

Annotated Bibliography on Participatory Approaches in Environmental Management

Compiled by Stentor Danielson, 2013

- Abel, T.D. 2000. The limits of civic environmentalism. *American Behavioral Scientist* 44(4):614–628.
Describes the critique of participation as empowering anti-environmental local elites.
- Abelson, J., P.-G. Forest, J. Eyles, P. Smith, E. Martin, and F.-P. Gauvin. 2003. Deliberations about deliberative methods: issues in the design and evaluation of public participation processes. *Social Science and Medicine* 57:239–251.
Reviews logistical challenges to achieving deliberation in participatory processes.
- Ackerman, B., and J.S. Fishkin. 2005. *Deliberation Day*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
Proposes the creation of “Deliberation Day,” a public holiday on which people in the US will engage in deliberation about important issues facing the country.
- Addams, J. 1910. *Twenty years at Hull-House, with autobiographical notes*. The Macmillan Company, New York.
A personal account of early efforts at participatory social reform in Chicago carried out through Jane Addams' Hull-House.
- Addams, J. 1902. *Democracy and social ethics*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL.
A more theoretical statement of Jane Addams' beliefs about participation and social reform.
- Agrawal, A. 2005. *Environmentality: technologies of government and the making of subjects*. Duke University Press, Durham NC.
Critical analysis of trend toward devolution of environmental management in India, describing it as an example of Foucault's idea of “governmentality” – a process of getting members of the public to buy into the government's worldview and thus carry out the government's agenda without coercion.
- Agrawal, A., and C.C. Gibson. 1999. Enchantment and disenchantment: the role of community in natural resource conservation. *World Development* 27(4): 629–649.
Critiques the use of the concept of “community” in participatory environmental management, arguing that the concept contains a number of unjustified assumptions.
- Allmendinger, P., and Tewdwr-Jones, M. 2002. The communicative turn in urban planning: unravelling paradigmatic, imperialistic and moralistic dimensions. *Space and Polity* 6(1): 5-24.
Reviews a variety of objections to participation's effectiveness and moral justifiability.
- Almudi, T., and F. Berkes. 2010. Barriers to empowerment: fighting eviction for conservation in a southern Brazilian protected area. *Local Environment* 15(3): 217–232.
Describes reasons for lack of empowerment of fishers in a National Park in Brazil.
- Amin, A. 2005. Local community on trial. *Economy and Society* 34(4): 612–633.
Critiques the use of the concept of “community” and the reliance on community participation in

decision-making, arguing that this serves to coopt grassroots resistance and abdicate the state's responsibility for redistribution.

Anguelovski, I. 2011. Understanding the dynamics of community engagement of corporations in communities: the iterative relationship between dialogue processes and local protest at the Tintaya Copper Mine in Peru. *Society and Natural Resources* 24(2): 384–399.

Describes a case study of corporate-sponsored participation at a mine in Peru, arguing that popular protests served a positive function in calling for a less ethnocentric and more responsive form of participation.

Armitage, D., F. Berkes, and N. Doubleday. 2007. *Adaptive co-management: Collaboration, learning, and multi-level governance*. University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver.

Describes how to integrate adaptive management approaches with participation.

Arnstein, S.R. 1969. A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planning* 35(4): 216–224.

A foundational article in the study of participation, which argues that forms of participation can be ranked on a “ladder” from perfunctory or manipulative approaches to ones that give real power to stakeholders.

Aronoff, M., and V. Gunter. 1994. A pound of cure: Facilitating participatory processes in technological hazard disputes. *Society and Natural Resources* 7: 235–252.

Case studies of participatory responses to hazards at sites in Michigan and Pennsylvania, concluding that establishing a strong basis of communication between stakeholders and seeking consensus brings the best results.

Arrow, K.J. 1963. *Social choice and individual values*, 2nd ed. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Explains “Arrow's impossibility theorem,” which holds that no decision rule can satisfy all of several reasonable-sounding criteria for aggregating individual preferences into a well-supported group decision.

Arvai, J.L. 2003. Using risk communication to disclose the outcome of a participatory decision-making process: effects on the perceived acceptability of risk-policy decisions. *Risk Analysis* 23(2): 281–289.

Reports a study that showed that describing a decision on a risky technology as having been made through a participatory process increased public acceptance of the decision.

Arvai, J.L., and A. Froschauer. 2010. Good decisions, bad decisions: the interaction of process and outcome in evaluations of decision quality. *Journal of Risk Research* 13(7): 845–859.

Reports a study showing that people see a participation process as inadequate if the outcome is not one they support.

Arvai, J.L., R. Gregory, and T.L. McDaniels. 2001. Testing a structured decision approach: value-focused thinking for deliberative risk communication. *Risk Analysis* 21(6): 1065–1076.

Argues, on the basis of a case study, that having a structured process for considering and debating information in a participatory forum leads to positive results.

- Atkinson, R. 1999. Discourses of partnership and empowerment in contemporary British urban regeneration. *Urban Studies* 36(1): 59–72.
Argues that participatory processes constrain participants to work within government-approved discourses.
- Balducci, A. 1999. Assessing the effectiveness of participatory planning: lessons from the experience. *Sociedade e território* 29: 82–88.
Reports on several case studies of participatory planning in Italy, in which a lack of government commitment undercut the results of stakeholders' decisions.
- Barreteau, O., P.W.G. Bots, and K.A. Daniell. 2010. A framework for clarifying “participation” in participatory research to prevent its rejection for the wrong reasons. *Ecology and Society* 15(2): 1
Available at <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss2/art1/>.
Gives a framework for thinking about how to make a participatory process appropriate to a specific issue.
- Barry, J.M. 2011. Mobilized bias and multistakeholder protected-area planning: a socio-institutional perspective on collaboration. *Society and Natural Resources* 24(10): 1116–1126.
Describes a participatory process in Ontario, Canada that fell victim to adversarial politics.
- Baum, H.S. 1998. Ethical behavior is extraordinary behavior; it’s the same as all other behavior. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 64(4): 411–424.
Describes a case study of urban planning in Baltimore, in which organizers' assumptions about who belonged to the community biased the set of stakeholders who could participate.
- Beierle, T.C. 1999. Using social goals to evaluate public participation in environmental decisions. *Policy Studies Review* 16(3/4): 75–103.
Presents a framework for evaluating participation, and rates a variety of common participatory mechanisms according to the stated criteria.
- Beierle, T.C. 2002. The quality of stakeholder-based decisions. *Risk Analysis* 22(4): 739–749.
Argues that participation is likely to raise the quality of decisions, making them more cost-effective and incorporating better information.
- Beierle, T.C. And J. Cayford. 2002. *Democracy in practice: Public participation in environmental decisions*. Resources for the Future, Washington DC.
Assesses whether participation makes environmental policy decisions more successful, with a positive conclusion.
- Benhabib, S. 1992. *Situating the self: Gender, community and postmodernism in contemporary ethics*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
A dense, thorough critique of Habermas's discourse ethics from a feminist perspective.
- Berkes, F. 2009. Community conserved areas: policy issues in historic and contemporary context. *Conservation Letters* 2: 19–24.
Gives an overview of the trend toward community conservation areas internationally.

