



Brigitte Geißel
Marko Joas (eds.)

Participatory Democratic Innovations in Europe

Improving the Quality of Democracy?

Barbara Budrich Publishers



Participatory Democratic Innovations in Europe

Brigitte Geißel
Marko Joas (eds.)

Participatory Democratic Innovations in Europe

Improving the Quality of Democracy?

Barbara Budrich Publishers
Opladen • Berlin • Toronto 2013

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of Barbara Budrich Publishers. Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from
Die Deutsche Bibliothek (The German Library)

© 2013 by Barbara Budrich Publishers, Opladen, Berlin & Toronto
www.barbara-budrich.net

ISBN 978-3-8474-0113-1

eISBN 978-3-8474-0371-5

epub 978-3-8474-0397-5

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme
Ein Titeldatensatz für die Publikation ist bei der Deutschen Bibliothek erhältlich.

Verlag Barbara Budrich  Barbara Budrich Publishers
Stauffenbergstr. 7. D-51379 Leverkusen Opladen, Germany

86 Delma Drive. Toronto, ON M8W 4P6 Canada
www.barbara-budrich.net

Jacket illustration by Bettina Lehfeldt, Kleinmachnow, Germany

Table of Contents

Preface	7
---------	---

Brigitte Geissel

Introduction: On the Evaluation of Participatory Innovations	9
---	---

Cooperative Governance

Anja Röcke

Forms of Democratic Innovations in European Participatory Budgeting	33
--	----

Antonio Putini

Participatory Instruments and Democratic Innovation Evaluating Four Italian Cases	53
--	----

Julien Talpin

When Deliberation Happens - Evaluating Discursive Interactions among Ordinary Citizens	73
---	----

Clemente Navarro & Joan Font

The Biased Inclusiveness of Local Democratic Innovations	95
---	----

Deliberative Procedures

Irena Fiket & Vincenzo Memoli

Improving the Quality of Democracy: The case of Deliberative Poll held in 2007 in Turin	123
--	-----

Kim Strandberg & Kimmo Grönlund

Innovating Democracy Online? Evaluating the Finnish
Virtual Polity Experiment in Citizen Deliberation 143

Staffan Himmelroos

Democratic Innovations and Deliberative Quality 161

Direct Democratic Procedures

Maija Setälä

Deliberation and Aggregation in Different Forms of
Direct Democracy 179

Michael L. Smith

The Local Recall Revisited 199

E-Democracy

Gusta Lidén

Qualities of E-Democracy: Examples from Sweden 225

Marko Joas

Conclusions
An Evaluation of Democratic Innovations in Europe 249

The Authors 263

Index 267

Preface

Democracy as form of governance is constantly under pressure from its environment, including its 'users'. Therefore it is also constantly changing, to follow the popular attitudes, ways of behavior by the public, academic research results and technological options in the society. Some changes are introduced deliberately by the political actors in our societies; others are just appearing, without any action by the contemporary political system.

The research society has taken up to follow these changes more closely during the last ten years. The view of s' democratic systems has changed into a picture of a vivid democracy that is – at least to some extent – responsive to the changes in our societies. This volume is showing and analyzing what is going on in Europe regarding democratic innovations.

We focus on institutionalized innovations in this volume, often based on examples already used in other countries. It is clear that diffusion of innovations, projects and good practices is the way how new models to act are introduced. It is also notable that many new democratic innovations are active at the local level of the society – the government level closest to the people.

We want to present a number of European cases with this volume, mostly based on empirical work on case studies, but also some experiments in the field of research.

The starting point for this volume was a workshop on democratic innovations at the ECPR Joint Sessions in Potsdam 2009. We have added to this base some additional articles, giving the book an in-depth view on all major innovations used today.

We want to thank Barbara Budrich Verlag for giving us the opportunity to publish the book. We also want to thank our authors for very responsive mode to the work during the last hectic phase before publishing. Dr Iris Lindahl-Raittila has made excellent work with our linguistic problems as many of us are non-native English speakers. Likewise, Michele Ferrari has been of invaluable help to finalize the technical lay-out. We want also to thank the economic support for the book by Goethe University Frankfurt, Research Unit 'Democratic Innovations' and the Department of Political Science at Åbo Akademi University, with the 'Democracy: A Citizen Perspective - A Centre of Excellence on Democracy Research'.

Åbo and Frankfurt, August 31, 2013,

Brigitte Geissel and Marko Joas

Introduction:

On the Evaluation of Participatory Innovations - A Preliminary Framework

Brigitte Geissel

Despite the world-wide triumph of democracy, the quest for an optimal ‘politike’ has not yet reached the “end of history” (Fukuyama). It turned out that representative democracies do not necessarily satisfy the citizenries. A few examples may suffice here to demonstrate current democratic malaises (e.g. Dalton 2004). The perception that politicians care about what people think has declined dramatically in countries like Germany, France, Sweden, Finland and Austria – all stable democracies – since the 1970s. Many citizens are convinced that their governments aim to serve ‘big interests’ and they doubt the abilities of their representatives to govern complex societies. While these malaises – some authors even speak of disenchantments, ills, demystification or deconsolidation Dalton et al. 2006; Offe 2003; Habermas 1973) – do not necessarily lead to far-reaching political crises, they are viewed as cause for concern. This concern is the breeding-ground for discussions about new forms of democratic decision-making. As Diamond and Morlino (2005: ix) put it, there is a high level of consensus that also “long-established democracies must reform ... to attend to their own gathering problems of public dissatisfaction and ... disillusionment”.

