citizen participation. In “Assessing Public Participation in U.S. Cities,” he reports the findings from a survey of chief administrative officers in U.S. cities with populations greater than 50,000. The officers were asked to identify the types of participatory methods citizens used, where and how much citizen participation occurred in their cities (both in terms of management and service functions), and the extent to which citizens were involved in decision making. He found that a wide variety of citizen participation mechanisms were employed, with a surprising 81.6% of the cities using the Internet to communicate with citizens. Some citizen participation appeared to occur in central management functions (*e.g.*, budgeting, personnel, procurement), while a much higher level was reported in service functions (*e.g.*, zoning and planning, parks and recreation, policing and public safety). Citizen participation in decision making did occur, but only about one third of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their cities involved the public in identifying agency goals and objectives. The study also found various causes of increased citizen participation: size of government, political divisiveness, managers’ willingness for accountability, and an interesting agenda. Citizen participation had the greatest impact in terms of its ability to meet public needs and build a consensus.

Eran Vigoda (2002a) explores the relationship between citizen participation and public sector performance in his article “Administrative Agents of Democracy? A Structural Equation Modeling of the Relationship between Public-Sector Performance and Citizen Involvement.” Drawing a sample from 260 households in a large Israeli city, he uses five alternative models to test the relationship between public administration performance and citizenship involvement. A structural equation modeling using LISREL VIII reveals the superiority of one model. However, the results were paradoxical, according to Vigoda. Public sector performance was negatively related to citizen involvement. As citizens became more satisfied with performance, they were less inclined to actively participate in political and community affairs. This finding suggests “citizens may become active only when some of their essential needs are not satisfied by public authorities” (p. 266).

Section VI: Building Theories of Direct Citizen Participation

Theory building is an art, but on the topic of direct citizen participation, not a particularly well developed one. We are in the early stages of theory development. The area is rich in case studies, but there have been no attempts at meta-analysis across cases, at least that we have been to uncover. Although there is much speculation on what makes direct citizen participation successful or unsuccessful, few definitive statements can be made for all policy arenas, for all stages of the policy process, and for all participants. What works in one situation may not work in another.

The lack of theory development is not surprising given the complexity of the topic. The number of individual, group, and organizational variables, not to mention contextual factors that could be considered, can be overwhelming. One reasonable response has been to reduce this complexity by focusing on one aspect of direct citizen involvement. Sherry Arnstein (1969), for example, categorized various approaches to citizen participation ranging from manipulation to citizen control. Thomas Webler and Seth Tuler (2000) empirically developed a set of “rules,” based on Renn and Webler’s normative theory of public participation and Jürgen Habermas’ concept of ideal speech and communicative competence that they believe should govern interactions between citizens and public officials. Each of these efforts has taken an important first step in theory building, but both require more field-testing in different contexts before they attain the status of a developed theory.

Another technique of theory building is to approach the topic of direct citizen participation by focusing on different levels of analysis. For example, micro-level theory could be developed to account for citizen and administrative behavior during problem solving and decision making activities. Mid-range theories could be developed to link the nature of issues being addressed and the type of participation mechanisms being employed. Macro-level theories could be developed to describe how direct citizen participation evolves over time given certain historical and social forces. The three articles summarized below represent the state of the art in theory building for direct citizen participation at the micro, mid, and macro level of analysis.

For example, John Clayton Thomas’ (1990) article “Public Involvement in Public Management: Adapting and Testing a Borrowed Theory” builds theory at the micro level. He adapts the Vroom and Yetton Model from the literature on small group decision-making and tests it against 42 decisions made with varying degrees of public involvement. He finds that the data support the modified theory. Public administrators have four styles of decision making: modified autonomous

managerial; segmented public consultation; unitary public consultation; and public decision. Choice of style depends on multiple factors: information available, the structure of the problem, the criticality of public acceptance for implementation success, the public's likely acceptance of the decision if the manager makes the decision alone, the public's acceptance of the agency's goals in solving the problem, and the likely conflict on the preferred solution. Time was not found to be a critical factor in decision-making style, suggesting that managers should either ignore time constraints in deciding how to involve the public or to factor in the constraints on both decision making *and* implementation.

At the mid level, Lawrence Walters, James Aydelotte, and Jessica Miller (2000) offer a model of public involvement based on the purpose of public involvement (discovery, education, measurement, persuasion, and legitimization) and the nature of the issue (well structured, moderately-structured, and ill-structured). Creating a purpose-issue matrix, they then position public participation techniques and strategies (*e.g.* town meetings, focus groups, formal hearings, etc.) within the matrix in order to give public administrators some guidance on which strategies to use under which conditions. A retrospective analysis of two case studies, one that failed and one that succeeded illustrates the application of the model. Although the model has yet to be empirically verified, the authors believe decision makers and administrators will be able to use it to ensure more successful involvement of the public and improve the quality of the decision.

Eran Vigoda's (2002b) article "From Responsiveness to Collaboration: Governance, Citizens, and the Next Generation of Public Administration" represents theory building at the macro level. He builds an evolutionary continuum of public administration-citizen interactions based on the role of citizens, governance and public administration authorities, and their reciprocal interactions. Depending on the historical context, citizens can be viewed as subjects, voters, clients or customers, partners, or owners. Authorities in turn can be rulers, trustees, managers, partners, or subjects. Four types of interactions derive from the interactions between citizens and authorities: coerciveness, delegation, responsiveness, and collaboration. Vigoda positions New Public Management (NPM) on the mid point on the continuum due to its emphasis on responsiveness rather than its willingness to endorse sharing, participating, collaborating, and partnering with citizens. While he considers NPM to be an improvement over earlier classical ideas of administration that viewed citizens as subjects or voters, he still finds it obscures the importance of citizen participation and collaboration—the essence of democratic civil society. For future public administration, he advocates the next step on the evolutionary continuum—collaborative interactions and partnerships between citizens and authorities. He discusses what collaboration and partnership mean, and whose responsibility it is to forge them. Although his model has not been tested empirically, he speculates that by changing the roles of authorities, citizens, the media, and academia, productive collaborations can be achieved in the future.

Conclusion: Coming of Age of Direct Citizen Participation

Direct citizen participation is pervasive. We find examples in arenas from education to the environment, in policy processes from policy initiation through budgeting and implementation, and at all levels of government from the local to the federal. Its growth has been explosive, thanks in no small measure to federal legislation that mandated it and the practitioners and scholars who have developed innovative techniques to accommodate it. Interactive surveys and statewide collaborative

projects are just two of the new techniques that have been used successfully to enable more people to come to public judgment about the common good. Given people's inventiveness and ingenuity, there is good reason to expect that other social inventions will follow in the future.

Despite the pervasiveness and growth of direct citizen participation over the last fifty years, tensions remain. We return to those outlined in the first section in order to gauge how much progress has been made in dealing with them.

Dilemmas of Direct Citizen Participation

The dilemma of size. Size continues to be a factor in direct citizen participation, although we find very important advances in reducing some of its drawbacks. New *social technology* has been invented that enables more citizens to be directly involved in large-group problem solving and decision making. As reviewed in section three, citizen collaborations now can accommodate thousands of people at one point in time. At this juncture, no upper limit to the numbers involved appears to have been reached. Careful attention to design and process issues have improved chances for success, as have new patterns of leadership and decision making. Revolutionary forms of connectedness—media, new adaptations of information and computer technology, the Internet, and the WorldWideWeb—are now being utilized to support the deliberative process.

One very famous example, which used some new technological advances, is the electronic town meeting for World Trade Center site planning. On July 20, 2002, as part of the civic initiative called Listening to the City, 4,300 people came together to shape the future of Lower Manhattan. New Yorkers from every walk of life participated to review the six plans that had been developed for the reconstruction of the World Trade Center site. The nonprofit AmericaSpeaks designed the format, called 21st Century Town Meeting, to accommodate over four thousand people who sat in groups of ten, with a facilitator and a laptop computer at each table, and an electronic polling keypad for each person (Lukensmeyer, and Brigham, 2002). Nearly 1,000 staff and volunteers supported the event. They came from every state in the union as well as five countries to volunteer their services. As part of the design, participants heard presentations about the six plans and then deliberated with their table group about what they had heard. Facilitators worked with each table to ensure participants listened and learned from one another. Each table then submitted its views through a wireless laptop computer that was linked to others in the room. Neutral analysts, called the "theme team," reviewed the comments from the hundreds of tables and identified the strongest themes coming from the deliberations. The theme team, in a matter of minutes, reported back the results of the deliberations to the participants in the meeting room on a dozen large screens. Participants then used their polling keypad to prioritize the themes, and give feedback to the theme team and to public officials. A two-week online dialogue with 818 people in 26 small groups followed, allowing people who could not attend to discuss the issues and review proposals. The results of this innovative program, Listening to the City had a profound impact on the rebuilding process. Public officials rejected the original six site plans, went back to the drawing board and identified six new design teams who were charged with developing plans based on criteria set forth by participants. Thus, with this very important example, we see how dialogue and deliberation can be married with computer and information technology to deal with the serious problems of scale.

The dilemma of excluded or oppressed groups. Federal legislation gave some voice to

excluded and oppressed groups in the 1960s, but for many, the involvement was short-lived due to changing mandates and regulations that reduced the level of their initial participation. These groups were further disadvantaged because they lacked the resources that would enable them to take time off to join deliberations with more affluent citizens. To bridge the economic divide, at least during regulatory hearings, some assistance was provided in the way of financial aid to help defray the cost of obtaining legal counsel, expert witnesses, necessary documentation, and the actual reimbursement of participation expenses (Paglin, 1977; Aron, 1979), although these efforts were not widespread throughout government. As noted in section three, there has been some success in bringing disadvantaged groups into public deliberations with public officials through the use of interactive surveys that draw random samples of the population. But as society becomes more reliant on information and computer technology to conduct these surveys, it will be important to guard against other divides—those between the information rich and the information poor, between the computer literate and the computer illiterate. The educational divide among citizens also continues to be a source of concern. Many citizens are discouraged and intimidated from participating because they lack the information and knowledge to consider complex policy issues. Inviting everyone to the table as coequals in a learning process, and giving them the tools and resources they need to be successful, is one of the greatest challenges of direct citizen participation.