- Bidwell, D. 2009. Is community-based participatory research postnormal science? *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 34(6): 741–761.
 Outlines the concept of community-based participatory research, and gives suggestions on making it more effective through enhancing the level of participation.
- Bijlsma, R.M., P.W.G. Bots, H.A. Wolters, and A.Y. Hoekstra. 2011. An empirical analysis of stakeholders' influence on policy development: the role of uncertainty handling. *Ecology and Society* 16(1): 51.
 Compares the outcomes of participatory and expert-based decision processes in a case study of water management in the Netherlands, showing that the participatory process produced a more ambitious, more uncertainty-sensitive, and less adaptive outcome.
- Billgren, C., and H. Holmén. 2008. Approaching reality: Comparing stakeholder analysis and cultural theory in the context of natural resource management. *Land Use Policy* 25: 550–562.
 Examines the usefulness of Grid-Group Cultural Theory as a framework for ensuring a diversity of stakeholders, with mixed results.
- Bleiker, H., and A. Bleiker. 2011. *Citizen participation handbook: For public officials and other professionals working in the public sector*. Institute for Participatory Management and Planning, Monterey, CA.
 Gives a practical guide for officials who are organizing participatory processes.
- Bloomfield, D., K. Collins, C. Fry, and R. Munton. 2001. Deliberation and inclusion: vehicles for increasing trust in UK public governance? *Environment and Planning C* 19: 501–513.
 Explores the emergence of participation as a response to the crises of democracy in the contemporary era.
- Blumenthal, D., and J.-L. Jannink. 2000. A classification of collaborative management methods. *Conservation Ecology* 4(2): 13.
 Evaluates the strengths of several common forms of collaborative environmental management.
- Bohman, J. 1998. The coming of age of deliberative democracy. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 6(4): 400–425.
 Describes how theories of deliberative democracy are “coming of age” by confronting and responding to practical concerns of implementation and institutionalization.
- Booher, D.E., and J.E. Innes. 2002. Network power in collaborative planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21: 221–236.
 Warns of the impact of unequal power relations on participation, and urges the cultivation of flatter “network” power relations.
- Bohman, J. *Public deliberation: Pluralism, complexity, and democracy*. MIT Press, Boston.
 Gives a defense of deliberative democracy's ability to cope with cultural pluralism and social complexity.
- Bohman, J., and W. Rehg. 1997. *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. MIT Press, Boston.

Collects a variety of key statements from major theorists of deliberative democracy.

Bora, A. 2010. Technoscientific normativity and the “iron cage” of law. *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 35(1): 3–28.

Argues that participation procedures fall short because dominant actors set the terms of the debate – focusing on “technoscientific” norms – in ways that exclude certain interests and stakeholder positions.

Branch, K.M., and J.A. Bradbury. 2006. Comparison of DOE and Army advisory boards: application of a conceptual framework for evaluating public participation in environmental risk decision making. *Policy Studies Journal* 34(4): 723–753.

Compares community advisory boards set up to give input on contaminated site management by the US Department of Energy versus those set up by the Department of Defense, drawing conclusions about the importance of agency commitment, decision-making power, and openness of information.

Brennan, M.A., and A. Dodd. 2009. Exploring citizen involvement in the restoration of the Florida Everglades. *Society and Natural Resources* 22: 324–338.

Reports on a survey that examines why residents of south Florida do or do not participate in management of the Everglades.

Broderick, K. 2005. Communities in catchments: implications for natural resource management. *Geographical Research* 43(3): 286–296.

Analyzes the differing conceptions of “community” held by different residents of a watershed in Western Australia, and examines their implications for participation.

Brosius, P.J., A.L. Tsing, and C. Zerner. 2005. *Communities and conservation: Histories and politics of community-based natural resource management*. AltaMira Press, Lanham, MD.

Collects essays on community-based conservation from experienced practitioners.

Brown, J. 2013. Can participation change the geography of water? lessons from South Africa. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 103(2): 271–279.

Describes how larger structural forces and the power of dominant interests undermined a participatory process in water governance in South Africa.

Brown, K. 2002. Innovations for conservation and development. *Geographical Journal* 168(1): 6–17.

Critiques participatory approaches in developing country conservation for making unjustified assumptions about “communities” and failing to give real power to stakeholders, using case studies in Tobago and Brazil.

Brummel, R.F., K.C. Nelson, S.A. Grayzeck-Souter, P.J. Jakes, and D.R. Williams. 2010. Social learning in a policy-mandated collaboration: community wildfire protection planning in the eastern United States. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 53(6): 681–699.

Evaluates the social learning that occurred in three participatory processes for developing community wildfire protection plans, concluding that mandatory participation will not necessarily foster deep learning.

- Bryson, J.M., and S.R. Anderson. 2000. Applying large-group interaction methods in the planning and implementation of major change efforts. *Public Administration Review* 60(2): 143–162.
Canvasses the use of large group interaction methods for participation, and suggests ways of making them more effective.
- Buck, J.V., and B.S. Stone. 1981. Citizen involvement in federal planning: myth and reality. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 17(4): 550–565.
An early paper that documents how a participation process at Yellowstone National Park fell short of the promise of participation's proponents both in terms of the quality of the democracy involved and the influence on policy.
- Burger, J., and M. Gochfeld. 2009. Changes in Aleut concerns following the stakeholder-driven Amchitka Independent Science Assessment. *Risk Analysis*.
Describes how participation in a risk assessment at a nuclear energy site in Alaska altered the concerns expressed by members of the local indigenous (Aleut) people.
- Bull, R., J. Petts, and J. Evans. 2010. The importance of context for effective public engagement: learning from the governance of waste. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 53(8): 991–1009.
Contrasts two cases of participatory processes to site energy-from-waste plants in England, showing that preexisting local context can shape the nature and outcome of the process.
- Burns, M.R., J.G. Taylor, and J.T. Hogan. 2008. Integrative healing: The importance of community collaboration in postfire recovery and prefire planning. p. 81–97. *In* Martin, W.E., Raish, C., Kent, B. (eds.), *Wildfire risk: Human perceptions and management implications*. Resources for the Future, Washington DC.
Describes how participation in environmental planning helped to promote community healing after a catastrophic wildfire.
- Busenberg, G.J. 2000. Resources, political support, and citizen participation in environmental policy: a reexamination of conventional wisdom. *Society and Natural Resources* 13(6): 579–587.
Uses a case study of oil industry oversight in Alaska to examine the usefulness of funding a CAG to do its own independent scientific analyses.
- Byron, I., and A. Curtis. 2001. Landcare in Australia: burned out and browned off. *Local Environment* 6(3): 311–326.
Discusses the Landcare program in Australia, a nationwide participatory environmental management program, detailing how the government has displaced responsibility onto Landcare groups without giving them adequate funding.
- Campbell, J.T., T.M. Koontz, and J.E. Bonnell. 2011. Does collaboration promote grass-roots behavior change? Farne adoption of best management practices in two watersheds. *Society and Natural Resources* 24(11): 1127–1141.
Finds that participation in collaborative programs increases adoption of best management practices by land owners.
- Campbell, L.M., and A. Vainio-Mattila. 2003. Participatory development and community-based

- conservation: opportunities missed for lessons learned? *Human Ecology* 31(3): 417–437.
Explains what the current proponents of “community-based conservation” could learn from the earlier wave of “participatory development.”
- Carr, D.S., and K.E. Halvorsen. 2001. An evaluation of three democratic, community-based approaches to citizen participation: surveys, conversations with community groups, and community dinners. *Society and Natural Resources* 14(2): 107–126.
Compares the benefits of three methods of participation: surveys, focus groups, and community dinners.
- Carter, J. 2010. Protocols, particularities, and problematising Indigenous “engagement” in community-based environmental management in settled Australia. *Geographical Journal* 176(3): 199–213.
Uses case studies in Queensland, Australia to critique how prevailing approaches to participation fail to genuinely engage with indigenous needs, perspectives, and culture.
- Carter, J.L., and G.J.E. Hill. 2007. Critiquing environmental management in indigenous Australia: Two case studies. *Area* 39(1): 43–54.
Compares and contrasts two projects – one successful, one unsuccessful – to gain indigenous participation in environmental management through creating sustainable trepang (sea cucumber) production systems.
- Chambers, R. 1997. *Whose reality counts? putting the first last*. Intermediate Technology Publications, London.
Gives an introduction to the justifications for participation in international development projects, focusing on the methodology of Participatory Rural Appraisal.
- Chambers, S. 2009. Rhetoric and the public sphere: has deliberative democracy abandoned mass democracy? *Political Theory* 37(3): 323–350.
Evaluates the role of rhetoric in deliberation, and gives suggestions on how to bridge the gap between mass publics (which are vulnerable to rhetorical appeals) and small deliberative forums (which can neutralize rhetoric).
- Chapman, B. 1998. More easily done than said: rules, reasons, and rational social choice. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 18(2): 293–329.
Argues that the paradoxes raised by group decision theory arise from the use of purely instrumental rationality, and can be overcome by reasoned deliberation.
- Charnley, S., and B. Engelbert. 2005. Evaluating public participation in environmental decision-making: EPA’s superfund community involvement program. *Journal of Environmental Management* 77(3): 165–182.
Emphasizes the importance of evaluation of participation processes, and carries out evaluations of several US EPA Superfund sites using mail surveys.
- Checkoway, B. 1981. The politics of public hearings. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 17(4): 566–582.
Analyzes public hearings as a mechanism for participation, outlining many ways that standard hearing formats fall short of providing real participation.