More and more citizens as well as political scientists pin their hopes on participatory innovations as a means to cure the malaises. They are convinced that “the cure for democracies’ ills is more democracy” (Dalton et al. 2006: 251; also: Warren 2006; Offe 2003). Several national and subnational governments followed this route and implemented various kinds of participatory innovations, i.e. the inclusion of citizens into processes of political will-formation and decision-making. In fact, current democracies are constantly changing, finding new forms and adapting to societal challenges and pressures.

However, up to now there is a striking imbalance between the amount of time, money and energy invested in participatory innovations and the amount of attention paid to assess them empirically (OECD 2005: 10). With few exceptions, published in recent years, the case-study approach is still prevailing. Case studies assess each innovation within its own setting and according to its own goals providing detailed descriptions and rich understanding of the individual cases. However, with case studies alone a scientific patchwork remains, leaving too many questions open. Therefore, in this edition we apply a criteria-based approach for analyzing participatory innovations (similar: Smith 2009). The price for criteria-based approaches is the lack of detailed

information ignoring the special features of individual cases – for the benefit of creating more comprehensive insights (Mathur and Skelcher 2007).

Recently some scholars applied systematic criteria-based approaches, most notably Smith (2009), Fung (2003, 2006) and Papadopoulos and Warin (2007). However, these studies mainly focus on the Americas –for example the British Columbia Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform (Canada), Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre (Brasil), or community policing in Chicago (USA). Systematic research comparing the impacts of different innovations in *Europe* is still missing and our edition is starting to fill this gap by evaluating benefits and disadvantages of participatory procedures tried out in European states. We hope to shed light on the puzzle of which innovation is useful, useless, or even harmful when it comes to addressing different 'democratic malaises' in the European context.

The outline of this chapter is as follows: First, participatory innovations are categorized and explained. In the main part of the introduction, we develop the analytical framework for evaluating participatory procedures all contributors in this edition will adhere to in their evaluation. Finally, we describe the outline of the edition.

(Democratic) Innovations

'Innovation' is a complex term, which is used mostly in technology and economics but is also attracting increasing interest in the context of politics (Considine and Lewis 2007; Papadopoulos and Warin 2007; Casper and van Waarden 2005; Smith 2005). It is difficult to delineate the term 'innovation' with any precision. What makes the definition even more challenging is the fact, that innovations are often not invented, but reinvented or copied. In technology and economics, about 70-80 percent of what firms interpret as innovations are not really new for the sector, but are actually imitations (Unger 2005: 21). This is also true in the world of politics. An innovation can be new in one country, but widespread in another. Thus given the fact that, for example, direct democracy is common in Switzerland, direct democratic elements in other countries could be considered as imitation - or as an innovation in a different 'sector' (for processes of diffusion, see e.g. Grönholm 2000: 63).¹

1 The literature on democratic innovations covers for example checks and balances between the branches of representative government or new forms of top-down communication (e.g. Offe 2003). However, for the most part, the literature has focused on popular participation in processes of political will-formation and

Accordingly, we refer to participatory innovation as new procedures consciously and purposefully introduced with the aim of mending current democratic malaises and improving the quality of democracy. If a new procedure is tried out in a country, we call it innovation irrespective of whether the innovation in question has already been tried out in another country. Similar political terms, such as ‘strong democracy’, ‘deep democracy’, and ‘participatory democracy’ refer to participatory innovations as well, but are often utilized as normative concepts portraying ‘more participation’ as a desirable project with many utopian features. In contrast, *this edition aims at evaluating existing participatory procedures empirically.*

Which Innovations?

Which innovations are now worth considering? Based on a comprehensive literature survey conducted at the Social Science Research Center Berlin in 2006, using over 200 publications, three types of participatory innovations can be identified:

- cooperative governance,
- deliberative procedures,
- direct democratic procedures.

All types will be discussed in the following paragraphs. Since “the newest are the experiments with co-governance, ... and deliberative assemblies” (Newton 2012: 16) we start with cooperative governance and deliberative procedures and finally discuss direct democracy. Additionally we take e-democracy into account. Although we consider e-democracy as a technical innovation providing novel ways of political interaction we add one chapter and evaluate the impacts of e-democracy (for a detailed discussion of the varieties of participatory procedures, see also Geissel and Newton 2012; Fung 2006).

Cooperative Governance

According to authors like Smith (2005: 56–60) or Talpin (2012) cooperative governance is distinguished from other participatory innovations by direct citizen influence on political decisions. “The main specificity of co-governance² institutions, in comparison with other participatory innovations, is their

decision-making. These participatory innovations are regarded as a cure for current malaises of representative democracy (see Geissel 2009).

2 The terms cooperative governance and co-governance are used interchangeably.

level of empowerment.” Innovations of this type mean “that power is shared between citizens and elected officials.” (Talpin 2012: 184). Other terms used in the literature are ‘collaborative governance’ or ‘empowered participatory governance’ (e.g. Fung and Wright 2001): state actors and non-state actors work jointly to decide on a policy (Geißel 2009).

Forms of cooperative governance with state actors and non-state actors are wide spread and exist probably since the beginning of modern democracy. In corporatist democracies inclusion of major economic interests in public decision-making is by definition ensured. However, cooperative governance goes beyond this concept, because it means more than the inclusion of trade unions and employers’ representatives. Cooperative governance involves institutionalized citizens’ and often organized groups’ involvement in political will formation and decision-making to a broader extent.

Cooperative governance procedures are initiated for a variety of reasons. Mostly they are expected to improve problem-solving capacities and to develop effective and legitimate decisions. The recruitment of participants varies considerably, as well. Some procedures try to guarantee the involvement of all relevant stakeholder groups and affected citizens, other procedures rely on self-selected participants and interest groups (e.g. Fung 2003).