A very encouraging demonstration of how social technology could be utilized as a leveling device is the World Trade Center deliberation on reconstruction. When advance registration numbers revealed under representation of certain demographic and geographic groups, organizers of the 21st Century Town Meeting were able to increase the numbers by directly contacting community neighborhoods and encouraging people to participate. The result was roughly an equal representation of men and women, and a good mixture of age groups, with the exception of youth. (The youth had a much higher participation rate in the online dialogue that followed the event). Although racial diversity did not match the regional census, it was notable: 14 percent of participants identified themselves as “mixed racial heritage” or “other,” 12 percent as Asian, 10 percent as Hispanic, 7 percent as African American, and 67 percent as Caucasian (Lukensmeyer and Brigham, 2002). Equally important, the expert facilitation at each table leveled the playing field by ensuring that all participants had the same information, the same access to subject matter experts who were present to answer their questions, and the same opportunity to be heard.

The dilemma of risk. The risks from complex technology are grave. Direct threats from our technology (*e.g.*, nuclear power and recombinant DNA) and indirect threats from the by-products of the technology (*e.g.*, pollution, environmental degradation) pose hazards to everyone. As Jack DeSario and Stuart Langton (1984) point out, “never before has mankind had the imminent capability to achieve such radical constructive and destructive alterations of society” (p. 223). However, setting up the incentives and decision processes so that these issues can be dealt with equitably has been a subject of much debate. Early direct citizen participation efforts tended to focus on social issues such as civil rights, housing, urban renewal, education, and social services. It was only in the 1970s with the environmental and consumer movements that direct citizen participation began to collide with technological establishment over issues of risk and the distribution of hazards. The NIMBY opposition got its start in these encounters and continues unabated today, although the oppressed and excluded groups have not been heavily represented in these movements. One mechanism that could be utilized in the future is Paolo Freire’s (1970) *conscientizaco*, or “critical consciousness,” a method of civic education developed in Brazil. It

involves dialogue among oppressed people to help them discover the social injustices they are experiencing and to encourage the collaborative action necessary to transform their situations. Interest-group politics and adversarial legalism, characteristic of the U.S. system (Kagan, 1991; Kelman, 1992), have made critical consciousness a less attractive option in the past. However, its emphasis on civic education, dialogue and learning makes it a process worthy of exploration in the future.

The dilemma of technology and expertise. The federal government acquired a central role in the development, application, and regulation of new technologies (DeSario and Langton, 1984). When sophisticated technologies outgrew congress' ability to oversee them, new professional bureaucracies developed to serve in its stead. Private organizations experienced a simultaneous expansion of specialists and experts. Together the two sectors eventually created a new "technostructure" of professionals who were expected to apply their specialized theories, models, and procedures to solving societal problems (DeSario and Langton, 1984). However, the limits of expert decision making began to surface. Scientific experts, good at achieving objectives, were not particularly good at defining them. Moreover, the science they espoused did not preclude them from making value choices in the name of objectivity and neutrality. As the public became more uneasy about technology and expert power, especially as the failures of technology became more apparent (e.g., Love Canal, Three Mile Island, Agent Orange), citizens began to demand greater participation in complex technological issues such as air and water management, control of hazardous wastes, nuclear power and DNA research (DeSario and Langton, 1984). Yet the match between citizens and experts does not necessarily produce a level playing field. As Zimmerman notes, "nuclear power provides the prototypical example of technological authoritarianism" (Zimmerman, 1995:89). We lack the structures and procedures to integrate technocratic and democratic contributions. To the extent the deliberative processes described in section three continue to unite experts and citizens in collaborative problem solving and decision making, then we can say with some confidence that progress is being made in addressing the dilemma of technology and expertise. To the extent that these two groups fall back into their separate corners, then technocracy and democracy will continue to be the "chief protagonists in the technological struggle" (DeSario and Langton, 1984, p. 224).

The dilemma of time. A constant criticism of direct citizen participation is that it takes too much time. The business of government requires expeditious treatment, especially during crises when 'split-second' decisions have to be made. The more people who are involved in some decisions process, the harder it is to act with dispatch. True, it is more difficult to make decisions as the number of people increases. However, this argument has less sway when we examine the cases that employed direct citizen participation to address budget problems (Roberts, 1997; Weeks, 2000). Not only were large-scale public deliberations effective in cutting budgets, they also were instrumental in maintaining civility throughout the process. As long as there was some latitude in terms of time—four months in one case at the local level—then direct citizen participation was found to be a viable option. When we factor in the argument that time is money, and that public deliberations are expensive with all the planning, facilitation, staff and resources needed to support them, we still have to consider what it costs *not* to have public deliberations. There is the potential for implementation disruptions and failures, costly litigation when citizens challenge administrative decisions, not to mention lost good will and opportunities for social learning. So unless these long-term costs are factored in, the counter-argument can easily be made that the dilemma of time is more of an issue for those who want to retain their administrative prerogatives rather than build a

community of citizens who need to learn how to make hard choices in a resource-constrained world.

Related to the dilemma of time is the nature of the problem under consideration. ‘Hard’ problems take more time for consideration. Siting a toxic waste facility, cutting a budget, and strategically planning for the future all are good examples of these types of problems. Often referred to as “wicked problems” (Rittel and Webber, 1973; Fischer, 1993; Roberts, 2001), their formulations are ambiguous and inconclusive, their resolutions are imperfect and temporary, and their criteria for judgment are difficult to assess independently of the social actors involved (Day, 1997). These intractable problem situations do not lend themselves to technical resolution and routine decision making. They require tradeoffs and value choices among competing options and solutions. Growing numbers of social scientists (e.g., Gray, 1989; Chrislip and Larson, 1994; Huxham, 1996; Chisholm, 1998; Susskind, *et.al.*, 1999; Mandell, 2001; Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002; Straus, 2002) have concluded that the only way to cope with wicked problems is through “increased doses of participation” (Day, 1997, p. 430). Collaborations among citizens, experts, and administrators over strategic plans, budgeting, and environmental concerns in sections three and four of this overview certainly give evidence that this strategy can be effective. Citizens often expressed appreciation for the opportunity to be directly involved in policy matters that they considered to be relevant and important. Rather than criticize direct citizen participation for its inability to be efficient in crisis situations (and that criticism may not stand when all the long-term costs and consequences are factored into the equation), it may be just as important to assess its effectiveness in coping with wicked problems. Although direct citizen participation *takes* time, it also *affords* time for meaningful dialogue and deliberations. Indeed, proactive citizen involvement may be just what is needed to prevent wicked problems from becoming crises in the future.

The dilemma of the common good. The issue of the common good is not just about direct citizen participation. It is about *direct, deliberative citizen participation*—the ability of citizens to reason together and to come to public judgments with their peers in *face-to-face meetings* about issues of public concern. We know that a number of trends are threatening this ability. Although citizen access and personal involvement may be on the rise with the growing use of public initiatives, referenda, public opinion polls, and tele-democracy, these techniques aggregate individual interests, they do not enable direct contact and interaction. Traditional mechanisms for citizen participation—party involvement, voluntary associations, and membership in advisory and advocacy groups—have the potential to be deliberative but they usually are not (Fishkin, 1991; 1997). In terms of civic engagement, there has been movement from direct toward indirect participation in civic organizations as professional staffs are hired and citizens become dues-paying members who substitute money for time. Some, in fact, have referred to the period of 1930 through 1995 as the “bureaucratization of civic engagement” (Skocpol and Farina, 1999). Additionally, as nonprofit agencies sign on to deliver social services through partnerships, alliances, joint ventures, and networks, these arrangements that professionalize and privatize civic life center on the efficiencies of production rather than the deliberation of public concerns. The question that prompts much discussion and debate is where is the *public space* where citizens can directly reason and learn with one another about issues of public interest?

The new participatory mechanisms such as large-group collaborations introduced in sections three and four belie these trends and give evidence that it is possible to create a public space for social learning even in complex, modern societies.⁴³ The King *et. al.* (1998) evaluation study in

section five also provides strong support for learning through deliberation and demonstrates how receptive people are to engaging in meaningful dialogue with one another. Deliberative polling, a new technique that has possibilities for the future, was mentioned in several articles. It brings together a cross sample of the electorate to deliberate over questions of public policy, aided by experts who provide the ‘facts’ in language that can be understood by the layperson. The numbers of people involved in these experiments are small thus far, but measurements before and after these deliberations indicate learning among the participants does occur (Fishkin, 1991; 1997). The wonderful example of the World Trade Center deliberations, as noted above, has profound implications for large-scale deliberations. Not only did more than four thousand citizens learn from one another, public officials also learned that when the public is deliberatively engaged, their policy recommendations can be thoughtful and substantive. And finally, the ideal of community as a living space, not just a marketplace, is very much alive in Box’s (1998) work on citizen governance. He advocates rethinking the structure of local government by redefining the roles of citizens, elected officials and administrators. The intent is to shift responsibility from the professionals and elected representatives to the citizen through new mechanisms such as the coordinating council, citizen boards, and ‘helper’ role for public service practitioners. These and other recommendations for change, along with the evidence collected in this volume, indicate that the search for a ‘space’ to deliberate about the common good still motivates a great deal of creative thinking and action. While not conclusive, these are hopeful signs and positive avenues for experimentation in the future.

Next Steps

Direct citizen participation captivates our attention and imagination. There is something very seductive about the idea that people ought to be directly involved in the decisions that affect their lives. Despite the warnings of its dangers, limitations, impracticality, and expense, especially in large, complex, heterogeneous, technologically advanced twenty-first century societies, it still remains an ideal that animates many of our theories and beliefs. Its appeal continues to attract and fascinate us.