- Checkoway, B., and J. Van Til. 1978. What do we know about citizen participation? a selective review of research. p. 25–42. *In* Langton, S. (ed.), *Citizen participation in america*. D.C. Heath and Company, Lexington, MA.
An early review of research findings, which raises many of the same issues that later research has followed up on.
- Cheng, A.S. 2006. Build it and they will come? Mandating collaboration in public lands planning and management. *Natural Resources Journal* 46(4): 841–858.
Reviews the pros and cons of participation with a particular focus on wildfire management in the US.
- Chess, C. 2000. Evaluating environmental public participation: Methodological question. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 43(6): 769–784.
Gives a framework for thinking about evaluating participation processes.
- Chess, C., T. Dietz, and M. Shannon. 1998. Who should deliberate when? *Human Ecology Review* 5(1): 45–48.
Argues that participatory processes should be sensitive to whether there is uncertainty about factual knowledge, conflict about values, or both.
- Chess, C., and B.B. Johnson. 2006. Organizational learning about public participation: “Tiggers” and “Eeyores.” *Human Ecology Review* 13(2): 182–192.
Identifies two basic perspectives on participation within an environmental agency – one enthusiastic, the other feeling constrained by resources and rules.
- Chess, C., and K. Purcell. 1999. Public participation and the environment: Do we know what works? *Environmental Science and Technology* 33(16): 2685–2692.
Reviews research on the effectiveness of different participatory mechanisms, concluding that the precise nature of the mechanism is less important than the commitment of the sponsoring agency.
- Chilvers, J., and J. Burgess. 2008. Power relations: The politics of risk and procedure in nuclear waste governance. *Environment and Planning A* 40(8): 1881–1900.
Uses a case study of decision-making about nuclear power in Britain to illustrate how power relations distort participation and lead to cooptation.
- Clarke, B. 2008. Seeking the grail: Evaluating whether Australia’s Coastcare program achieved “meaningful community participation.” *Society and Natural Resources* 2(1): 891–907.
Evaluates the Coastcare grant program in Australia, finding that it had mixed success in promoting real participation.
- Clarke, L., and J. Agyeman. 2011. Is there more to environmental participation than meets the eye? understanding agency, empowerment and disempowerment among black and minority ethnic communities. *Area* 43(1): 88–95.
Examines how the structure of most participation processes in the UK tend to exclude black and minority ethnic people because they are based on white norms and don't engage the BME community.

- Coggins, G.C. 1999. Regulating federal natural resources: a summary case against devolved collaboration. *Ecology Law Quarterly* 25: 602.
Makes a case against participation for being an abdication of government responsibility and empowering unrepresentative and anti-environmental local groups.
- Coglianesse, C. 2003. Is satisfaction success? Evaluating public participation in regulatory policymaking. p. 69–86. *In* O’Leary, R., Bingham, L.I. (eds.), *The promise and performance of environmental conflict resolution*. Resources for the Future, Washington DC.
Critiques the use of participant satisfaction as a criterion for success in evaluating participation.
- Cohen, J. 2002. Deliberation and democratic legitimacy. p. 87–106. *In* Estlund, D. (ed.), *Democracy*. Blackwell, Malden, MA.
Explains the theoretical basis for deliberative democracy, and answers some objections to it.
- Cohen, J., and A. Fung. 2004. Radical democracy. *Swiss Political Science Review* 10(4): 23–34.
Explores the tension between the ideals of democracy (empowering the largest number of citizens) and deliberation (holding constructive dialogues among stakeholders).
- 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): 119–126.
Evaluates two case studies in which a Community Advisory Group received a grant to do independent scientific analyses, concluding that these analyses were helpful to the sponsoring agencies but the CAGs were unrepresentative of the public.
- Cohen, R.L. 1985. Procedural justice and participation. *Human Relations* 38: 643–663.
Argues on the basis of experiments in employee dispute resolution that participation can make the final decision less accepted by the losers if they view the offer of participation as a cynical ploy.
- Conley, A., and M.A. Moote. 2003. Evaluating collaborative natural resource management. *Society and Natural Resources* 16(5): 371–386.
Outlines the key considerations for evaluation of participatory processes.
- Connick, S., and J.E. Innes. 2003. Outcomes of collaborative water policy making: applying complexity thinking to evaluation. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 46(2): 177–197.
Argues that participation takes us away from a paradigm in which policy mechanically produces good outcomes, to one in which policymaking is a complex adaptive process.
- Cooke, B., and U. Kothari. 2001. *Participation: the new tyranny?* Zed Books, London.
This edited volume includes a number of trenchant critiques of the dominance of participatory approaches in the context of international development.
- Cox, M., G. Arnold, and S. Villamayor Tomás. 2010. A review of design principles for community-based natural resource management. *Ecology and Society* 15(4): 38.
Conducts a meta-analysis of empirical evidence bearing on Ostrom’s eight design principles for successful community-based resource

- Creighton, J.L. 1991. A comparison of successful and unsuccessful public involvement: a practitioner's viewpoint. p. 135–141. *In* Zervos, C. (ed.), *Risk analysis: prospects and opportunities*. Plenum Press, New York.
Gives a detailed list of factors that lead to participation that will be considered “successful,” concluding that most of them are outside the sponsoring agency's control.
- Cullen, D., G.J.A. McGee, T.I. Gunton, and J.C. Day. 2010. Collaborative planning in complex stakeholder environments: an evaluation of a two-tiered collaborative planning model. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(4): 332–350.
Describes a participatory process in British Columbia that used a “two table” model to give indigenous people a special say in the decision rather than treating them like just another stakeholder at the table.
- Cuppen, E. 2012. Diversity and constructive conflict in stakeholder dialogue: considerations for design and methods. *Policy Sciences* 45(1): 23–46.
Explores how Q method can be used to ensure adequate diversity of perspectives in a participation process, and how the process can be structured to generate constructive conflict rather than simply focusing on areas of already-existing agreement.
- Cuppen, E., S. Breukers, M. Hisschemöller, and E. Bergsma. 2010. Q methodology to select participants for a stakeholder dialogue on energy option from biomass in the Netherlands. *Ecological Economics* 69: 579–591.
Uses a case study of biomass burning in the Netherlands to illustrate how Q method can be used to select a diverse set of stakeholders for a participatory process.
- Dahlberg, L. 2005. The Habermasian public sphere: taking difference seriously? *Theory and Society* 34: 111–136.
Responds to critics of Habermas's ideal of deliberation, arguing that Habermas's theory actually embraces critics' concerns about the exclusion of non-rational talk and the coerciveness of consensus.
- Dale, A.P., and M.B. Lane. 1994. Strategic perspectives analysis: A procedure for participatory and political social impact assessment. *Society and Natural Resources* 7: 253–267.
Proposes a formal process for incorporating stakeholder input in environmental decision-making.
- Daniels, S.E., R.L. Lawrence, and R.J. Alig. 1996. Decision-making and ecosystem-based management: applying the Vroom-Yetton model to public participation strategy. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 16: 13–30.
Shows how to apply the model created by Vroom and Yetton () to choosing a form of participatory process in an environmental decision-making context.
- Daniels, S.E., and G.B. Walker. 1996. Collaborative learning: improving public deliberation in ecosystem-based management. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 16: 71–102.
Explains how social learning can be encouraged in environmental decision making contexts.
- Daniels, S.E., and G.B. Walker. 2001. *Working through environmental conflict: the collaborative learning approach*. Praeger, Westport, CT.