Deliberative Procedures

Deliberation emphasizes discursive will-formation – in contrast to the aggregative modus of voting (see Setälä in this edition). The definition of deliberation, however, is controversial (e.g. Delli Carpini et al. 2004: 316-219; Talpin, Fiket and Memoli, Strandberg and Grönlund, Himmelroos in this edition). Many European proponents of deliberative democracy refer to Habermas’ concept of deliberation which includes strict rules, for example rational exchange of arguments among free and equal citizens (Habermas 1992). Only communication in compliance with these rules is regarded as deliberative. In contrast, US American proponents apply lower standards and regard most kinds of discussion as deliberation (e.g. Fishkin and Luskin 2004; Fishkin 1995). In this edition we suggest a similar, broad definition. According to our broad definition deliberative procedures can have many different faces – ranging on a ‘continuum of deliberative procedures’ from minimum to extensive deliberation (see also Himmelroos in this edition). The most widespread forms are information-exchanging events with a minimum of discussion, e.g. public meetings. They can be located on the ‘deliberation-continuum’ at the ‘least deliberative, information-exchanging side’. On the ‘most deliberative side’, high-quality deliberative procedures can be found with well organized deliberative processes, well-recruited participants, well-prepared background materials, including invited experts, facilitators, and mediators, for example

the Deliberation Day in Finland in 2006 or Deliberative Polls (Fishkin and Luskin 2004).

Generally deliberative procedures are consultative. They produce and provide elaborate advice which is submitted to decision-making bodies. The decision-making bodies decide whether they accept or reject the advice.³ Deliberative procedures are often adopted in small-scale units and are initiated for different reasons, for instance to negotiate compromises in contentious situations, to identify collective goals, or to generate new ideas. The recruitment of the participants reflects the multitude of forms. Some deliberative procedures comprise of self-selected participants, in other procedures participants are selected carefully to mirror the social composition of the constituency.⁴

Direct Democratic Procedures

Direct democracy is currently popular in many countries as an additional and complementary form of decision-making within representative democracies.⁵ Direct democratic procedures include casting votes on policies and rules or dismissing officials (recall). They can be consultative or binding, mandatory, e.g. constitutionally required, as well as initiated top-down by political representatives (e.g. parliament, city council, president, mayor) or bottom-up by citizens ('popular initiative' or 'petition').⁶ Some procedures are decision-controlling, referring to a law(-proposal), or decision-promoting, putting is-

3 The Danish consensus conference on gene-technology (1987), for example, contributed significantly to the decisions of the parliament (for more examples, see Goodin/Dryzek 2006; Delli Carpini et al. 2004: 329-330).

4 Examples of deliberative procedures include 'Planungszellen' (planning cells), 'Round Figures', 'Cooperative Discourse', 'Citizen Juries', and 'Focus Groups'. All of these different terminologies insinuate unambiguous differences between the different procedures and clear-cut procedural structures. However, this is not the case: similar procedures may be named differently and dissimilar procedures can have the same labels. Thus the field remains chaotic with respect to terminology and semantics.

5 Over 20 institutional changes offering improved options for direct democracy have been introduced in OECD countries within the last decades and the trend is continuing (Scarow 2001).

6 The terminology used in the literature is rather blurred and intricate. Some authors use, for example, the term 'referendum' for all forms of direct democratic procedures including popular initiatives (e.g. Setälä 2006); other authors differentiate between popular initiatives initiated by the citizens and referenda initiated by representatives.

sues on the political agenda (see Setälä in this edition; Kriesi 2008). Direct democratic procedures also differ vastly in terms of the number of signatures required to launch a citizens' petition or the minimum quota of participants casting their votes for a popular vote to be accepted as valid.⁷

Motives for initiating a top-down or a bottom-up popular vote vary vastly (see Setälä in this edition). Governments often promote a referendum to improve legitimacy or to gain a mandate from the citizens especially if their parties or coalitions are divided on an issue. The Swedish government, for example, launched a referendum on nuclear energy (1980) because the major parties could not find a consensus on the issues. Non-state actors use the popular vote to push topics on the political agenda, or to control political decisions.

E-Democracy

E-democracy became famous with the rise of information and communication technology. It covers a variety of novel tools and channels of communication, information and participation, for example online-platforms. E-democracy had raised lofty hopes in the 1990s. It was expected to make political communication and participation easier, faster and more equal. However, real-life experiences have revealed the limited benefits. New technologies – as far as we know to date – do not necessarily improve democracy – and sometimes even have opposing impacts. Involvement and participation, for example, often did not become more inclusive, but even more biased (see Lidén, Strandberg and Grönlund in this edition). The term “digital divide” illustrates this bias.

How to Evaluate Participatory Innovations – Framework

Frameworks for evaluating participatory innovations within consolidated democracies have been spelled out rarely. Although the call for a “concise research agenda” was made as early as 1979 (Sewell and Philips) and continued to echo in the following years, it remained almost unheard of for years (Rowe and Frewer 2004: 521 ff.). During the 1990s, few publications discussed the problem, referring to for example “fairness and competence”

7 Petitions for referenda are applied seldom if a high number of signatures is required, whereas low quota lead to a more intensive use (see Mittendorf 2008).