The practice of direct citizen participation is another matter. We struggle to ensure that our public deliberations are inclusive of all citizens, not just a subset. Our ability to organize, plan, and deliberate with thousands of people strains the limits of our social technology. We are in a continual search for new practices and techniques that enable us to be directly involved in a way that creates a public space for learning while at the same does not hinder the work of government. The disappointments and failures in direct citizen participation over the last fifty years have been well chronicled.

The gap between our ideal and its practice, rather than deter us, appears to have energized us. Over the last decade, there has been a surge in the number of books and articles written on the subject of direct citizen participation, dialogue, deliberation, collaboration, and the use of information technology to support the democratic process. Creative experiments with direct citizen participation are occurring in the field in increasing numbers. The deliberative democratic project, our ‘social experiment,’ is still very much alive. Although the tensions still plague us, the articles document that substantial progress has been made in coping with them.

The next steps in this journey will proceed on two interrelated paths. The first path compels

us to track and evaluate what innovative practitioners in the field are doing. Social technology (designing and managing large groups of people for deliberative problem solving and decision making) is advancing at a rapid rate thanks to their inventiveness and creativity. Practitioners are energized, and as two innovators behind “Listening to the City” have commented: “The values are there, the strategies are there, the people are there. It is simply up to all of us to make it happen” (Lukensmeyer and Bringham (2002, p. 365).

Scholars have a role to play in these evaluations. A number of critical questions need to be addressed:

- Do the public deliberations involve substantive issues of concern to the public? Are the problems “wicked” enough to warrant the expenditures of public resources that will be required to plan, conduct, and follow up the deliberations and integrate their results into government problems solving and decision making?
- How are participants selected? Are all individuals and groups invited and do they attend and actively participate?
- Does the process enable participants to learn from one another and what is it they learn? Do citizens’ views of their fellow participants change as a result of these deliberations, and how do they change?
- Does the social technology used to organize the deliberations level the playing field among the participants and provide everyone with the resources, information, and expert support that they need to come to public judgments?
- What do the public officials learn from participants? To what extent does the deliberative process affect their roles as public officials? How do their views of citizens change as a result of the deliberative process?
- Do public deliberations achieve their stated intentions? Do the outcomes inform new policy and procedures?
- Do those *not in attendance* trust the outcomes of the deliberative process? The general citizenry will want to know that these efforts are credible and truly represent an attempt to learn and discover about the common good rather than be used as another platform for interest-group politics, behind the scenes manipulations, or a cover for decisions already made.
- Do the outcomes of these deliberations have the potential for unintended consequences and if so, is there an attempt to consider what they might be and how one might deal with them?
- Can new information and computer technology be *a substitute for* face-to-face deliberations⁴⁴ or can they only be used as *a support for* face-to-face deliberations?

The second path, related to the first, requires better theory building about direct, deliberative citizen participation, especially as it pertains to administration. The least developed area of all the topics addressed in this paper, it needs careful attention from scholars. Theory building can proceed on many different levels as we saw in section six. At the micro level, it would be helpful to know what motivates citizens to participate. What keeps them invested in social learning and direct, deliberative participation and what discourages them from being engaged? Knowing when and how citizens learn also would be important. For example, is it possible for all citizens to listen, learn, and solve problems together, no matter what their backgrounds, personal characteristics, educations, and situations? What enhances their learning and what inhibits it?

At the group level, it would be useful to have better theory on how deliberative groups function. What type of leadership enables this learning and what are the implications for public officials when they assume the role of steward of the learning process? Which design options and techniques of facilitation, organizing, and problem solving are supportive of the learning process? Does computer-assisted groupware facilitate the deliberative process or does it distract participants' attention and impede face-to-face dialogue? Often referred to as collaborative technology, the question is whether groupware can support higher level learning activities as well as it supports administrative functions.

At the macro level, we need to understand how larger political, technological, economic, and historical forces may shape or inhibit direct, deliberative citizen participation. As other countries seek to emulate western democratic traditions, it is important to question whether the model is applicable to those that have not had a democratic tradition or those that recently have emerged from totalitarian rule. Is the social learning process a necessary condition for democracy to take hold or is social learning a consequence of a democratic system? If there is an evolutionary process that prepares people for the responsibilities and requirements of direct, deliberative citizen engagement, then the model might not be appropriate for all countries and situations. On the other hand, what better way to teach people how a democracy functions than to engage the citizens in problem solving and decision making about issues of importance to them?

No matter what the level of analysis, it must be remembered that central to any evaluation or theory building exercise concerning direct, deliberative citizen participation is the issue of power (Aleshire, 1972; McNair, *et. al.*, 1983). Citizen deliberations intentionally seek to level the playing field among the participating social actors *during the deliberations*. Whatever power base individuals bring to the table, all share the right to be there, to be heard, and to be part of the learning process. Privileged status, whether it is based on expertise, money, or position, does not give some participants the right to control the agenda or the outcomes, especially when the issues are “wicked” and alternative solutions are based on values not science.

Moreover, it is important to recognize that it is not just how much power a social

actor has, but it is the power distance among the social actors that is the critical variable (Kipnis, 1976; Kanter, 1977; Pfeffer, 1981). Evidence for the “power equalization” hypothesis indicates greater consensual, cooperative behavior between and among people when power is more equally distributed among them. Unequal power tends to produce exploitative actions in the more powerful, while more equal power results in more effective and collaborative outcomes (Bacharach and Lawler, 1981; Rubin and Brown, 1975). Research on conflict also supports this view. Although conflict can arise between people of equal power, the most pervasive conflict comes from dominant and subordinate groups—the “haves” and the “have-nots” (Deutsch, 1973, p. 93). Thus, power equalization, or conversely power distance among participants, should be a central feature of future evaluations and theory-building exercises on citizen deliberations.

The two paths—evaluation and theory building—eventually converge as we attempt to understand the conditions under which direct, deliberative citizen participation is or is not appropriate. Wholesale application of direct citizen participation has not been advocated, nor is it expected to be a viable option in all cases, in all situations. Rather, its use has been recommended in “wicked” situations (Rittel and Webber, 1973; Fischer, 1993; Roberts, 2000) when problem formulation is ambiguous, judgment criteria are difficult to establish, solutions are valued-based and do not lend themselves just to technical reasoning and analysis. This is an important step, but more guidance than this is needed for public administrators who, as we saw in section two, are caught in a maelstrom of competing views on how to conduct the public’s business. On the firing line between government and citizens, their role conflicts pull them in different directions—from being efficient, responsive professionals to being co-learners and stewards of the public trust. When should they rely on indirect citizen participation through top-down directives from legislative and executive authority, and when should they open up the problem solving process to invite more “grass-roots” citizen participation? One possible answer comes from what we refer to as the “safety valve” principle. Direct, deliberative citizen engagement is likely to be utilized to the extent that there is dissatisfaction with current government policy and procedures. The higher the level of dissatisfaction, the more likely that direct citizen engagement will be employed as a mechanism to reduce dissatisfaction levels. To be effective, however, its use must be predicated on power sharing and social learning among the participants of a deliberation. If direct involvement is used or seen to be used as a tool for the purposes of manipulation or co-optation, then the levels of dissatisfaction among participants, as well as observers, are likely to increase, setting up a cycle of instability and distrust between the government and its citizens.

No matter which theory one explores or which path one follows pursues in the study of direct, deliberative citizen participation, the undertaking will be complex and challenging. But for those who believe that our democracy is in trouble, that citizens’ voices are muted by manipulation and moneyed interests, that adversarial democracy, by pitting citizen against citizen, threatens the commonweal and our collective future, the choice may well worth making. For others who remain skeptical about the benefits direct citizen participation, especially its deliberative version, they owe it to themselves to

observe at least one of these occasions in action. Many who witness them are awed by the fundamental wisdom of people, who, when given the chance, are able to rise to the occasion and publicly deliberate about the common good. One recent example is the New York Daily News columnist Peter Hamill, who listened to the deliberations over the World Trade Center. His words are a fitting way to end this review and a good beginning to the next phase of the ‘social experiment’ in direct, deliberative citizen participation.

We came to the vast hangar at the Javits Center expecting the worst. Put 5,000 New Yorkers in a room, charge them with planning a hunk of the New York future, and the result would be a lunatic asylum.... None of that happened.... From 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. they were presented with basic issues about the rebuilding of those 16 gutted acres in lower Manhattan. At each table they debated in a sober, thoughtful civil way. They voted, offered comments, and moved on to the next item on the agenda.... and because the process was an exercise in democracy, not demagoguery, no bellowing idiots grabbed microphones to perform for the cameras.... In this room, “I” had given way to “we.” Yes, the assembly was boring to look at, too serious, too grave, too well-mannered for standard TV presentation. And it was absolutely thrilling.... We have a word for what they were doing. The word is democracy.⁴⁵

Table 1

Citizen and Administrator Roles in Public Administration Models

System	Citizen Role	Administrator Role
Authority	Subject	Surrogate for Ruler Authority
Representative	Voter	Implementer of Legislation
Administrative	Client	Expert, Professional
Pluralist	Interest-Group Advocate	Referee, Adjudicator
Political/Market Economy	Consumer, Customer	Broker, Contract Monitor
Civil Society	Volunteer, Coproducer	Liaison, Coproducer
Social Learning	Co-Learner	Co-Learner, Trustee, Steward, Facilitator

REFERENCES

- Abel, R.D. and Stephan, M. 2000. The Limits of Civic Environmentalism. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 44(4): 614-628.
- Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. 1979. Citizen Participation in the American Federal System. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Aleshire, R.A. 1972. Power to the People: An Assessment of the Community Action and Model Cities Experience. *Public Administration Review*, 32, September, pp. 428-442.
- Almond, G.A. and Verba, S. 1989. *The Civic Culture*. 3rd ed. Newbury Park, Calif.:Sage.
- Andranovich, G. 1995. Achieving Consensus in Public Decision Making: Applying Interest-Based Problem Solving to the Challenges of Intergovernmental Collaboration. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 31(4):429-445.
- Aron, J.B. 1979. Citizen Participation at Government Expense. *Public Administration Review*, 39(5):477-485.
- Arnstein, S. R. 1969. A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4):216-224.
- Arnstein, S.R. 1972. Maximum Feasible Manipulation. *Public Administration Review*, 32, September, pp. 377-389.
- Austin, D.M. 1972. Resident Participation: Political Mobilization or Organizational Co-optation? *Public Administration Review*, 32, September, pp. 409-420.
- Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M.S. 1962. Two Faces of Power. *American Political Science Review*, 56:947-952.
- Bacharach, S.G. and Lawler, E.J. 1981. *Bargaining, Power, Tactics, and Outcomes*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bachelor, L.W. and Jones, B.D. 1981. Managed Participation: Detroit's Neighborhood Opportunity Fund. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(4):518-535.
- Bacot, H., McCabe, A.S., Fitzgerald, M.R., Bowen, T., Folz, D.H. 1993. Practicing the Politics of Inclusion: Citizen Surveys and the Design of Solid Waste Recycling Programs. *American Review of Public Administration*, 23(1):29-43.
- Barber, B. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Beckett, J. and King, C.S. 2002. The Challenge to Improve Citizen Participation in

Public Budgeting: A Discussion. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 14(3):463-485.