Frames decision-making as a social learning process, with participants gaining deeper understandings of both the facts of the issue at hand as well as the values and perspectives of other participants, leading to a better outcome and greater decision legitimacy.

Danielson, S., S.L. Santos, T. Webler, and S.P. Tuler. 2008. Building and breaking a bridge of trust in a Superfund site remediation. *International Journal of Global Environmental Issues* 8(1/2): 45–60. Describes a contaminated site remediation process in which one citizen group lost the confidence of a significant segment of the public because they were viewed as coopted by the sponsoring agency.

Danielson, S., S.P. Tuler, S.L. Santos, T. Webler, and C. Chess. 2012. Three tools for evaluating participation: Focus groups, Q method, and surveys. *Environmental Practice* 14(2): 101–109. Compares the strengths and weaknesses of the use of focus groups, Q method, and surveys in evaluating participation processes.

Danielson, S., T. Webler, and S.P. Tuler. 2010. Using Q method for the formative evaluation of a public participation process. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(1): 92–96. Gives an overview of the use of Q method in evaluating participation processes.

Darnall, N., and G.J. Jolley. 2004. Involving the public: when are surveys and stakeholder interviews effective? *Review of Policy Research* 21(4): 581–593. Proposes that surveys and interviews to get public input are an adequate substitute for deliberative forms of participation.

Davies, A.R. 2001. Hidden or hiding? public perceptions of participation in the planning system. *Town Planning Review* 72(2): 193–216. Examines reasons for non-participation in the British public, attributing it to a lack of trust and a lack of cultural support for participation.

Davies, B.B., K. Blackstock, and F. Rauschmayer. 2005. “Recruitment,” “composition,” and “mandate” issues in deliberative processes: should we focus on arguments rather than individuals? *Environment and Planning C* 23: 599–615. Examines the issues raised by a small group of participants representing the interests and views of a larger population of people.

Davis, N.A. 2011. Broadening participation in fisheries management planning: a tale of two committees. *Society and Natural Resources* 24(2): 103–118. Describes a case of participation in fisheries management in which the government organized two separate advisory groups, one for just fishers and one for all stakeholders, showing that the process gave inadequate input to the stakeholders.

Day, D. 1997. Citizen participation in the planning process: an essentially contested concept? *Journal of Planning Literature* 11(3): 421–434. Gives an overview of considerations in creating participation processes, describing the rationales for participation and the problems and concerns raised by its critics.

DeCaro, D., and M. Stokes. 2008. Social-psychological principles of community-based conservation

and conservancy motivation: Attaining goals within and autonomy-supportive environment. *Conservation Biology* 22(6): 1443-1451.

Describes how participation can be designed to support and enhance the development of psychological autonomy.

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. Evaluates the nature of participation at different stages of implementation of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act in the USA, showing that laypeople are more engaged with permitting at specific sites, since those affect them directly, rather than general rulemaking.

Dewey, J. 1954. *The public and its problems*. Swallow Press, Chicago.
John Dewey's clearest statement on the role of participation in society, describing how problems generate concerned publics who can engage in inquiry to resolve the problem.

Dietz, T., and P.C. Stern. 2008. Public participation in environmental assessment and decision making [Online]. Available at http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=12434 National Academies Press, Washington DC.

Gives a positive overview of the potential for participation in decision-making in the US federal government.

Dovers, S. 1998. Community involvement in environmental management: thoughts for emergency management. *Australian Journal of Emergency Management* 13(2): 6–11.

Describes how the emergency management field can learn about participation from the environmental management field.

Druckman, J.N. 2004. Political preference formation: competition, deliberation, and the (ir)relevance of framing effects. *American Political Science Review* 98(4): 671–686.

Reports on an experiment showing that deliberation can overcome framing effects that would otherwise make people's decisions irrational.

Druckman, J.N., and K.R. Nelson. 2003. Framing and deliberation: how citizens' conversations limit elite influence. *American Journal of Political Science* 47(4): 729–745.

Reports on an experiment showing that deliberation can overcome framing effects that would otherwise make people's decisions irrational.

Dryzek, J.S. 1994. Ecological and discursive democracy: beyond liberal capitalism and the administrative state. p. 176–197. *In* O'Connor, M. (ed.), *Is capitalism sustainable? political economy and the politics of ecology*. Guilford, New York.

Proposes deliberative democracy as an alternative to capitalism and liberal democracy which can achieve greater ecological rationality.

Dryzek, J.S. 1995. Political and ecological communication. *Environmental Politics* 4(4): 13–30.

Argues that democracy should be based on authentic communication, which can only be achieved through deliberation.

Dryzek, J.S. 1996. Political inclusion and the dynamics of democratization. *American Political Science*

Review 90(3): 475–487.

Argues that most stakeholder groups ought to be excluded from participation in government decision-making, because they will have a better influence and resist cooptation if they are external protest movements.

Dryzek, J.S. 2002. *Deliberative democracy and beyond: liberals, critics, contestations*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Gives a comprehensive theory of deliberative democracy.

Dryzek, J.S., and C. List. 2003. Social choice theory and deliberative democracy: a reconciliation. *British Journal of Political Science* 33: 1–28.

Argues that deliberation can overcome many of the paradoxes and irrationalities described by group decision theory.

Dryzek, J.S., R.E. Goodin, A. Tucker, and B. Reber. 2009. Promethean elites encounter precautionary publics: the case of GM foods. *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 34(3): 263–288.

Gives several examples supporting the contention that participatory approaches will tend to lead to more precautionary policies.

Dryzek, J.S., and S. Niemeyer. 2008. Discursive representation. *American Political Science Review* 102(4): 481–493.

Shows how Q method can be used to ensure equal representation of all viewpoints in a participatory process (rather than focusing on representation of all stakeholder categories).

Durodié, B. 2003. Limitations of public dialogue in science and the rise of new “experts.” *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 6(4): 82–92.

Criticizes participation for injecting value considerations into science, watering down scientific discourse, and creating a new group of participation experts.

Earle, T.C., and M. Siegrist. 2008. On the relation between trust and fairness in environmental risk management. *Risk Analysis*.

Reports on survey research showing that people's acceptance of a decision is based more on whether they like the outcome and whether the decision-maker is part of their cultural group, rather than the fairness of the decision process.

Easterling, K.M., M.A. Neblo, and D.M.J. Lazer. 2011. Means, motive, and opportunity in becoming informed about politics: a deliberative field experiment with members of Congress and their constituents. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75(3): 483–503.

Reports on an experiment in which deliberation was shown to increase participants' political knowledge, especially among those who started out with low knowledge.

Eckersley, R. 1999. The discourse ethic and the problem of representing nature. *Environmental Politics* 8(2): 24–49.

Argues that because nature can't participate in deliberation as envisaged by its major proponents, its rights must be safeguarded through the precautionary principle.

Ehrenhalt, A. 1994. Let the people decide between spinach and broccoli. *Governing Magazine* 7(10): 6.