(Renn et al. 1995). A couple of years later Chess and Purcell's (1999) and Rowe et al.'s (2004: 93) studies might be regarded as starting signals for the next generation of frameworks (see Table 1.1). And they already differentiated between theory-based criteria and criteria based on participants' goals (Chess and Purcell 1999: 2686). Referring to the criteria presented by Rowe et al. (2004), Abelson and Gauvin (2006) evaluated context, process, and outcome using sub-categories such as deliberative quality (similar: Burgess/Chilvers 2006). In the following years similar yardsticks could be found and are compiled in Table 1.1: some authors focus on inclusion and equality (equal access⁸, equal consideration, equal opportunities to participate), on efficiency and effectiveness, or on aspects of legitimacy and accountability. In his seminal book on "Democratic Innovations" Smith (2009) applied the following criteria: inclusiveness, popular control, considered judgement, publicity, efficiency, and transferability. And finally, Geissel (2012, also 2009) summarizes the contributions of a recent edition on 'Evaluating Democratic Innovations'.⁹ She identified the following recurring criteria in current research on participatory innovations: inclusive participation, improvement of citizens' democratic skills, impact on public policies, quality of deliberation, legitimacy and political satisfaction, and transparency (almost identical: Michels 2011). Table 1.1 summarizes the different generations of frameworks in form of a synopsis.¹⁰

-
- 8 This is often defined as expanded opportunities for citizens and/or to increased citizen usage of these opportunities (e.g. Dalton et al. 2006:14).
 - 9 Geissel and Newton 2012 with articles by Budge, Kriesi, Beetham, Fishkin, Smith, Rucht, Talpin
 - 10 Although other studies on democratic, participatory innovations have been conducted in recent years, the studies collected in the figure are among those publications discussing their framework of analysis explicitly.

Table 1.1 Frameworks and Criteria Applied in Evaluation Studies on Participatory Innovations

	Reem et al. 1995	Chess & Purcell 1999	Rowe et al. 2004	Abelson & Gauvin 2006	Dalton et al. 2006	Holtk. et al. 2006	Papadop. & Warin 2007	Fung 2008	Smith 2009	Geissel 2009	Michels 2011	Geissel 2012
Inclusive participation	(x)	(x)	x	x	x		x	x	x	(x)	x	x
Meaningful participation			x	x	(x)		(x)	x	x	(x)	x	x
Legitimacy		(x)		x		x				x	x	x
Quality of Deliberation	(x)			x			x	x	x	x	x	x
Effectiveness		x	x	x		x	x	x	x		(x)	(x)
Citizens' Enlightenment	(x)	(x)		x					(x)	x	x	x
Other criteria (examples)	Fairness		many ¹	process rules	transparency		publicity, accountability		trans-ferability			transparency

*x = mentioned explicitly, although terms differ
(x) = mentioned implicitly*

Based on the described literature, we suggest a framework including the following dimensions: 1) inclusive and meaningful participation, 2) legitimacy, 3) deliberation, 4) effectiveness, and 5) enlightened citizens. This framework is in line with current developments (Geissel 2012; Michels 2011) and avoids pitfalls of former agendas.¹¹

The identified criteria are complex concepts requiring further clarification. They are outlined in the remaining part of this chapter. For each criterion we start with a short description of its meaning and its malaise in current representative democracies. Then we discuss whether and how participatory innovations are expected to mend this malaise and provide some ideas about how to evaluate their impacts. However, some words must be said about measurements beforehand. In this introduction we can just tackle the question of how to measure the different criteria empirically and give some ideas about which indicators might be applied. The authors themselves decided which indicators are useful for their specific cases.¹² And the authors also decide which criteria are most important in the context of the innovation they are examining. Thus, not all authors are able to cover all criteria in their empirical work, but choose the adequate and applicable ones.

1) Inclusive and Meaningful Participation

Inclusive participation seems to be guaranteed in representative democracies - at least de jure - via election of political representatives with the notion of 'one man one vote'. However, two democratic malaises are currently discussed in the context of voter turnout. First, participation in elections has been declining

11 Three pitfalls can be mentioned: First, several criteria mentioned in other frameworks are problematic, as for example 'openness' (see Papadopoulos/Warin 2007). 'Open' innovations might provide less inclusive participation than innovations with selected participants. Or, as Dalton et al. (2006: 262) put it: "Equality of access is not sufficient if equality of usage is grossly lacking". Second, ex ante and ex post impacts have often not been differentiated properly, i.e. impacts which are predisposed by design, and impacts which can only be measured after the end of the procedure are lumped together (e.g. Abelson/Gauvin 2006). For example, the fact that consultative procedures are without decision making competency is part of the design and not an ex post impact. And third, criteria for the evaluation of success and prerequisites for success are often confused: for example, "access to resources" or "early involvement" (Rowe et al. 2004) might be favorable conditions for a successful procedure. However, they cannot serve as criteria for the evaluation of the impact.

12 The same is true for the time frame of evaluation – weeks, months or years. Each author works with the time frame which is useful in his or her case. However, the contributions in this edition are surprisingly coherent (see conclusion).

in most consolidated democracies for years with sometimes less than 40% of the electorate casting a ballot. Many politicians as well as political scientists regard this as an alarming sign. Second, participation in elections became de facto more exclusive because underprivileged strata of society refuse to take part (Schäfer 2009). The promise of ‘one man one vote’ does not suffice to guarantee inclusive, equal input into the political system.

These malaises need to be addressed and many authors demand a cure arguing for more ‘equality in input’, ‘representative input’ or ‘inclusive participation’ via participatory innovations. Participatory innovations, so goes the argument, provide more inclusive input options – especially for those citizens who are not engaged in traditional forms of participation such as elections. However, opponents of participatory innovations claim the converse: participatory forms would undermine inclusive and equal participation. Participatory innovations are used – and misused – by politically already active social strata of society, i.e. the well-off and better-educated strata of society, especially middle-aged and middle class males with time, money, and political know-how. Their interests would be pushed through under the cover and rhetoric of ‘participatory democracy’ – to the detriment of the common good (Raymond, 2002: 183). According to these voices, participatory innovations impede inclusive participation (Papadopoulos 2004: 220).