Berry, J.M. 1981. Beyond Citizen Participation: Effective Advocacy Before Administrative Agencies. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(4):463-477.

Bohman, J. 1998. Survey Article: The Coming of Age of Deliberative Democracy. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 6(4):400-425.

Bohman, J. and Rehg, W. 1997. *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*. Cambridge, Mass. The MIT Press.

Boone, R.W. 1972. Reflections on the Citizen Participation and the Economic Opportunity Act. *Public Administration Review*, September, pp. 444-456.

Box, R.C. 1998. *Citizen Governance: Leading American Communities into the 21st Century*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Brudney, J.L. and England, R.E. 1983. Toward a Definition of the Coproduction Concept. *Public Administration Review*, 43(1):59-65.

Bryson, J.M. and Anderson, S.R. 2000. Applying Large-Group Interaction Methods in the Planning and Implementation of Major Change Efforts. *Public Administration Review*, 60(2):143-153.

Bunker, B.B. and Alban, B.T. 1997. *Large Group Interventions: Engaging the Whole System for Rapid Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Buck, J.V. and Stone, B.S. 1981. Citizen Involvement in Planning: Myth and Reality. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(4):550-565.

Burke, E.M. 1968. Citizen Participation Strategies. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 34, pp. 287-294.

Burnheim, J. 1985. *Is Democracy Possible?* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Callahan, K. 2002. The Utilization and Effectiveness of Citizen Advisory Committees in the Budget Process of Local Governments. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 14(2):295-319.

Checkoway, B. 1981. The Politics of Public Hearings. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(4):567-582.

Chess, C. 2000. Evaluating Environmental Public Participation: Methodological Questions. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 43(6): 769-782.

Chisholm, R.F. 1998. *Developing Network Organizations: Learning From Practice and Theory*. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley Longman.

City Officials. 1972. The View From City Hall. *Public Administration Review*, 32, September, pp. 390-401

Cleveland, H. Cleveland, H. 1975. How Do You Get Everybody in on the Act and Still Get Some Action?" *Public Management*, 57, June, pp. 3-6.

Cohen, N. 1995. Technical Assistance for Citizen Participation: A Case Study of New York City's Environmental Planning Process. *American Review of Public Administration*, 25(2):119-136.

Cole, R.L. 1974. *Citizen Participation and the Urban Policy Process*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

Cole, R.L. and Caputo, D.A. 1984. The Public Hearing as Effective Citizen Participation Mechanism: A Case Study of the General Revenue Sharing Program. *The American Political Science Review*, 78(2):404-416.

Cooper, T.L. 1984. Citizenship and Professionalism in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, March, pp. 143-149.

Crompton, J.L. 1983. Recreation Vouchers: A Case Study in Administrative Innovation and Citizen Participation. *Public Administrative Review*, 43, September, pp. 537-546.

Crosby, N., Kelly, J.M. and Schaefer, P. 1986. Citizens Panels: A New Approach to Citizen Participation. *Public Administration Review*, 46(2):170-178.

Cunningham, J.V. 1972. Citizen Participation in Public Affairs. *Public Administration Review*, October, pp. 589-602.

Cupps, D.S. 1977. Emerging Problems of Citizen Participation. *Public Administration Review*, 37(5): 478-487.

Dahl, R.A. 1989. *Democracy and its Critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dahl, R.A. 1998. *On Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dahl, R.A. 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven: Yale University.

Dahl, R.A. 1956. *Preface to Democratic Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Day, D. 1997. Citizen Participation in the Planning Process: An Essentially Contested Concept? *Journal of Planning Literature*, 11(3):412-434.

Denhardt, R.B. and Denhardt, J.V. 2000. The New Public Service: Serving Rather Than Steering. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6):549-559.

de-Haven-Smith, L. and Wodraska, J.R. 1996. Consensus-Building for Integrated Resource Planning. *Public Administration Review*, 56(4):367-371.

deLeon, P. 1992. The Democratization of the Policy Sciences. *Public Administration Review*, 52(2):125-129.

Desai, U. 1989. Public Participation in Environmental Policy Implementation: Case of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act. *American Review of Public Administration*, 19(1): 49-66.

DeSario, J. and Langton, S. (Eds.). 1987. *Citizen Participation Public Decision Making*. Westport, Conn.:Greenwood.

DeSario, J. and Langton, S. 1984. Citizen Participation and Technology. *Policy Studies Review*, 3(2):223-233.

Deutsch, M. 1973. *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dewey, J. 1966. *Democracy and Education*. New York: MacMillan.

Diebert, R.J. 2000. International Plug 'n Play? Citizen Activism, the Internet, and Global Public Policy. *International Studies Perspectives*, 1, pp. 255-272.

Dimock, M. 1990. The Restorative Qualities of Citizenship. *Public Administration Review*, 50(1):21-25.

Drysek, J.S. 1990. *Discursive Democracy: Politics, Policy, and Political Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drysek, J.S. 1996. Political Inclusion and the Dynamics of Democratization. *American Political Science Review*, 90(3):475-487.

Drysek, J.S and Torgerson. 1993. Democracy and the Policy Sciences: A Progress Report. *Policy Sciences*, 26(3):127-137.

Durning, D. 1993. Participatory Policy Analysis in a Social Service Agency: A Case Study. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 12(2):297-322.

Ebon, C. 2002. Beyond the Public Hearing: Citizen Participation in the Local Government Budget Process. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 14(2):273-294.

- Ebon, C. 2000. The Relationship Between Citizen Involvement in the Budget Process and City Structure and Culture. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 23(3):383-393.
- Ellul, J. 1964. *The Technological Society*. New York: Random House.
- Elster, J. (Ed.). 1998. *Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Etzioni-Halevy, E. 1983. *Bureaucracy and Democracy: A Political Dilemma*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fagence, M. 1977. *Citizen Participation in Planning*. Oxford, U.K.:Pergamon.
- Ferris, J.M. 1984. Coprovision: Citizen Time and Money Donations in Public Service Provision. *Public Administration Review*, 44(4): 324-333.
- Fiorino, D.J. 1990. Citizen Participation and Environmental Risk: A Survey of Institutional Mechanisms. *Science and Technology, & Human Values*, 15(2):226-243.
- Fischer, F. 1993. Citizen Participation and the Democratization of Policy Expertise: From Theoretical Inquiry to Practical Cases. *Policy Sciences*, 26(3):165-188.
- Fishkin, J.S. 1991. *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fishkin, J.S. 1997. *Voice of the People: Public Opinion and Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Follett, M.P. 1940. "Power." In Henry Metcalf and L. Urwick, eds., *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. New York: Harper, pp. 95-116.
- Frankenfeld, P.J. 1992. Technological Citizenship: A Normative Framework for Risk Studies. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 17(4):459-484.
- Frederickson, H.G. 1982. The Recovery of Civism in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 42(6):501-507.
- Frederickson, H.G. 1997. *The Spirit of Public Administration*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Freire, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Gawthrop, L.C. 1984. Civis, Civitas and Civilitas: A New Focus for the Year 2000.

Public Administration Review, 44, March, pp. 101-107.

Gittell, M. 1972. Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Education. *Public Administration Review*, 32, October, pp. 670-686.

Godschalk, D.R. and Stiffler, B. 1981. Making Waves: Public Participation in State Water Planning. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(4):597-609.

Gormley, W.T. 1981. Public Advocacy in Public Utility Commission Proceedings. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(4):446-462.

Grant, J. 1994. *The Drama of Democracy: Contention and Dispute in Community Planning*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gulick, L. and Urwick, L. 1937. *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University.

Guston, D.H. 1999. Evaluating the First U.S. Consensus Conference: The Impact of the Citizens' Panel on Telecommunications and the Future of Democracy. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 24(4):451-482.

Hadden, S.G. 1981. Technical Information for Citizen Participation. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(4):537-549.

Haight, D. and Ginger, C. 2000. Trust and Understanding in Participatory Policy Analysis: The Case of the Vermont Forest Resources Advisory Council. *Policy Studies Journal*, 28(4):739-759.

Hallman, H.W. 1972. Federally Financed Citizen Participation. *Public Administration Review*, September, pp. 421-427.

Hart, D.K. 1972. Theories of Government Related to Citizen Participation. *Public Administration Review*, September, pp. 603-621.

Hart, D.K. 1984. The Virtuous Citizen, the Honorable Bureaucrat, and "Public" Administration. *Public Administration Review*, March, pp. 111-120.