- Argues that if the public is given real power and responsibility to make decisions, people will do well at it.
- Elbakidze, M., P.K. Angelstam, C. Sandström, and R. Axelsson. 2010. Multi-stakeholder collaboration in Russian and Swedish Model Forest initiatives: adaptive governance toward sustainable forest management? *Ecology and Society* 15(2): 14.
Compares participatory forest management cases in Sweden and Russia, examining differences in motivation for creation of participatory processes and differences in effects of more top-down or bottom-up approaches to participation.
- Eliasoph, N. 1998. *Avoiding politics: How Americans produce apathy in everyday life*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
An ethnographic account of several different social groups, explaining why each of them is disengaged from political participation.
- Ellerbusch, F., D.M. Gute, A.M. Desmarais, and M. Woodin. 2006. Community engagement as a component of revitalization: lessons learned from the Technical Outreach Services to Communities program. *Local Environment* 11(5): 515–535.
Examines a program providing technical assistance to communities, showing that a strong sense of community is important to making the process work.
- Ens, E.-J., P. Cooke, R. Nadjamerrek, S. Namundja, V. Garlmgarr, and D. Yibarbuk. 2010. Combining Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal knowledge to assess and manage feral water buffalo impacts on perennial freshwater springs of the Aboriginal-owned Arnhem Plateau, Australia. *Environmental Management* 45: 751–758.
Gives an overview of how integration between Aboriginal and scientific knowledge was achieved in a research project to support management of water buffalo in the Northern Territory of Australia.
- Entwistle, T., G. Bristow, F. Hines, S. Donaldson, and S. Martin. 2007. The dysfunctions of markets, hierarchies and networks in the meta-governance of partnership. *Urban Studies* 44(1): 63–79.
Uses data from 10 cases in Wales to argue that participation requires a mix of markets, hierarchies, and networks in organizing their activities, because a pure form of any one of those options will become dysfunctional.
- Eriksen, C., and T. Prior. 2011. The art of learning: wildfire, amenity migration and local environmental knowledge. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 20: 612–624.
Challenges the “deficit model” of outreach to the public, in favor of seeing learning as a transformative process following Kolb's learning cycle.
- Estlund, D.M. 1993. Who’s afraid of deliberative democracy? On the strategic/deliberative dichotomy in recent constitutional jurisprudence. *Texas Law Review* 71: 1437–1477.
Examines the basis for legitimacy of decisions in several models of deliberative democracy, concluding that deliberation should be legitimate because it has a tendency to produce correct outcomes, rather than because it is a priori fair.
- Everett, Y., and M. Fuller. 2011. Fire Safe Councils in the interface. *Society and Natural Resources* 24(4): 319–333.

- Describes the importance of social capital to making participation effective, using a case study of Fire Safe Councils in California.
- Faast, T., and V. Simon-Brown. 1999. A social ethic for fish and wildlife management. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 4(3): 86–92.
- Argues that trust in the sponsoring agency is much more important to the success of participation than the institutional form that the participation process takes.
- Farrar, C., J.S. Fishkin, D.P. Green, C. List, R.C. Luskin, and E.L. Paluck. 2010. Disaggregating deliberation's effects: an experiment within a deliberative poll. *British Journal of Political Science* 40: 333–347.
- Reports on an experiment that showed that shifts in position by participants in a deliberative poll were genuinely due to the experience of deliberation.
- Fernandez-Gimenez, M.E., H.L. Ballard, and V.E. Sturtevant. 2008. Adaptive management and social learning in collaborative and community-based monitoring: a study of five community-based forestry organizations in the western USA. *Ecology and Society* 13(2): 4.
- Describes five participatory environmental monitoring projects, showing that they lead to enhanced learning and trust.
- Fiorino, D.J. 1989. Technical and democratic values in risk analysis. *Risk Analysis* 9(3): 293–299.
- Argues that democratic values should take precedence in risk management, with technical risk analysis serving an advisory function.
- Fiorino, D.J. 1990. Citizen participation and environmental risk: a survey of institutional mechanisms. *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 15(2): 226–243.
- Describes the substantive, normative, and instrumental reasons for participation, and evaluates a selection of common participatory mechanisms.
- Fischer, F. 1993. Citizen participation and the democratization of policy expertise: from theoretical inquiry to practical cases. *Policy Sciences* 26: 165–187.
- Criticizes elite professionalism in the policy sciences field, and offers as a counterpoint two case studies of participatory research and decision-making that successfully resolved environmental conflicts.
- Fischer, F. 2003. *Reframing public policy: discursive politics and deliberative practices*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Presents a theory of deliberative democracy based on postempiricist philosophy and discourse analysis.
- Fishkin, J.S. 1997. *The voice of the people: public opinion and democracy*. Yale University Press: New Haven.
- Makes an argument for the widespread use of deliberative polling.
- Fishkin, J.S. 2006. Strategies of public consultation. *Integrated Assessment Journal* 6(2): 57–72.
- Reviews a selection of common participation mechanisms, based on whether they use raw opinions or opinions refined through deliberation, and based on how participants are selected.

- Fleeger, W.E. 2008. Collaborating for success: Community wildfire protection planning in the Arizona White Mountains. *Journal of Forestry* 106(2): 78–82.
 Reports on the success of a participatory process for wildfire planning in Arizona, attributing its success to the commitment of all stakeholders and the sponsoring agency, and the interest generated by a major fire as a focusing event.
- Flyvbjerg, B. 1998. Empowering civil society: Habermas, Foucault and the question of conflict. p. 185–211. *In* Douglass, M., Friedmann, J. (eds.), *Cities for citizens: Planning and the rise of civil society in a global age*. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester.
 Criticizes Habermas's theory of deliberative democracy for being naïve about the role of power, and recommends Foucault's non-prescriptive analysis of the workings of power instead.
- French, S., and C. Bayley. 2011. Public participation: comparing approaches. *Journal of Risk Research* 14(2): 241–257.
 Compares various participation approaches – with different mixes of laypeople and experts, and held in different formats – used in food safety issues in the UK, to show that laypeople can understand complex technical issues and tend to raise a broader set of concerns.
- Freudenberg, W.R., and D. Olsen. 1983. Public interest and political abuse: public participation in social impact assessment. *Journal of the Community Development Society* 14(2): 67–82.
 Contrasts participation, which can favor the voices of the privileged, with social impact assessment, which makes an objective and fair assessment of all of the social consequences of a proposed policy.
- Frewer, L.J. 2001. Environmental risk, public trust, and perceived exclusion from risk management. *Research in Social Problems and Public Policy* 9: 221–248.
 Gives a framework for evaluating participation on multiple criteria.
- Fung, A. 2003. Recipes for public spheres: eight institutional design choices and their consequences. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 11(3): 338–367.
 Describes eight design choices and ten potential outcomes to consider in designing a participatory process.
- Fung, A., and E.O. Wright. 2001. Deepening democracy: innovations in empowered participatory governance. *Politics and Society* 29(1): 5–41.
 Gives an overview of the worldwide trend toward deliberative democracy, and lists several important questions to ask about any participation process.
- Fung, A., and E.O. Wright. Deepening democracy: institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance. Verso, London.
 Outlines the process for developing appropriate participatory processes.
- Gallagher, D.R. 2009. Advocates for environmental justice: the role of the champion in public participation implementation. *Local Environment* 14(10): 905–916.
 Describes the importance of having “champions” who will advocate for participation in order to achieve environmental justice.