The question whether participatory procedures provide *inclusive and equal participation* has become a crucial topic in empirical research in the last years. Authors use different terms such as representativeness, equal access, political equality, equal opportunities to participate, inclusiveness in presence and voice or inclusion (of those affected) – but they all refer to the same idea of inclusive and equal participation. In the context of this edition we leave it to the authors to define and analyse ‘inclusive participation’ in line with the participatory procedure under research.

Not only inclusiveness of participation is a malaise of current representative democracies, but also the notion of *meaningful* participation. Meaningful participation seems to be guaranteed in democracies – again with the notion of “one man one vote”. Every vote counts the same and has the same influence on the composition of the government. However, citizens increasingly regard participation as meaningless. They feel that their participation does not make a difference and that most politicians do not care much about what their constituencies want. Proponents argue that participatory innovations would mend these malaises, because they give citizens more say. In contrast, some authors emphasize that most participatory procedures are symbolic anyway and without influence on political decision – and there is some controversy whether the symbolic character is to be considered as fortune or as misfortune (Geissel 2012). However, many studies on participatory innovations refer to this criterion, applying terms like influence, transformation of citizen preferences into public policies, responsiveness or popular control. The conceptual umbrella of

all these different terms is the impact of participatory procedures on political decisions.

However, how can *meaningful participation* be measured in the context of participatory innovations? Co-governance and direct democratic procedures lead by definition more often to public policies. Thus it can be easily evaluated whether and how outcomes of these procedures are transferred into policies. In contrast, deliberative procedures are seldom connected to decision-making bodies and have had little or even no impact on public policies. In our edition, authors evaluate in different ways whether and to what degree participation in the cases they are examining have been meaningful.

2) *Legitimacy and Political Support*

Legitimacy is one of the core notions of democracies and is defined in many different ways (e.g. legal legitimacy, input-legitimacy, output-legitimacy; for details, see Geißel 2008). In this edition, we refer to legitimacy derived by citizens' political support, i.e. 'perceived legitimacy'. Perceived legitimacy is declining in many representative democracies. Citizens still support the idea of democracy, but they are less satisfied with their political system, and especially with their representatives. Participatory innovations are expected to meet some of these malaises. Several proponents argue that citizens would accept the political system, decisions, or even politicians with more enthusiasm, if they were involved in the political process. Opponents in contrast argue that impacts on perceived legitimacy are doubtful. There are, for example, no reasons to assume more positive attitudes towards politicians after involvement in a participatory procedure. And Easton (1965: 58) already highlighted the danger of "demand input overload". Demands might be created and enforced by participatory involvement, while the state has insufficient capacity and means to fulfill them. Frustration and discontent rather than improved legitimacy might be the result of participatory procedures.

Trying to support one hypothesis or the other, research on participatory innovations has often taken (perceived) legitimacy into account – from the perspective of the participants and/or the wider public. Indicators applied in this context are, for example, acceptance (of decisions and of decision-making procedures) or trust in public institutions and decision-makers.

3) *Deliberation*

Representative democracies depend on elections, e.g. on the aggregation of citizens' preferences. However, this aggregative mode is increasingly regarded as 'too simplistic', because citizens' preferences are often "raw, crude", unsophisticated, and not well thought out. Proponents of deliberative procedures ar-

gue that this malaise of current representative democracies can be solved via deliberative procedures. Only by means of deliberation can citizens reflect and transform their preferences and make reasoned decisions.¹³ Accordingly, the quality of *deliberation* is raised in many studies on participatory innovations. Authors of these studies are concerned about whether participatory procedures really involve high-quality deliberation, applying concepts such as “reflective judgements” (Smith 2009: 24), constructive conflict management or thoughtfulness (see Talpin, Setälä and Himmelroos in this edition).

4) Effectiveness

In politics effectiveness means attainment of shared, collective goals of a constituency, for example, economic growth, social equality, or low criminality (Roller 2005; Lijphart 1999). Effectiveness is often regarded as one of the advantages of democracies. Democracies seem to work more effectively than any other kind of political system (see e.g. Government-Effectiveness-Index of World Bank). However, this looks quite different from the perspective of citizens. Citizens in representative democracies are not necessarily satisfied with the performance of their systems, but increasingly discontent because the outcome does not meet their needs and interests. Participatory innovations are often expected to mend these malaises and lead to the attainment of collective goals.

In contrast to ‘meaningful participation’ the main question concerning effectiveness is, whether collective problems are actually solved – whereas meaningful participation just measures whether participants’ statements are taken into account by policy-makers. It might, for example, happen that suggestions made by a participatory procedure are transformed into policies, but the actual outcome largely missed the collective goal.¹⁴

How can effectiveness of participatory procedures be measured? The easiest way would be to evaluate, whether collective goals are more often reached

13 Deliberation has always played an important role in theories of democracy. However, it was limited to the political elite for a long time. In contrast, current democratic theories demand deliberation within civil society and among citizens.