Held, D. 1996. *Models of Democracy*. 2nd ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Herbert, A.W. 1972. Management Under Conditions of Decentralization and Citizen Participation. *Public Administration Review*, 32, October, pp. 622-637.

Herman, J.L., Morris, L.L., Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. 1987. *The Evaluator's Handbook*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Howard, L.C. 1972. Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Health Services.

- Public Administrative Review*, 32, October, pp. 701-717.
- Huxham, C. (ed.). 1996. *Creating Collaborative Advantage*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Ireland, L.C. 1975. Citizen Participation—A Tool for Conflict Management on the Public Lands. *Public Administration Review*, 35(3):263-269.
- Jacobsohn, G.J. 1977. Citizen Participation in Policy Making: The Role of the Jury. *The Journal of Politics*, 39(1):73-96.
- Kagan, R.A. 1991. Adversarial Legalism and American Government. *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management*, 10(3):369-405.
- Kakabadse, A., Kakabadse, N.K. and Kouzmin, A. 2003. Reinventing the Democratic Governance Project through Information Technology? A Growing Agenda for Debate. *Public Administration Review*, 63(1):44-60.
- Kalu, K.N. 2003. Of Citizenship, Virtue, and the Administrative Imperative: Deconstructing Aristotelian Civic Republicanism. *Public Administration Review*, 63(4):418-427.
- Kanter, R.M. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kathlene, L. and Martin, J.A. 1991. Enhancing Citizen Participation: Panel Designs, Perspectives, and Policy Formation. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 10(1):46-63.
- Kaufman, H. 1969. Administrative Decentralization and Political Power. *Public Administration Review*, 29(1):3-14.
- Kauffman, K.G. and Shorett, A. 1977. A Perspective on Public Involvement in Water Management Decisions. *Public Administrative Review*, 37(5):467-471.
- Kelly, M. and Maynard-Moody, S. 1993. Policy Analysis in the Post-Positivist Era: Engaging Stakeholders in Evaluating the Economic Development Districts Program. *Public Administration Review*, 53(2):135-142.
- Kelman, S. 1992. Adversary and Cooperationist Institutions for Conflict Resolution in Public Policymaking. *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management*, 11(2):178-206.
- Kihl, M.R. 1985. The Viability of Public Hearings in Transportation Planning. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 21(2):185-200.
- King, S.K., Feltey, K.M. and Susel, B.O. 1998. The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Participation in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*,

58(4):317-326.

King, C.M. and Stivers, C. 1998. *The Government is Us: Public Administration in an Anti-Government Era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kipnis, D. 1976. *The Powerholders*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kissler, G.R., Fore, K.N., Jacobson, W.S., Kittredge, W.P. and Stewart, S.L. 1998. State Strategic Planning: Suggestions from the Oregon Experience. *Public Administration Review*, 58(4):353-359.

Kloman, E. 1972. Citizen Participation in the Philadelphia Model Cities Program: Retrospect and Prospect. *Public Administration Review*, 32, September, pp. 402-408.

Korten, D.C. 1980. Community Organization and Rural Development: A Learning Process Approach. *Public Administration Review*, 40(5):480-511.

Korten, D.C. 1981. The Management of Social Transformation. *Public Administration Review*, 41(6):609-618.

Kraft, M.E. and Clary, B.B. 1991. Citizen Participation and the Nimby Syndrome: Public Response to Radioactive Waste Disposal. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 44(2):299-328.

Kraft, M.E. and Kraut, R. 1985. The Impact of Citizen Participation on Hazardous Waste Policy Implementation: The Case of Clermont County, Ohio. *Policy Studies Journal*, 14(1):52-61.

Krause, R.W. 1982. Two Concepts of Democratic Representation: James and John Stuart Mill. *The Journal of Politics*, 44(2):509-537.

Kweit, M.G. and Kweit, R.W. 1981. *Implementing Citizen Participation in a Bureaucratic Society: A Contingency Approach*. New York: Praeger.

Kweit, M.G. and Kweit, R.W. 1990. *People and Politics in Urban America*. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth.

Kweit, M.G. and Kweit, R.W. 1984. The Politics of Policy Analysis: The Role of Citizen Participation in Analytic Decisionmaking. *Policy Studies Review*, 3(2):234-245.

Laird, F.N. 1993. Participatory Policy Analysis, Democracy, and Technological Decision Making. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 18(3):341-361.

Langton, S. (Ed.) 1978. *Citizen Participation in America*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Levine, C.H. 1984. Citizenship and Service Delivery: The Promise of Coproduction. *Public Administration Review*, 44, March, pp. 178-189.
- Lukensmeyer, C.J. and Brigham, S. 2002. Taking Democracy to Scale: Creating Town Hall Meeting for the Twenty-First Century. *National Civic Review*, 91(4):351-366.
- MacNair, R.H., Caldwell, R. and Pollane, L. 1983. Citizen Participants in Public Bureaucracies: Foul Weather Friends. *Administration & Society*, 14(4):507-524.
- McShane, M.D. and Krause, W. 1995. Community Corrections Advisory Boards and Commissions: Decision Makers or Decoration? *Public Administration Quarterly*, 19(1):58-67.
- Mandell, M.P. (ed.). 2001. *Getting Results Through Collaboration: Networks and Network Structures for Public Policy and Management*. Westport, Conn.: Quorum Books.
- Michels, R. 1949. *Political Parties*. New York: Free Press.
- Milbrath, L.W. 1981. Citizen Surveys as Citizen Participation Mechanisms. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(4):478-496.
- Miller, G.J. and Evers, L. 2002. Budgeting Structures and Citizen Participation. *Journal of Public Budgeting & Financial Management*, 14(2):233-272.
- Morgan, E. 1984. Technocratic V. Democratic Options for Educational Policy. *Policy Studies Review*, 3(2):263-277.
- Myren, R.A. 1972. Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Criminal Justice Systems. *Public Administration Review*, 32, October, pp. 718-738.
- Nalbandian, J. 1999. Facilitating Community, Enabling Democracy: New Roles for Local Government Managers. *Public Administration Review*, 59(3):187-197.
- Oldfield, A. 1990. *Citizenship and Community: Civic Republicanism and the Modern World*. London: Routledge.
- Orosz, J.R. 2002. Views from the Field: Creating a Place for Authentic Citizen Participation in Budgeting. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 14(3):423-444.
- Osborne, D. and Gaebler, R. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Paglin, M.D. and Shor, E. 1977. Regulatory Agency Responses to the Development of Public Participation. *Public Administration Review*, 37(2):140-148.

- Pateman, C. 1970. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pfeffer, J. 1981. *Power in Organizations*. New York: Pitman.
- Plumlee, J.P., Starling, J.D. and Kramer, K.W. 1985. Citizen Participation in Water Quality Planning. *Administration & Society*, 16(4):455-473.
- Putnam, R.D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Reidel, J.A. 1972. Citizen Participation: Myths and Realities. *Public Administration Review*, 32(3):211-220.
- Rein, M. 1972. Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Social Services. *Public Administrative Review*, 32, October, pp. 687-700.
- Renn, O., Webler, T., Rakel, H., Dienel, P., Johnson, B. 1993. Public Participation in Decision Making: A Three-Step Procedure. *Policy Sciences*, 26(3):189-214.
- Rich, R.C and Rosenbaum, W.A. 1981. Introduction to Symposium on Citizen Participation in Public Policy. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 17(4): 439-445.
- Rimmerman, C. 1985. Citizen Participation and Policy Implementation in the Columbus, Ohio, DCBG Program. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 9(3):328-348.
- Rittel, H.W.J. and Webber, M. 1973. Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4, pp. 155-169.
- Roberts, N.C. 2001. Coping with Wicked Problems: The Case of Afghanistan. In L. Jones, J. Guthrie and P. Steane (Eds.), *Learning from International Public Management Reform*, Vol. II., pp. 353-375. Amsterdam: JAI Press.
- Roberts, N.C. 2002. Dialogue and Accountability. *Public Administration Review*, 62(6):658-669.
- Roberts, N.C. 1997. Public Deliberation: An Alternative Approach to Crafting Policy and Setting Direction. *Public Administration Review*, 57(2):124-132.
- Roberts, N.C. (Ed.). 2002. *The Transformative Power of Dialogue*. New York: JAI Press.
- Roberts, N.C. 1991. Towards a Synergistic Model of Power. In J.M. Bryson and R.C. Einsweiler (eds.) *Shared Power*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, pp. 103-121.

- Roberts, N.C. 1997. Public Deliberation: An Alternative Approach to Crafting Policy and Setting Direction. *Public Administration Review*, 57(2):124-132.
- Rohr, J.A. 1984. Civil Servants and Second-Class Citizens. *Public Administration Review*, March, pp. 135-140.
- Rosener, J.B. 1978. Citizen Participation: Can We Measure Its Effectiveness? *Public Administrative Review*, 38(5):457-463.
- Rosener, J.B. 1982. Making Bureaucrats Responsive: A Study of the Impact of Citizen Participation and Staff Recommendations on Regulatory Decision Making. *Public Administration Review*, 42(4):339-345.
- Rosenthal, D.B. 1984. Forms of Local Participation in a Neighborhood-Based Federal Program. *Policy Studies Review*, 3(2):279-295.
- Rubin, J.Z. and Brown, B.R. 1975. *The Social Psychology of Bargaining and Negotiation*. New York: Academic Free Press.
- Salisbury, R.H. 1975. Research on Political Participation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 29(2):323-341.
- Sanders, L.M. 1997. Against Deliberation. *Political Theory*, 25(3):347-376.
- Schachter, H.L. 1995. Reinventing Government or Reinventing Ourselves: Two Models for Improving Governance Performance. *Public Administration Review*, 55(6):530-537.
- Schuck, P.H. 1977. Public Interest Groups and the Policy Process. *Public Administration Review*, 37(2):132-140.
- Schumpeter, J. 1943. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Selznick, P. 1949. *TVA and the Grass Roots*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Simonsen, B., Johnston, N. and Barnett, R. 1996. Attempting Non-Incremental Budget Change in Oregon: An Exercise in Policy Sharing. *American Review of Public Administration*, 26(2):231-251.
- Skocpol, T. and Fiorina, M.P. (eds.). 1999. *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Skocpol T. and Fiorina, M.P. 1999. Making Sense of the Civic Engagement Debate. In T. Skocpol and M.P. Fiorina (eds.). *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, pp. 1-23. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
- Smith, G.E. and Huntsman, C.A. 1997. Reframing the Metaphor of the Citizen-

Government Relationship: A Value-Centered Perspective. *Public Administration Review*, 57(4):309-318.