- Gastil, J., and P.J. Weiser. 2006. Jury service as an invitation to citizenship: assessing the civic value of institutionalized deliberation. *Policy Studies Journal* 34(4): 605–627.
Reports a study showing that serving on a jury – which is a participatory forum – increases people's civic engagement.
- Genskow, K.D. 2008. Catalyzing collaboration: Wisconsin's agency-initiated basin partnerships. *Environmental Management*.
Shows that commitment from various stakeholders, especially government agencies, explains why some participation forums continue operating while others fold.
- Gilmour, A., G. Walkerden, and J. Scandol. 1999. Adaptive management of the water cycle on the urban fringe: three Australian case studies. *Conservation Ecology* 3(1): 11.
Describes two Australian case studies in which participatory processes were used to create ecological models to aid in water management.
- Gismondi, M., and M. Richardson. 1994. Discourse and power in environmental politics: public hearings on a bleached kraft pulp mill in Alberta, Canada. p. 232–252. *In* O'Connor, M. (ed.), *Is capitalism sustainable? political economy and the politics of ecology*. Guilford, New York.
Shows how participants in a series of public hearings about building a paper mill in Alberta, Canada were able to shift the discourse despite the limited opportunities for engagement presented by the hearing format.
- Goldstein, B.E., and W.H. Butler. 2010. The U.S. Fire Learning Network: providing a narrative framework for restoring ecosystems, professions, and institutions. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(10): 935–951.
Describes the US Fire Learning Network, which built connections among stakeholders in the wildfire management field in order to promote learning without having to directly challenge the institutional status quo.
- Gooch, M. 2005. Volunteering in catchment management groups: empowering the volunteer. *Australian Geographer* 35(2): 193–208.
Shows how participation can create individual and group empowerment and self-development, using a case study from Australia.
- Gooch, M., and J. Warburton. 2009. Building and managing resilience in community-based NRM groups: an Australian case study. *Society and Natural Resources* 22(2): 158–171.
Reports on participatory groups in Queensland, Australia, showing that they were able to achieve resilience in environmental outcomes by cultivating resilience, adaptability, and transformability in the governance process.
- Goodin, R.E. 1993. Democracy, preferences and paternalism. *Policy Sciences* 26: 229–247.
Argues that elitist democracy is better than populist democracy (which enacts people's knee-jerk, unreflective preferences) or deliberative democracy (which proceeds one issue at a time rather than offering comprehensive party platforms).
- Goodin, R.E. 2000. Democratic deliberation within. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 29(1): 81–109.
Argues that because it is so difficult to conduct actual deliberation with large numbers of people, we

should do more to cultivate people's ability to conduct deliberation within their own minds by exposing them to the widest possible set of artistic voices.

Gray, G.J., M.J. Enzer, J.P. Kusel. 2001. *Understanding community-based forest ecosystem management*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Describes how to conduct participatory forest management, based on practitioners' experiences.

Greenberg, M., and M.J. Lewis. 2000. Brownfields redevelopment, preferences, and public involvement: a case study in an ethnically mixed neighbourhood. *Urban Studies* 37(13): 2501–2514.

Reports on a survey in the neighborhood of a proposed brownfield redevelopment in New Jersey, USA showing that the people most interested in participation had preferences for the site at odds with the government's vision.

Gregory, R. 2000. Using stakeholder values to make smarter environmental decisions. *Environment* 42(5): 34–44.

Argues that participation's goal is to clarify and elaborate understandings of the situation, not to achieve consensus.

Gregory, R. 2002. Incorporating value trade-offs into community-based environmental risk decisions. *Environmental Values* 11: 461–488.

Makes a case for a highly structured approach to evaluating environmental problems within participatory processes, to ensure that high-quality analysis is done.

Gregory, R., J. Arvai, and T. McDaniels. 2001. Value-focused thinking for environmental risk consultations. *Research in Social Problems and Public Policy* 9: 249–273.

Reports on an experiment in the context of participation about dams in British Columbia, Canada, showing that a structured approach generated better results than an unstructured one.

Gruber, J.S. 2010. Key principles of community-based natural resource management: a synthesis and interpretation of identified effective approaches for managing the commons. *Environmental Management* 45(1): 52-66.

Uses a meta-analysis to identify 12 features that contribute to successful participatory processes.

Gruber, J.S. 2011. Perspectives of effective and sustainable community-based natural resource management: an application of Q methodology to forest projects. *Conservation and Society* 9(2): 159–171.

Uses Q methodology to examine the perspectives on what makes successful participation from stakeholders in participatory processes in Romania, USA, and Mexico.

Gundersen, A.G. 1995. *The environmental promise of democratic deliberation*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI.

Argues that deliberation can be a favorable form of governance for environmentalists to achieve their goals.

Gundry, K.G., and T.A. Heberlein. 1984. Do public meetings represent the public? *Journal of the American Planning Association* 50: 175–182.

Examines the demographic and ideological representativeness of attendees at three public meetings

about environmental policy topics, concluding that they are much closer to being fully representative than is commonly believed.

Gute, D.M., and M.R. Taylor. 2006. Revitalizing neighbourhoods through sustainable brownfields redevelopment: principles put into practice in Bridgeport, CT. *Local Environment* 11(5): 537–558.

Reports on a successful community workshop around brownfield redevelopment in Connecticut, USA.

Gutmann, A., and D. Thompson. 1996. *Democracy and disagreement*. Belknap Press, Cambridge, MA. Makes a case for deliberative democracy on political theory grounds, and illustrates its application to a variety of social controversies.

Habermas, J. 1970. Towards a theory of communicative competence. *Inquiry* 13: 360–375. Uses theory about undistorted communication to outline the concept of the ideal speech situation.

Habermas, J. 1984. *The theory of communicative action, vol. 1: reason and the rationalization of society*. Beacon Press, Boston.

Habermas, J. 1984. *The theory of communicative action, vol. 2: lifeworld and system*. Beacon Press, Boston.

This is Habermas's best-known work, setting out his theory of deliberative democracy.

Habermas, J. 1996. *Between facts and norms: contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Explains the basis for the validity of policies agreed to through undistorted communication.

Hackel, J.D. 1997. Community-based conservation and the future of African wildlife. *Conservation Biology* 13(4): 726–734.

Casts doubt on whether participatory approaches can guarantee the adequate protection of nature, if stakeholders decide they'd be better off exploiting nature.

Hadden, S.G. 1981. Technical information for citizen participation. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 17(4): 537–549.

Describes the results of an early program to provide technical information to citizens in order to enable their participation in policymaking.

Hajjar, R.F., R.A. Kozak, and J.L. Innes. 2012. Is decentralization leading to “real” decision-making power for forest-dependent communities? case studies from Mexico and Brazil. *Ecology and Society* 17(1) Available at <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol17/iss1/art12/> (verified 12 June 2013).

Uses case studies in Mexico and Brazil to show that decentralization of forest management has had mixed results.

Halvorsen, K.E. 2006. Critical next steps in research on public meetings and environmental decision making. *Human Ecology Review* 12(2): 150–160.

Argues that public hearings tend to be unrepresentative of the wider population, and that more research is needed on what motivates people to participate or not, and how much influence hearings have over policy.

- Hamilton, J.D., and C. Wills-Toker. 2006. Reconceptualizing dialogue in environmental public participation. *Policy Studies Journal* 34(4): 755–775.
Argues that current approaches to participation emphasize problem-solving types of discussion over sense-making types.
- Hamlett, P.W., and M.D. Cobb. 2006. Potential solutions to public deliberation problems: structured deliberations and polarization cascades. *Policy Studies Journal* 34(4): 629–648.
Uses case studies of citizens' forums on nanotechnology to show how deliberation can overcome some of the pathologies noted in the group decision theory literature.
- Hampton, G. 2009. Narrative policy analysis and the integration of public involvement in decision making. *Policy Sciences*.
Argues that weaving together narratives, rather than making arguments, is the best way to resolve conflicts in a participatory process.
- Hanna, K.S. 2000. The paradox of participation and the hidden role of information: a case study. *American Planning Association Journal* 66(4): 398–410.
Based on a case study of estuary management, argues that the influence of participatory processes is often subtle and informal.
- Hanna, S.S. 1998. Managing for human and ecological context in the Maine soft shell clam fishery. p. 190–212. *In* Berkes, F., Colding, J., Folke, C. (eds.), *Linking social and ecological systems: management practice and social mechanisms for building resilience*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Shows the success of local community management of a clam fishery.
- Hardy, S.D. 2010. Governments, group membership, and watershed partnerships. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(7): 587–603.
Examines the differences in issue framing between different watershed partnerships, depending on whether they are citizen-led or government-led.
- Hardy, S.D., and T.M. Koontz. 2009. Rules for collaboration: institutional analysis of group membership and levels of action in watershed partnerships. *Policy Studies Journal* 37(3): 393–414.
Compares the effectiveness of three watershed partnerships in Ohio, based on whether they are citizen-led, government-led, or hybrid.
- Harris, T.M., D. Weiner, T.A. Warner, and R. Levin. 1995. Pursuing social goals through participatory Geographic Information Systems. p. 196–222. *In* Pickles, J. (ed.), *Ground truth: the social implications of geographic information systems*. Guilford Press, New York.
Cautions that participatory use of Geographic Information Systems still forces participants to reformulate their knowledge into a format compatible with GIS software, which can create distortions.
- Harrison, C.M., and J. Burgess. 1994. Social constructions of nature: a case study of conflicts over the development of Rainham Marshes. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 19(3):

291–310.