14 Output means policies and public spending, outcome refers to the actual resolution of the problem. For example, studies on output ask about policies and public spending concerning the health care or education systems, whereas studies on outcome look at the actual achievement, e.g. low infant mortality or high educational level of the population. From this perspective, (output) legitimacy is achieved when a political system provides these goods. Or, in the words of Scharpf, political decisions are legitimate if and because they effectively promote the collective goals of the constituency in question (Scharpf 1999: 6).

via participatory procedures than via decisions of political representatives. However, empirical research is not that easy. First, there are methodological problems and lack of data. In most cases it is not possible to compare the effectiveness of decisions made by citizens' and by political representatives directly. Second, in complex societies collective goals are more often than not contested or vague.¹⁵ Thus, it is problematic to assess whether a 'collective goal' was actually reached. In these cases collective goals must be compromised or identified, before they can be 'translated' into policies. Actually, many participatory innovations are designed to support the process of identifying or compromising collective goals. Thus participatory innovations might also be evaluated on the basis of whether they are helpful to identify or to compromise collective goals of a constituency.

5) Enlightened Citizens and Democratic Education

As already stated by Thomas Jefferson (1776), democracy should not only generate common welfare, but also an enlightened democratic citizenry. Almond and Verba (1963) have demonstrated the importance of enlightened citizens' attitudes, skills, and behaviour for thriving democracies (see also Inglehart and Welzel 2005). Democracies can only consolidate and stay stable, if their citizens accept democratic principles and perform democratic skills. However, democratic skills and virtues seem to stagnate in current representative democracies or even to worsen, for example participation in elections. Again, proponents hope that participatory innovations mend this malaise. In fact, *citizens' enlightenment* is often regarded as a major advantage of participatory procedures. Democratic virtues and skills are expected to improve via participation. Some authors even anticipate that "participating in democratic decisions makes participants better citizens", enhances tolerance, public spiritedness, or the ability to listen and to compromise (Fung and Wright 2001; Mansbridge 1999; Gundersen 1995: 6, 112; Renn et al. 1995; Pateman 1970). However, it is unlikely that all civic skills can be enhanced at the same pace and to the same extent. Some skills, such as knowledge, for example, might be improved easily while democratic skills like tolerance might be more difficult to acquire. And some opponents even doubt that participatory innovations have any educative impacts at all. Accordingly, the final yardstick to measure im-

15 In a few cases, of course, the collective goals are undisputed and the effectiveness of participatory innovations can be measured straightforwardly. An innovation is effective, for example, if it attains a collective local goal, such as the reduction of water pollution (e.g. Geissel/Kern 2000) or low public debt (e.g. Freitag/Wagschal 2007).

pacts of participatory innovations is citizens' enlightenment, i.e. the improvement of citizens' democratic skills.

The framework with the discussed dimensions is summarized in the following table (Table 1.2).¹⁶ The criteria portrayed in Table 1.2 are intertwined in many ways. Some criteria might be so densely related – conceptually and empirically – that improvement of one criterion may diffuse benefits to the other criteria. High quality of deliberation and enlightenment of citizens might go hand in hand, for example. If citizens have the chance to deliberate in a highly qualified way, they probably enhance political knowledge and even democratic skills. However, potential trade-offs can also be mentioned.¹⁷ For example, there could be a trade-off between inclusive involvement and deliberation – depending on the applied innovation and its design (e.g. Talpin in this edition). Generally up to now, interconnectedness and trade-offs are surely no 'iron laws' but a matter for empirical research. Or, as Warren (2006: 245) already observed, many trade-offs "happen under some circumstances but not under others" and it is still a challenge for empirical research to elaborate Warren's finding.

One Framework for all Innovations?

The objective of the introduction was to develop a framework for the evaluation of participatory innovations, which can be applied by the contributors. However, in terms of the variety of innovations, should the criteria and the framework not differ from innovation to innovation because different innovations might aim to solve different democratic problems? Should each innovation not be assessed according to its own goals and objectives?

The answer to this question is: no. First, it is the intention of this edition to provide a criteria-based evaluation of several innovations – not a case study approach. Second, it is in most cases hardly possible to identify clear goals of a

16 Some criteria will not be taken into account in this edition. Transferability, for example, is a useful criterion, but in this edition we are trying to evaluate democratic evaluations considering their impacts. And criteria such as "access to resources" or "early involvement" (see Rowe et al. 2004) are necessary for evaluating prerequisites for success. However, they cannot serve as criteria for the evaluation of the impacts of participatory innovations. Impacts and prerequisites are linked without doubt, but for a clear analysis the distinction is crucial.

17 Some authors might state that a trade-off might exist between comprehensive inclusion and effectiveness. In the wake of Schumpeter (1950) or Dahl (1994) they suspect that 'too much' participation hinders effectiveness. However, they follow a different definition of effectiveness, which includes for example the speed of decision-making. Since this is not a malaise that participatory innovations are expected to improve, this argument does not fit.

participatory procedure, because different political actors pin different hopes on an innovation. One example is Participatory Budgeting: local councils launched it with the aim of cutting local expenses and decreasing local debts. Other actors, however, were hoping to improve citizens' civic skills or to enhance meaningful participation (Sintomer et al. 2005). And some initiators of direct democratic procedures, to mention another example, intend not only to support effectiveness, but to increase deliberation (see LeDuc 2006; Setälä in this edition). Also, organizers of deliberative procedures do not only expect to improve deliberation and to enlighten citizens, but also to achieve meaningful participation (Goodin and Dryzek 2006). Most participatory procedures are expected to treat several democratic malaises and it is a task of empirical research to find out which hopes are actually fulfilled.