Stallings, R.A. and Quarantelli, E.L. 1985. Emergent Citizen Groups and Emergency Management. *Public Administration Review*, 45, January, pp. 93-100.

Stenberg, C.W. 1972. Citizens and the Administrative State: From Participation to Power. *Public Administrative Review*, 32(3):190-198.

Stewart, T.R., Dennis, R.L., and Ely, D. 1984. Citizen Participation and Judgment in Policy Analysis: A Case Study of Urban Air Quality Program. *Policy Sciences*, 17, pp. 67-87.

Stivers, C. 1990. The Public Agency as Polis: Active Citizenship in the Administrative State. *Administration & Society*, 22(1):86-105.

Strange, J.H. 1972a. Citizen Participation in Community Action and Model Cities Programs. *Public Administration Review*, 32, October, pp. 655-669.

Strange, J.H. 1972b. The Impact of Citizen Participation on Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 31, September, pp.457-470.

Weiss, C. 1972. *Evaluation Research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Straus, D. 2002. *How to Make Collaboration Work*. San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Suchman, E.A. 1967. *Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service & Social Action Programs*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Sullivan, H. and Skelcher, C. 2002. *Working Across Boundaries: Collaboration in Public Services*. New York: Palgrave/Macmillan.

Stecher, B.M. and Davis, W.A. 1987. *How to Focus an Evaluation*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Tesh, S. N. 2002. The Internet and the Grass Roots. *Organization and the Environment*, 15(3):336-339.

Thomas, J.C. 1990. Public Involvement in Public Management: Adapting and Testing a Borrowed Theory. *Public Administration Review*, 50(4):435-445.

Thomas, J.C. 1995. *Public Participation in Public Decisions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Toffler, A. 1971. *Future Shock*. New York: Bantam House.

Van Meter, E.C. 1975. Citizen Participation in the Policy Management Process. *Public*

Administration Review, 35, December, pp. 804-812.

Ventriss, C. 1989. Toward a Public Philosophy of Public Administration: A Civic Perspective of the Public. *Public Administration Review*, 49(2):173-179.

Ventriss, C. and Pecorella, R. 1984. Community Participation and Modernization: A Reexamination of Political Choices. *Public Administration Review*, 44(3):224-231.

Verba, S. and Nie, N. H. 1972. *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. New York: Harper and Row. (Reprinted by University of Chicago Press, 1987).

Verba, S., Schlozman, K.L., and Brady, H.E. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Democracy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Vigoda, E. and Golembiewski, R.T. 2001. Citizenship Behavior and the Spirit of New Managerialism: A Theoretical Framework and Challenge for Governance. *American Review of Public Administration*, 31(3):273-295.

Vigoda, E. 2002a. Administrative Agents of Democracy? A Structural Equation Modeling of the Relationship between Public-Sector Performance and Citizenship Involvement. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 12(2):241-272.

Vigoda, E. 2002b. From Responsiveness to Collaboration: Governance, Citizens, and the Next Generation of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 62(5):527-540.

Wagle, U. 2000. The Policy Science of Democracy: The Issues of Methodology and Citizen Participation. *Policy Sciences*, 33(2):207-223.

Walters, L.C., Aydelotte, J. and Miller, J. 2000. Putting More Public in Policy Analysis. *Public Administration Review*, 60(4):349-359.

Walzer, M. 1980. *Obligations: Essays on Disobedience, War and Citizenship*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Wamsley, G.L., Goodsell, C.T., Rohr, J.A., Stivers, C.M. White, O.F., and Wolf, J.F. 1987. The Public Administration and the Governance Process: Refocusing the American Dialogue. In R.C. Chandler (ed.), *A Centennial History of the American Administrative State* (pp. 291-320). New York: Free Press.

Wang, X. 2001. Assessing Public Participation in U.S. Cities. *Public Performance and Management Review*, 24(4):322-336.

Warner, B.E. 2001. John Stuart Mill's Theory of Bureaucracy within Representative Government: Balancing Competence and Participation. *Public Administration Review*,

61(4):403-413.

Watson, D.J., Juster, R.J. and Johnson, G.W. 1991. Institutionalized Use of Citizen Surveys in the Budgetary and Policy-Making Processes: A Small City Study. *Public Administration Review*, 51(3):232-239.

Weber, E.P. and Chademian, A.M. 1997. From Agitation to Collaboration: Clearing the Air through Negotiation. *Public Administration Review*, 57(5):396-410.

Webler, T and Tuler, S. 2000. Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Theoretical Reflections from a Case Study. *Administration & Society*, 32(5):566-595.

Weissman, S.R. 1978. The Limits of Citizen Participation: Lessons from San Francisco's Model Cities Program. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 31(1):32-47.

Wilson, W. 1941. The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 56(2):197-222. (Originally published in 1887).

Weeks, E.C. 2000. The Practice of Deliberative Democracy: Results from Four Large-Scale Trials. *Public Administration Review*, 60(4):360-372.

White, C.S. 1997. Citizen Participation and the Internet: Prospects for Civic Deliberation in the Information Age. *The Social Studies*, January, pp. 23-28.

Yankelovich, D. 1991. *Coming to Public Judgment*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Yates, D. 1982. *Bureaucratic Democracy: The Search for Democracy and Efficiency in American Government*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Zavestoski, S. and Shulman, S.W. 2002. The Internet and Environmental Decision Making. *Organization and the Environment*, 15(3): 323-327.

Zimmerman, A.D. 1995. Toward a More Democratic Ethic of Technological Governance. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 20(1):86-107.

Endnotes

¹ For an expanded analysis of the many different strands in the definition and conceptualization of citizenship, see Kalu (2003).

2. Pluralist theory (Dahl, 1971) assumes that citizens assemble into interest groups and pressure the political elite in government to formulate policy to support their interests. Since everyone is assumed to have a chance to be part of an interest group and get their ideas considered by the political elite, then those whose ideas are adopted and “win” out over other ideas are considered to be, by definition, in the public’s interest.

3. See Vigoda (2002) for a fuller description of this model.

4. See Dahl (1998) for an elaboration of this model.

5. See Wilson (1941), Gulick and Urwick (1937), and Yates (1982) for an overview of this model.

6. See Dahl (1956) and Yates (1982) for a summary of this model.

7. For a general overview of this perspective, see Osborne and Gaebler (1992). For a description of vouchers that enable citizens to purchase services of their choice from authorized suppliers, see Crompton (1983).

8. See Brudney and England (1983), Ferris (1984), Skopol and Fiorina (1999), and Putnam (2000) for an overview of this perspective.

9. See Dewey (1966), Gawthrop (1984), and Korton (1980; 1981) for a more complete description of the learning process.

¹⁰ See Frederickson (1982), Ventriss (1989), Nalbandian (1999), and Denhardt and Denhardt (2000) for an overview of the social learning approach.

¹¹ Frederickson’s (1982) fundamental premise is that “effective public administration of the future should be intimately tied to citizenship, the citizenry generally, and to the effectiveness of public managers who work *directly* with the citizenry” (p. 502). He traces the origins and traditions of civism in public administration and concludes that public administration has lost its focus on civism. Its restoration requires “an emphasis on the *public* aspects of the field and to the basic issues of democratic theory” (p. 503). Three issues are particularly important to restore the sense of community to American life: the directness of the democratic process; the principles of justice; and the principles of individual freedom. Public administrators have critical roles to play in this transition. They need to discover new methods of building consensus, including those that would employ modern technology, and keep people fully and directly involved in the policy process. They need to help public organizations become more responsive and adaptive to the tremendous changes that are occurring worldwide. Educational institutions also have a part to play by increasing civic learning in the schools at all levels and making civic education a lifelong process. The recovery of civism, he believes, will provide “the anchor that both the practice and study of public administration need, not only to find its identity but to be effective once again” (p. 503).

¹² Curtis Ventriss (1989) builds on the same theme and advocates developing a new philosophy of public administration based on civic purpose. He asks, “is public administration’s public purpose always restricted to responding to state direction, or does it entail broader social responsibilities” (p. 175)? Broader social responsibilities, he answers, because the polity is more than government institutions. To meet its social responsibilities, public administration must expand its conceptualization of the public and incorporate a new public purpose based on citizenship. Citizenship should be shaped by acceptance of

societal interdependencies, a renewed emphasis on public learning and a revitalized public language. Interdependencies acknowledge multiple levels of social, political, and economic realities in which everything depends on everything else, prompting administrators to serve as stewards of a multiplicity of public actors and interests. Public learning enables public dialogue and an open exchange of information in the shared definition of social problems and their solutions. A new public language “examines the value assumptions of policy decisions and openly explores the relationship of political means to political ends” (p. 178). This new civic purpose ultimately requires a shift from the “scientization of social science” to the creation of a new public social science.

¹³ See Nalbandian (1999). He illustrates how the roles, responsibilities, and values of city management professionals have been transformed to accommodate the new civic purpose. Based on data from survey questions, correspondence, and in-depth panel discussions, he finds that city managers now aspire to be community builders and enablers of democracy. They expect to take on a facilitative leadership role to encourage citizen participation, develop community partnerships and build consensus among diverse community interests. As part of their new responsibilities, they work to empower the governing body and the citizens and help both to develop and use the tools of engagement to address community problems. Their work is informed by new values based on individual rights, fairness, representation, and the belief that collectively a community can accomplish some tasks more efficiently and effectively than its individual members could do on their own. Local government managers have become much more process oriented and with less adherence to the “one best form” of government.