Shows how differing cultural views about nature made dialogue difficult in a participatory forum about development and conservation of a marsh in England.

Hart, P.S., E.C. Nisbet, and J.E. Shanahan. 2011. Environmental values and the social amplification of risk: an examination of how environmental values and media use influence predispositions for public engagement in wildlife management decision making. *Society and Natural Resources* 24(3): 276–291.

Uses psychological factors and the social amplification of risk framework to explain who does and does not participate in a wildlife management process.

Hartley, T.W., and R.A. Robertson. 2006. Stakeholder engagement, cooperative fisheries research and democratic science: the case of the Northeast Consortium. *Human Ecology Review* 13(2): 161–171.

Reviews a participatory science project involving both scientists and fishers in New England.

Healey, P. 1997. *Collaborative planning: shaping places in fragmented societies*. University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver.

Advocates participatory approaches within the practice of spatial planning.

Heberlein, T.A. 1976. Some observations on alternative mechanisms for public involvement: the hearing, public opinion poll, the workshop and the quasi-experiment. *Natural Resources Journal* 16: 197–212.

Examines four common forms of participation, finding weaknesses in each, and recommends a mixed strategy.

Heller, P. 2001. Moving the state: the politics of democratic decentralization in Kerala, South Africa, and Porto Alegre. *Politics and Society* 29: 131–163.

Cautions that without a strong leftist political presence, decentralization of policymaking will promote corporate power rather than democracy.

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

Describes how deliberative models of participation can threaten the power of established interest groups, and gives suggestions for resolving the conflict.

Hendriks, C.M. 2005. Participatory storylines and their influence on deliberative forums. *Policy Sciences* 38: 1–20.

Uses case studies of participatory forums in Australia about container deposit laws and genetically modified organisms to show how having a “storyline” about participation can help to make participation work better.

Hendriks, C.M., and L. Carson. 2008. Can the market help the forum? Negotiating the commercialization of deliberative democracy. *Policy Sciences* 41(4): 293–313.

Reviews the increasing commercialization of deliberative democracy through consultants and professional facilitators, showing how this trend could be positive or negative for democracy.

- Heyward, C. 2008. Can the all-affected principle include future persons? *Green deliberative democracy and the non-identity problem*. *Environmental Politics* 17(4): 625–643.
Examines how the interests of future generations can be protected in deliberative democracy, since people who don't exist yet can't participate in deliberation.
- Hibbing, J., and E. Theiss-Morse. 2002. *Stealth democracy: Americans' beliefs about how government should work*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Argues, on the basis of extensive survey and experimental data, that people in the US are not interested in participating more in policymaking, and would prefer if the government handled it – though they will participate if the government fails.
- Hickey, S., and G. Mohan. 2004. *Participation: from tyranny to transformation? exploring new alternatives to participation in development*. Zed Books, London.
This book is a follow-up to Cooke and Kothari's *Participation: The new tyranny?* which seeks a middle ground between embrace and rejection of participation.
- Hill, R., C. Grant, M. George, C.J. Robinson, S. Jackson, and N. Abel. 2012. A Typology of Indigenous Engagement in Australian Environmental Management: Implications for Knowledge Integration and Social-ecological System Sustainability. *Ecology and Society* 17(1) Available at <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol17/iss1/art23/> (verified 12 June 2013).
Examines indigenous participation in environmental management in Australia, suggesting that processes that give more power to indigenous people are better.
- Hillman, M., G. Aplin, and G. Brierley. 2003. The importance of process in ecosystem management: lessons from the Lachlan catchment, New South Wales, Australia. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 46(2): 219–237.
Uses a catchment management group in Australia to show the importance of trust and social relationships in making a participation process successful.
- Hisschemoller, M., R. Hoppe, W.N. Dunn, and J.R. Ravetz. 2001. *Knowledge, power, and participation in environmental policy analysis*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, NJ.
Brings together essays on a variety of practical challenges confronted in participatory environmental management.
- Hoggett, P., and S. Thompson. 2002. Toward a democracy of the emotions. *Constellations* 9(1): 106–126.
Describes the importance of emotions, not just detached reasoning, in deliberation.
- Holifield, R. 2004. Neoliberalism and environmental justice in the United States environmental protection agency: translating policy into managerial practice in hazardous waste remediation. *Geoforum* 35: 285–297.
Argues that neoliberalism has led the US government to avoid or distort its obligations to achieve environmental justice, including the role of participation in this process.
- Holifield, R. 2012. Environmental justice as recognition and participation in risk assessment: negotiating and translating health risk at a Superfund site in Indian country. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 102(3): 591–613.

- Uses a case study of a Superfund site on Native American land in Minnesota as a case study to show how participation can advance environmental justice.
- Horelli, L. 2002. A methodology of participatory planning. p. 607–627. *In* Bechtel, R.B., Churchman, A. (eds.), *Handbook of environmental psychology*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
Gives a chart rating various participation mechanisms based on their suitability to different contexts and stages of a project.
- Howe, P.D., B. Yarnal, A. Coletti, and N.J. Wood. 2013. The participatory vulnerability scoping diagram: deliberative risk ranking for community water systems. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 103(2): 343–352.
Proposes a framework for participatory priority-setting and vulnerability analysis.
- Humphrey, M. 2007. *Ecological politics and democratic theory: The challenge to the deliberative ideal*. Routledge, New York.
Argues that, contrary to the widespread turn toward participatory approaches, deliberative democracy will hamper the achievement of environmentalist goals.
- Hunold, C., and I.M. Young. 1998. Justice, democracy, and hazardous siting. *Political Studies* 46: 82–95.
Gives a general political theory argument in favor of deliberative democracy, with a case study of a landfill siting process in Switzerland.
- Hunt, L.M., and B.L. McFarlane. 2007. Understanding self-evaluations of effectiveness by forestry advisory committee members: A case of Ontario's Local Citizens Committee members. *Journal of Environmental Management* 83: 105–114.
Reports on a survey of forestry committee participants, showing that control over the process was the greatest contributor to their belief in the process's success.
- Huntington, H.P., S.F. Trainor, D.C. Natcher, O.H. Huntington, L. DeWilde, and F.S. Chapin III. 2006. The significance of context in community-based research: understanding discussions about wildfire in Huslia, Alaska. *Ecology and Society* 11(1): 40.
Describes challenges arising from a community forum with native Alaskans about climate change and wildfire, due to a culture of deference to elders and deep ontological divides between organizers and native participants.
- Innes, J.E. 1992. Group processes and the social construction of growth management: Florida, Vermont, and New Jersey. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 58(4): 440–454.
Uses case studies of participatory growth management planning in three US states to show how participation can enhance learning, innovation, and adaptation to uncertainty.
- Innes, J.E. 1996. Planning through consensus building: a new view of the comprehensive planning ideal. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62(4): 460–473.
Advocates consensus-building as a solution to the impossibility of rationalistic comprehensive planning.
- Innes, J.E. 2004. Consensus building: Clarifications for the critics. *Planning Theory* 3(1): 5–20.

Defends consensus as a goal for participation against a variety of criticisms.

Innes, J.E., and D.E. Booher. 1999. Consensus building and complex adaptive systems: a framework for evaluating collaborative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 65(4): 412. Gives a set of criteria for evaluating high-quality consensus-based participation processes.

Innes, J.E., and D.E. Booher. 2004. Reframing public participation: strategies for the 21st century. *Planning Theory and Practice* 5(4): 419–436. Criticizes legally mandated participation processes like public hearings and comment periods for being inadequately participatory.