Table 1.2 Framework to Evaluate Participatory Innovations

Criterion	Intentions of Procedure	Possible Indicators (Examples)
Participation	Inclusive participation	Inclusive participation of affected groups and stakeholders, participation of minorities
	Meaningful participation	Agenda-setting options for participants, transformation of participants' preferences into policies
Legitimacy	Improvement of perceived legitimacy	Attitudes towards - political representatives - the political system
Deliberation	High-quality public deliberation	Rational debate, willingness to listen, respectful exchange of arguments
Effectiveness	Improvement of effectiveness	Identification of collective goals, achieving collective goals, output in line with collective interests
Democratic citizenries	Enlightenment of citizens	Improvement of knowledge, improvement of tolerance, enhanced public spiritedness

Outline of the Edition

This edition covers many European countries, which were active in the field of citizens' participation within the last decades – implementing co-governance procedures (e.g. Spain), fostering deliberative procedures (e.g. France) or improving direct democratic options drastically (Poland, Finland, Germany) (Scarrow 2001). Some of the experiences discussed in this edition are exemplary for specific regions. Participatory Budgeting, for example, became famous in the Western European Romance-speaking countries (Italy, France, and Spain) (Sintomer et al. 2006; Röcke and Putini in this edition). Accordingly these countries are discussed in this edition. Other types of innovations can be found in post-socialist democracies. Several of these rather new democracies have addressed their typical malaises of corruption and non-transparent decision-making by introducing recalls to a larger extent than older democracies (see Smith in this edition). In this publication recalls in Poland and Slovakia thus serve as examples of this general trend in post-communist countries.

Several countries are neglected in this edition. They are partly left out because they do not provide any participatory innovations and reforms, for example Greece. Other countries well-known for their participatory innovations are missing as well, i.e. Denmark, the Netherlands, and the UK.¹⁸ Denmark became famous through the invention of the 'Danish Consensus Conferences' and a huge number of publications are already available discussing this innovation. In the Netherlands, several participatory procedures, e.g. urban 'interactive policy making', have been en vogue since the 1990s. These Dutch examples have been examined in several recent publications and are already quite well-known (Hendriks and Michels 2011; Michels 2011). Finally the UK: Since most literature on participatory innovations focuses on the English-speaking world, British examples have already been widely discussed (e.g. Geissel and Newton 2012; Hansen 2006).

Our edition takes research a step forward by presenting new empirical cases. It highlights participatory innovations in less well-known regional settings and does not intend to be a systematic coverage of all European states. The edition proceeds as follows.

18 Switzerland is left out since most of all publications on direct democracy focus on Switzerland anyway.

Cooperative Governance

This chapter highlights procedures of cooperative governance. Currently, Participatory Budgeting is the most famous co-governance procedure: three of the four contributions examine Participatory Budgeting in France, Germany and Italy (Röcke, Putini, Talpin); the fourth paper scrutinizes local participatory procedures in Spain (Font and Navarro).

Anja Röcke analyses Participatory Budgeting processes considering their impacts on participation and effectiveness, but also takes aspects of deliberation, citizens' enlightenment and legitimacy into account. After a short description of Participatory Budgeting and its distribution within Europe, she develops a typology of Participatory Budgeting procedures. Two cases, a French example (Poitou-Charentes) and a German example (Berlin Lichtenberg), serve as models for her analysis. The very different PB designs in both cities lead to partly diverse impacts, but partly also similar results. For example, participation was more meaningful in the French than in the German case, but in both cases the percentage of active participants was relatively small. And in both cases, as PBs are situated at the local level, links to "the overall political agenda-setting-process" at higher political levels were missing – meaningful participation and effectiveness was strictly limited to small-scale issues.

Antonio Putini evaluates four Italian cases of Participatory Budgeting (Grottammare, Modena, Novellara, Priverno). These cases were selected based on a general survey on Italian Participatory Budgeting experience because of their most heterogenic contexts. Thus the four examples provide a broad variety of designs as well as contexts and involve different findings. Inclusive and meaningful participation, deliberation, effectiveness, and citizens' enlightenment are significantly shaped by designs and contexts of co-governance procedures.

Also Julien Talpin assesses Participatory Budgeting procedures. His main questions are what quality and discursive interactions among ordinary citizens look like and under what conditions collective discussions can become deliberative. To find out he compares two Participatory Budgeting procedures, Rome Municipio XI (Italy) and Morsang-sur-Orge (in the Paris banlieue, France), because these procedures are "among the most empowered in Europe, in terms of the proportion of budget directly decided by citizens". Applying direct observation and ethnographic research he detected that the quality of deliberation was low in both procedures, or in other words, deliberation was scarce. High quality deliberation seems to require "a deep procedural organization of the discussion – small groups, systematic facilitation, etc.". Furthermore, "the emergence of disagreement" is helpful, which can then be transformed into deliberation if sufficient support is provided.

Joan Font and Clemente Navarro scrutinize one specific criterion, inclusive participation, in Spanish participatory innovations. First, they debate about the

differences between participatory procedures in the different European states and explain the “Spanish case”. Then they describe their research design and the cities as well as the participatory instruments under research (Neighbourhood Councils, Policy Councils, Local Agenda 21, Local Ombudsman, Participatory Budgeting and Citizen Juries). The authors checked for differences in participation with emphasis on gender, age, education, social class and children living in the household. The findings are as expected; participation in participatory procedures is biased “towards men, dissatisfied citizens, more ... involved individuals and, above all, members of associations”. However, the authors do not end with descriptions of unequal participation, but try to find reasons leading to these inequalities. Based on comprehensive and in-depth empirical research they identified three causal mechanisms “responsible for the unequal outcomes of participatory processes”. And, furthermore, they discuss whether and how institutional design of participatory procedures matter. Thus this article is one of the very few ones which examines participatory biases in different participatory procedures – a necessary enterprise which will hopefully have many followers.

Deliberative Procedures

Three following articles focus on deliberative democratic procedures. Two of them highlight European small-scale deliberative procedures in one southern European country, Italy (Fiket and Memoli), and one northern country, Finland (Strandberg and Grönlund). The third paper has a conceptual approach.