¹⁴ See Denhardt and Denhardt (2000). They juxtapose what they call the New Public Service model with two other normative models—“Old Public Administration” and “New Public Management.” To make the comparisons, they lay out three ideas that provide the conceptual foundation for New Public Service: 1) An active and involved citizenry concerned with the public interest and collaboratively engaged with public officials in governance. 2) A rebirth of civil society, where people work out their personal interests in the context of community concerns, and government plays a role in creating, facilitating, and supporting connections between citizens and their communities. 3) New approaches to knowledge acquisition that are based on sincere and open discourse (*e.g.* dialogue and deliberation) among all parties, including citizens and administrators. The New Public Service model has seven basic tenets as its foundation: 1) The role of the public servant is to help citizens articulate and meet their shared interests, rather than to attempt to control or steer society in new directions. 2) Building a collective shared notion of the public interest is the aim of public service, not finding quick solutions driven by individual choices. 3) Public policies and programs can most effectively and responsibly be achieved through collective efforts and collaboration. 4) The public interest and decisions result from dialogue about shared values rather than an aggregation of individual self-interests. 5) Accountability is complex stemming from markets as well as statutory and constitutional law, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizen interests. 6) Public organizations and the networks in which they operate are more likely to succeed if they are based on collaboration, shared leadership and a respect for all people. 7) The public interest is best advanced by public servants and citizens rather than by entrepreneurial managers.

¹⁵ See Levine (1984), Schachter (1995), and Smith and Huntsman (1997) as examples of the economic approach to citizen participation.

¹⁶ Charles Levine (1984) asks how one designs a system that builds citizen trust in government, citizen efficacy and a shared conception of the common good, especially when the current conceptualization of the citizen is predicated on narrow self-interest? He reviews six service delivery models, the dominant strategy for each one and the roles the citizens are expected to play. He eliminates five alternatives and believes the answer lies in coproduction—“the joint provision of public services by public agencies and service consumers” (p. 181). Coproduction devolves service responsibility to neighborhood organizations, individual service, and public-private partnerships. Besides its potential for saving tax dollars, it has many

beneficial results that include shared responsibility, mutual respect between citizens and public officials and joint problem solving. Using community-based crime prevention groups as an example, he outlines their benefits as well as their problems and what must be done to overcome them. He also believes that coproduction can be generalized to other services, providing an important bridge between government and citizens.

¹⁷ Hindy Schachter (1995) offers an alternative role for citizens. In contrast to customer-centered models, she introduces an owner-based model of citizenship. This model derives from the New York Bureau of Municipal Research, a progressive organization incorporated in 1907 to help solve urban political problems. The bureau posited that urban citizens owned their government and their ownership required them to mind their business—the public’s business. As owner-shareholders in city corporations, citizens needed to work for administrative improvements by gathering information on how public services were performing, analyzing the data, presenting the results to politicians and public administrators, and demanding that changes be made if corporations were not functioning well. Although both the customer-centered and owner-centered models of citizenship are metaphors, and each has its own inconsistencies, Schachter believes that only the owner-citizen model keeps the focus on the citizen as a primary actor in a democratic society. To ensure the model’s implementation, however, requires public empowerment through citizen education, consistent information exchange between government and citizens, and service learning that reinforces the citizen’s responsibility for assuming a role in his or her community.

¹⁸ Gerald Smith and Carole Huntsman (1997) challenge both the citizen-owner model and the citizen-customer model and offer a third model—the citizen as co-investor. This model draws from economic theory and the marginalist theory of value. Central to it is the belief that as citizens are motivated to increase incremental value for themselves and their communities, so should public organizations be motivated to create incremental value for their constituents. In this value-based model, government becomes the trustee—a steward and manager of assets, resources and the public trust—whose purpose it is to deliver incremental value for citizens. In turn, citizens are equal shareholders of the common wealth of the community. They are expected to invest with other citizens and government in wealth creation by influencing the community’s collective goals and direction. Both administrators and citizens need to be proactive and focus on creating value through the use of partnerships, cooperative ventures, volunteering, and sharing with each other. Field research demonstrated the application of economic value analysis to a local government context. Although citizens were unaccustomed to thinking in value terms, the researchers found that they expressed opinions, engaged in activities, and co-invested personal resources consistent with a value perspective.

¹⁹ See Strange (1972) for an overview of Community Action and Model Cities Programs. His article reviews the history of citizen participation in OEO and Model Cities Programs. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which established Community Action Programs, required “maximum feasible participation” by area residents (the poor and minorities) in the operation of the Community Action Program. The article provides a good backdrop for the book in summarizing the various meanings of the term citizen participation and reviewing the alternative institutional forms through which participation was encouraged. Of particular significance are the restrictions placed on citizen involvement that made it difficult to attain maximum feasible participation. The article also provides an excellent bibliography on case studies and reports written up to that point in time on direct citizen involvement.

²⁰ For education see Gittell (1972). Marilyn explores the important role that citizen participation has had in the shaping of American public education. We learn how various citizen groups have developed local boards of education as the primary means of citizen participation in school decision making. Her argument is that education needs a balance between professionalism and public participation. Systematic exclusion of certain groups (*e.g.*, parents of school children, the poor, and minorities) has produced failure of the educational system. She sees community control, especially the redistribution of power between experts and citizens, as the vehicle for institutional change. “Quality education without the involvement and participation of the consumers” she asserts, “is a contradiction in terms” (p. 684). From her perspective,

“the potential for finding solutions to educational problems can only be enhanced by the broader range of alternatives offered by laymen and nonschool professionals” (p. 684).

²¹ For policing see Myren (1972). He focuses primarily on the policing function of the justice system where most citizen action has been found. He outlines four ways in which the citizenry can participate in policing: lending various kinds of support to policy agencies; actual assumption of police duties under the direction of regular police officers; formal evaluation of police performance; and community control and the setting of policy for police operations. He finds some support projects, a few cities in which community members perform police duties, isolated instances of formal citizen evaluation of police performance, and little evidence of direct citizen participation in the establishment of policy policies and procedures throughout large U.S. cities. He also notes that most experts of police operations do not advise citizen participation, especially in setting policy. They cite greater opportunities for corruption and favoritism and the lack of protection of civil liberties among suspects and witnesses.

22. For health services see Howard (1972).

23. For social services see Rein (1972).

24. Citizen involvement in environmental issues has a long history. The following articles offer a sample of some of the cases: Ireland (1975), Kaufman and Shorett(1977), Godschalk and Stiffler (1981), Plumlee *et.al.* (1985), Kraft and Kraut (1985), and Desai (1989). For those focusing on the tensions between the democratic ethic and technology, see: Fiorino (1990), Frankenfeld (1992), Laird (1993), Zimmerman, 1995, and Abel and Stephan (2000).

²⁵ See Ventriss and Pecorella (1984) as an example of citizen participation and community development. The authors use community development programs as the backdrop to pose a key question in the debates on direct citizen participation: How do we reconcile direct citizen participation with the exigencies of a modern, rational/analytic, technological society? They examine two very different community development programs to address this question. The first program follows a model of social action and community development that is less disruptive of the social order and relies on a bureaucratization and professionalization of its own experts (*e.g.*, lawyers, technicians, researchers) to manage the change process. The authors use David Korten's term (1980; 1981), the “blueprint” approach, to describe this effort because its program strategy mirrors governmental agencies by developing corresponding professional, technical, legal and bureaucratic staffs and procedures. The consequence of this bureaucratization and professionalization is a drop in direct citizen participation. The second model follows what David Korten (1980; 1981) has described as “the learning process approach to change”—maximum citizen participation in the development and implementation of community programs and the use of confrontational tactics, when necessary, to pressure the political system. It requires community development programs to learn how to embrace error, plan with community people, and to link knowledge with action. The authors point out that the dilemma between modernization and direct participation may never be resolved, but the success of the social learning approach challenges the assumption that “a decline in participation is an ultimate price of modernity” (p. 230). Although the authors acknowledge there are risks and opportunity costs in both approaches, and tradeoffs have to be made, they conclude that the effectiveness of economic and community development ultimately rests on the development and transformation of the citizen. It is their belief that the social learning approach holds the greatest promise for the citizen's development and ultimately for long-term community development.

²⁶ See deLeon (1992) for issues in policy analysis. He calls for an end of the “elite syndrome” in policy analysis. According to de Leon, policy analysts (*e.g.*, systems analysts, operation researchers, economists) suffer from geographic and bureaucratic isolation. Distant from the public and its concerns, usually working at the national level, these technical experts conduct studies (*e.g.*, cost benefit analysis, economic modeling) for the policy maker not the public. The separation between policy maker and public produces

“two cultures” and results in a “confidence gap” between the rulers and the ruled. The remedy, according to de Leon, is return to the original intent of policy science—the improvement of democratic practice. This can best be done by “policy sharing” between analysts and the public. Citizens have the responsibility to express their opinions in open public policy fora so that their values and needs can inform the policy formulation process. In turn, policy analysts have the responsibility of devising and actively practicing ways to recruit and include citizens’ personal and political views into policy making. Although certain policy issues (*e.g.*, education, health care, social welfare, housing), may lend themselves to a more democratic style of policy analysis due to their pervasiveness, importance and schedule, de Leon believes that policy sharing is essential to sustain democracy and prevent the “tyranny” of policy science.

²⁷ See Roberts (1997) for policy initiation and formulation. She uses two cases to illustrate the success of direct citizen involvement during the policy initiation phase. The first documents how a school superintendent invited direct citizen participation to help solve a district’s severe budget crisis. The second case shows how a governor and commissioner of education used direct citizen participation to craft state educational policy. In both cases, all interested groups and individuals were invited and did participate in the deliberations. And in both cases, policy decisions were reached that were informed by the views and opinions of the participants. These cases highlight the importance of the participatory process—its leadership, design, facilitation, and decision making—in ensuring successful citizen involvement. We return to this point in section three when we address the issue of citizen participation in large groups and the special techniques that have to be developed to accommodate growing numbers of citizens involved in collective problem solving. The budget case in this article also is important because it demonstrates that, even under crisis conditions, citizen participation can be a viable mechanism for making policy choices.