Irena Fiket and Vincenzo Memoli examine a Deliberative Poll held in Turin, Italy (2007). Deliberative Polls, invented by Fishkin, generally “bring together a statistical microcosm of citizens”. The organizers or the Turin Deliberative Poll, however, added an additional component and arranged meetings between the participants and political decision makers. Fiket and Memoli evaluate the impact of the Turin Deliberative Poll on inclusive participation, legitimacy, quality of deliberation and citizens’ enlightenment. Additionally, they analyzed the perceived legitimacy of this Deliberative Poll throughout its different phases. Some of the most surprising and interesting findings are that “participants’ satisfaction with how democracy works increase(d) after deliberation” and that “the increase is undoubtedly higher after the direct interaction with decision makers”. These findings are indeed novel. In contrast to most studies which could not find an increase in perceived legitimacy (see Strandberg and Grönlund in this edition) the Turin case was different. The most obvious explanation is that deliberative procedures do generally not imply direct communication with decision-makers – and that obviously this communication is the most influential part for enhancing legitimacy. This is surely an important finding for organizers of future deliberative procedures.

Kim Strandberg and Kimmo Grönlund explore a ‘Virtual Polity Experiment in Citizen Deliberation’ (Finland, 2008) focussing on the criteria inclusive participation (including “technical obstacles”), legitimacy, and citizens’ enlightenment. Strandberg and Grönlund’s experiment deals with the question, whether and how deliberation can be “made manageable in large scale societies” and apply information and communication technology to meet this challenge. Their experiment is “one of the first full-scale on-line experiments in citizen deliberation using live video (webcam streaming) and audio conducted in Europe” with several surveys at different stages of the experiment to assess the impacts of deliberation and to measure knowledge gains.¹⁹ Their findings are “ambiguous”. The experiment was rather inclusive in terms of participants, but had no impacts on perceived legitimacy and only few ramifications on citizens’ enlightenment.

Most of the contributions in this edition are empirical, with one exception: Staffan Himmelroos discusses in his conceptual contribution how to measure and to operationalize deliberation. Himmelroos rightly argues that to evaluate deliberation “we need to have a good understanding of what citizen deliberation entails and what the standards of a qualitative deliberative procedure are”. Accordingly, he provides us with helpful tools. Starting with a discussion of the “ideal process”, mainly the Habermasian ideal speech situation, he introduces current critical comments (“too rational – too rigid?”) and asks how Habermas’ concept can be expanded to capture “real world deliberation”. Himmelroos suggests an approach that “emphasises the underlying notion of dialog inherent in all forms of inter-subjective deliberation”. To do so he complements the currently most advanced instrument for measuring deliberation, the Discourse Quality Index, with a measurement called Initiative/Response-Analysis, understanding dialog as initiatives and responses. The combination of the Discourse Quality Index with the Initiative/Response-Analysis provides a useful tool, because it covers equally well rational discourses and other “dynamics of interactive communication”. We are convinced that this tool will be very helpful for future analysis of the deliberative quality of participatory innovations.

19 Since the experiment was not connected to political decision-making procedures, the criteria of meaningful participation and effectiveness could not be taken into account. This limitation is more or less in line with many studies on deliberative procedures since deliberative experiments seldom influence policies directly (e.g. Delli Carpini et al. 2004) – even if political decisions-makers are invited as in the case of the Turin Deliberative Polls.

Direct Democratic Procedures

In this part of the edition two different forms of direct democracy are scrutinized, one analysing different forms of referenda (Setälä) and the other looking at recall instruments (Smith).

Maija Setälä disentangles different forms of direct democracy and discusses their diverse advantages and disadvantages. In her contribution she asks whether direct democratic procedures enhance inclusive participation, deliberation and citizens' enlightenment. Her theoretical point of departure is deliberative democratic theory. This is a rather innovative approach, since direct democracy has rarely been scrutinized from this perspective. She illustrates that different forms of direct democracy have vastly different impacts when considering deliberation as well as inclusion. This is an important contribution because it clarifies that direct democracy can imply a wide range of impacts, depending on the specific design. Although Setälä's paper is not an empirical examination, she applies European real-life examples to illustrate her conceptual findings. Thus, she provides necessary insights for the evaluation of direct democratic procedures not published before.

Michael Smith discusses local recalls as 'old tools' for inclusive and meaningful participation in Poland and Slovakia. Recalls have been actively used in Poland and Slovakia at the local level and are "one of the most important innovations in citizen empowerment". Smith evaluates the recall process in terms of four main criteria: 1) whether citizen participation in the process is *meaningful*, 2) whether it is *inclusive*, 3) whether the recall helps restore *legitimacy*, and 4) the *effectiveness* of the recall process. His in-depth analysis is novel since research on local recalls is scarce and little is known about its impacts. Smith concludes that recall is a powerful tool for meaningful and effective participation "due to its binding outcomes". He shows that recalls are often used by poor, marginalized and minority populations. Recalls also restored perceived legitimacy of public office. Altogether recalls are "most effective in helping resolve extreme and highly divisive situations in a transparent, inclusive and legitimate manner".

E-Democracy

Since we consider e-democracy as an innovation which had raised high hopes but had soon revealed its limited potential for enhancing democracy, one article will discuss the topic. Gustav Lidén scrutinizes the 'qualities of e-democracy' and exemplifies his findings for the case of Sweden. Not surprisingly, one of his main conclusions is that e-democracy struggles with the same problems and challenges as democracy generally. E-democracy does, for example, not necessarily make participation more inclusive or meaningful; and the emergence of