²⁸ See Ebon (2000) for citizen participation in budgeting. She specifically examines direct citizen participation and the budgeting process using a 1996 International City/County Management Association survey. Her article, “The Relationship between Citizen Involvement in the Budget Process and City Structure and Culture” seeks to identify the determinants of greater citizen participation. Ebon operationalizes three concepts—institutional structure, degree of cultural diversity/homogeneity, and political culture—and correlates them with responses from city manager in cities with a council-manager form of government. In this initial exploration between budgeting and citizen participation, she finds variation in direct citizen involvement and in the use of participatory methods. For example, there are higher rates of participation in cities with “moralistic” and “traditionalistic” policy cultures. Larger cities also use greater citizen participation and a greater number of the participatory methods.

29. See for example Jacobsohn (1977).

30. For an overview of public hearings see Checkoway (1981), Cole and Caputo (1984), and Kihl, (1985).

31. For examples of citizen participation in advisory boards, commissions and task forces see Stewart, et.al. (1984), Rimmerman (1985) and McShane and Krause (1995).

32. Initiatives, referenda and recalls are exceptions that can involve large numbers of citizens. However, since the intent of these mechanisms is not dialogical or deliberative, they are not included in this overview.

³³ For an example at the individual level of analysis see Watson, Juster, and Johnson (1991) in “Institutionalized Use of Citizen Surveys in the Budgetary and Policy-making Processes.” They document the use of citizen surveys as an important tool to “stay in touch” with individual citizens. Citizen surveys gained prominence in the 1970s and 1980s, but these early versions did not allow for systematic evaluation of citizen opinion because the data were not comprehensive or representative of the entire community. Based on a case study of local government, this article demonstrates the utility of using interactive citizen surveys to evaluate basic services, identify service delivery problems, establish citizens’ goal preferences in

terms of services, set local government priorities, and allocate resources during the budget process. It also identifies survey methods and procedures that have to be followed to ensure that results are valid and reliable. Surveys can offer an effective and efficient framework for citizen participation in the local governing process, and as this case suggests, they also can create a positive linkage between citizen attitudes and city leaders' budgetary and programmatic decisions. If quality can be measured in terms of the absence of conflict, the authors conclude that the citizen survey and local government's response to it did indeed alter the political life of the community.

³⁴ For an example of small group participation see "Emergent Citizen Groups and Emergency Management," by Robert Stallings and E. L. Quarantelli (1985). They document how emergent groups of private citizens can participate in government activity. Emergent groups are those that "emerge around perceived needs or problems associated with both natural and technological disaster situations" (p. 94). Defined as newly formed, and lacking in formalization and tradition, they are grouped into two major types: emergent groups at emergency times and emergent groups at non-emergency times. NIMBY (not-in-my-backyard) groups that attempt to prevent or close a neighborhood hazardous waste dump would be an example of a non-emergency group.³⁴ The authors describe the basic characteristics of both types and note five important implications for public managers and administrators who deal specifically with emergent groups. Emergent groups are "inevitable, natural, neither necessarily dysfunctional nor conflictive, and cannot be eliminated by planning" (p. 98). However, the authors point out that if citizens believe that a problem is not being legitimately dealt with by the agencies that are responsible for serving the public, then citizen anger and hostility can result and turn public officials into "the enemy."

³⁵ Another example of small group participation is the citizen panel (Crosby, Kelly, and Schaefer (1986). The panel is a new form of citizen participation that is modeled after the jury system. It is small but demographically a representative sample of citizens called together for intensive deliberative processes. As a proxy for the public at large, similar to Fishkin's deliberative polling (1991; 1995) and Yankelovich's public agenda forums (1991), it represents conclusions that the electorate would have been expected to reach if it had had a similar opportunity to deliberate. The article presents a case study of 60 randomly selected individuals in Minnesota who participated in a panel charged with the responsibility of analyzing the impact of agriculture on water quality and making recommendations to project sponsors, including several state agencies. The articles identify six criteria for successful citizen panels: a random, stratified sampling of panel participants; effective decision making; fair procedures; cost-effective processes; a design that is adaptable to different tasks and settings; and a high probability that citizen recommendations would be heeded by government officials. The Minnesota citizen panel made a start in meeting the criteria, but the authors conclude that more work needed to be done to get the recommendations adopted by those public officials in power.

³⁶ deHaven-Smith and Wodraska (1996) document how government agencies are beginning to use large-group techniques to enable multiple agencies and jurisdictions to manage resources collaboratively in order to protect ecosystems as a whole. The article describes an integrated resource planning process used by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. Since water issues involve both technical and equity concerns, the idea was to bring managers, producers and consumers together for some joint problem solving and decision making. The case demonstrates the use of the American Assembly process, a model developed by Dwight Eisenhower when he was at Columbia to address issues that were national or international in scope. The process requires a series of steps and procedures: background papers written by experts; participants of diverse backgrounds, associations and fields of expertise; participants divided into equal-sized groups that are microcosms of the whole; group discussions on a specific policy topic over three consecutive days, and a facilitator and recorder assigned to each group. An overall assembly director prepares a report synthesizing the various findings and recommendations from all the groups. In a final or plenary session, a draft report is presented to all the participants meeting together. It is reviewed section-by-section under the direction of the assembly director, and amended by the participants (using parliamentary procedures) to reflect the consensus of the body. Modifications to the American Assembly process used in this case study included a steering committee to set the agenda, multiple assemblies rather than just one, and six open forums around the region to solicit public input. The authors concluded that the

process enabled the District and member agencies to move to a higher level of regional cooperation than had been achieved in the past.

³⁷ “State Strategic Planning: Suggestions from the Oregon Experience” by Gerald Kissler, Karmen Fore, Willow Jacobson, William Kittredge, and Scott Stewart (1998) describe large-group participation techniques that involve hundreds of citizens in setting the state’s direction. Their state model of strategic planning is a comprehensive process that includes: university faculty and students who lead regional information-gathering meetings to collect and analyze data and then draft reports for citizens and policy makers; use of benchmarks or performance measures to determine the progress on state strategic initiatives; a “bottom-up approach” (interviews and questionnaires of community leaders) to gather data; small group meetings and facilitated dialogues at the regional level for the purpose of making recommendations on policy tradeoffs; and incorporation of general public views through citizen polls and commissioned focus groups. The authors conclude this model of state strategic planning can be a valuable process to help the state and its citizens adjust to major economic and social transformations.

³⁸ Edward Weeks (2000) describes four community dialogues conducted in Eugene, Oregon, Sacramento, California, and Fort Collins, Colorado—cities with populations ranging from 100,000 to 400,000. The dialogues in Eugene and Sacramento invited citizens to invest their time and intellectual energy to work through difficult budget problems. The dialogues in Fort Collins and Eugene addressed contentious issues of community growth. The four dialogues were based on the following model of deliberative democracy: all citizens were invited to participate; all citizens received extensive information about the nature of the policy problem; citizens and elected officials were integrated within the same problem-solving context; and rigorous methods of data collection and analysis were employed. Each community dialogue proceeded through agenda setting, strategy development and decision making phases. Four methods supported the dialogues: an informational newsletter to every household in the community that introduced the dialogue and provided comprehensive information about the process; a questionnaire and exercises that enabled citizens to work through policy problems and arrive at their preferred course of action; workshops in which citizens were randomly assigned to work through structured exercises in small groups facilitated by community volunteers; and multiple sample surveys that provided a benchmark against which the results from the questionnaires and workshops were measured. Using four criteria to judge the effectiveness of the community dialogues (broad, informed, deliberative, and credible participation), the authors found it was possible to convene large-scale public deliberations to enable local governments to take effective action on pressing community problems.

³⁹ Andrew Kakabadse, Nada Kakabadse, and Alexander Kouzmin (2003) examine the pros and cons of information technology in the digital age and its ability to support the democratic process. In “Reinventing the Democratic Governance Project through Information Technology” they ask to what extent can IT bypass special interest groups, party politics, and the media and offer a new way to build consensus and common ground by engaging all the citizenry in a cyber-democracy or virtual polis? New forms of civic discourse such as the Citycard, electronic town hall meetings, Santa Monica’s interactive computer network and voter communication vouchers, suggest there is potential for virtual communities to form. Yet there is a downside to electronic democracy, not the least of which are the new divisions among the citizenry between the information rich and the information poor, between those who have access to sophisticated information and communication technology and those who do not. The authors have their doubts about a populist model of electronic democracy for these and other reasons. They recommend that the best use of IT is to promote participatory policy analysis to help educate citizens to make more informed policy choices.

40. In addition, the congressional mandate “maximum feasible participation” was difficult for administrators to interpret since congress could not agree on what participation meant and how it was to be implemented in practice (Cunningham, 1972; Strange, 1972a; b).

41. See Aleshire (1972) for an overall assessment of community action and model cities programs.

42. See Roberts 2002a and 2002b for an extended discussion of dialogue and deliberation.

Endnotes

43. See the research on collaboration to find other examples of participatory approaches (Gray, 1989; Chrislip and Larson, 1994; Huxham, 1996; Chisholm, 1998; Susskind, *et.al.*, 1999; Mandell, 2001; Sullivan and Skelcher, 2002; Strauss, 2002).

44. See the following links that are attempts to develop online dialogues without the face-to-face interaction: Web Lab <http://www.weblab.org> and Information Renaissance <http://www.info-ren.org/> and e-thePeople <http://www.e-thepeople.org/>

45. As quoted in Lukensmeyer and Brigham (2002, p. 365-366).