Irvin, R., and J. Stansbury. 2004. Citizen participation in decision making: Is it worth the effort? *Public Administration Review* 64(1): 55–65. Points out the many costs and drawbacks to the sponsoring agency of participation, and describes a case of watershed planning in Nebraska, USA where participation wasn't worth it.

Izurieta, A., B. Sithole, N. Stacey, H. Hunter-Xenie, B. Campbell, P. Donohoe, J. Brown, and L. Wilson. 2011. Developing indicators for monitoring and evaluating joint management effectiveness in protected areas in the Northern Territory, Australia. *Ecology and Society* 16(3) Available at <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol16/iss3/art9/> (verified 9 January 2012). Reports on a participatory process for selecting indicators to be used to evaluate the success of co-management in the Northern Territory of Australia.

Jakes, P.J., K.C. Nelson, S.A. Enzler, S. Burns, A.S. Cheng, V. Sturtevant, D.R. Williams, A. Bujak, R.F. Brummel, S.A. Grayzeck-Souter, and E. Staychock. 2011. Community wildfire protection planning: is the Healthy Forests Restoration Act's vagueness genius? *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 20: 350–363. Argues that the vagueness of the US Healthy Forests Restoration Act's mandate for participation has enabled participatory planning processes for wildfire to be flexible and adjust to the circumstances, and thus be more successful.

Johnson, G.F. 2007. Discursive democracy in the transgenerational context and a precautionary turn in public reasoning. *Contemporary Political Theory* 6: 67–85. Argues that deliberative democracy entails the implementation of the precautionary principle in order to include the interests of future generations.

Kadlec, A., and W. Friedman. 2007. Deliberative democracy and the problem of power. *Journal of Public Deliberation* 3(1): 8. Responds to critics who say that deliberative democracy ignores power inequalities, arguing that activists can make smart use of deliberation.

Kasperson, R.E. 1986. Six propositions on public participation and their relevance to risk communication. *Risk Analysis* 6(3). Makes six general observations about participation, centering on issues of information and trust.

Kasperson, R.E., D. Golding, and S.P. Tuler. 1992. Social distrust as a factor in siting hazardous facilities and communicating risks. *Journal of Social Issues* 68: 161–187.

- Argues that hazardous facility siting will be enhanced by trust, which has four dimensions: commitment, competence, caring, and predictability.
- Keen, M., and S. Mahanty. 2006. Learning in sustainable natural resource management: challenges and opportunities in the Pacific. *Society and Natural Resources* 19(6): 497–513.
Describes the importance of social learning in environmental management, using case studies from the Solomon Islands and Fiji.
- Keeney, R.L., D. Von Winterfeldt, and T. Eppel. 1990. Eliciting public values for complex policy decisions. *Management Science* 36(9): 1011–1030.
Reports on a “public value forum,” in which a structured analysis process led stakeholders to shift their positions on energy policy.
- Kellert, S.R., J.N. Mehta, S.A. Ebbin, and L.L. Lichtenfeld. 2000. Community natural resource management: promise, rhetoric, and reality. *Society and Natural Resources* 13: 705–715.
Evaluates five cases of participation in Nepal, Kenya, and the USA, concluding that they fall short on achieving environmental goals, and do just a little better on socioeconomic criteria.
- Kemp, R. 1985. Planning, public hearings, and the politics of discourse. p. 177–201. *In* Forester, J. (ed.), *Critical theory and public life*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
Argues, using a British nuclear plant case study, that public hearings formally satisfy the requirements of Habermas's ideal speech situation, but in practice are vehicles for domination by the ideologies of the powerful.
- Kenyon, W., N. Hanley, and C. Nevin. 2001. Citizens' juries: an aid to environmental valuation? *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 19: 557–566.
Gives a positive review of the potential for citizens' juries as a participation mechanism.
- Kerr, N.L., R.J. MacCoun, and G.P. Kramer. 1996. Bias in judgment: comparing individuals and groups. *Psychological Review* 103(4): 687–719.
Shows how different group decision rules can either enhance or reduce biases that are present in individual decision-making.
- Klinke, A., and O. Renn. 2002. A new approach to risk evaluation and management: risk-based, precaution-based, and discourse-based strategies. *Risk Analysis* 22(6): 1071–1094.
Contrasts three approaches to making decisions about risks – risk analysis (when probabilities are well-known), precaution (when there's uncertainty about probabilities), and deliberation (when there is ambiguity about possible outcomes).
- Konisky, D.M., and T.C. Beierle. 2001. Innovations in public participation and environmental decision making: examples from the Great Lakes region. *Society and Natural Resources* 14(9): 815–826.
Conducts a comparative analysis of four participation mechanisms (study circles, citizens' juries, round tables, and collaborative watershed management), concluding that a mix of mechanisms is best.
- Kupper, F., L. Krijgsman, H. Bout, and T. De Cock Buning. 2007. The value lab: exploring moral frameworks in the deliberation of values in the animal biotechnology debate. *Science and Public Policy* 34(9): 657–670.

Describes deliberation over animal biotechnology using a “value lab” approach, similar to a focus group.

Lahiri-Dutt, K. 2004. “I plan, you participate”: a southern view of community participation in urban Australia. *Community Development Journal* 39(1): 13–27.

Uses a case study from New South Wales, Australia to show how privileging science and starting participation late in the decision-making process lead to unfavorable results.

Laird, F.N. 1993. Participatory analysis, democracy, and technological decision making. *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 18(3): 341–361.

Evaluates regulatory negotiation and community advisory groups using two criteria of democracy – pluralist and direct participation – finding that they both qualify as good forms of participation.

Landa, D., and A. Meirowitz. 2009. Game theory, information, and deliberative democracy. *American Journal of Political Science* 53(2): 427–444.

Shows how game theory can be used to evaluate the decision-making rules that are proposed by normative theories of deliberation.

Lane, M.B. 2003. Decentralization or privatization of environmental governance? forest conflict and bioregional assessment in Australia. *Journal of Rural Studies* 19: 283–294.

Critiques Australia's Regional Forest Agreements, arguing that they simply enable government and corporate dominated decision-making rather than enabling real democracy.

Lane, M.B. 2005. Public participation in planning: an intellectual history. *Australian Geographer* 36(3): 283–299.

Gives a short history of the circumstances leading to the rise of participatory approaches in planning.

Lane, M.B., and L.J. Williams. 2009. The Natural Heritage Trust and indigenous lands: the trials and tribulations of “new technologies of governance.” *Australian Geographer* 40(1): 85–107.

Explains how Australia's Natural Heritage Trust has given little funding to indigenous environmental management due to disparagement of Aboriginal perspectives and a lack of resources for preparing effective grant proposals.

Langton, S. 1978. *Citizen participation in America*. D.C. Heath and Company, Lexington, MA.
An early overview of participation sponsored by governments in the USA.

Larner, W., and D. Craig. 2005. After neoliberalism? community activism and local partnerships in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Antipode* 37: 402–424.

Argues, based on experiences in New Zealand, that participation is a way of coopting activists within a neoliberal system.

Latour, B. 2004. *Politics of nature: How to bring the sciences into democracy*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Argues that the conventional separation between the social and natural worlds should be abolished, in both scientific analysis and democratic practice.

Lauria, M., and R.K. Whelan. 1995. *Planning theory and political economy: The need for reintegration*.

Planning Theory 14: 8–33.

Argues that advocates of participation ignore structural features of the political economy that constrain the effectiveness of participation.

Laurian, L. 2004. Public participation in environmental decision making: findings from communities facing toxic waste cleanup. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70(1): 53–66.

Surveys neighbors of toxic sites in North Carolina, USA to see why they do or do not participate in decision-making, finding that lack of trust, lack of time, and lack of information are among the most important reasons for non-participation.

Leach, M., R. Mearns, and I. Scoones. 1999. Environmental entitlements: dynamics and institutions in community-based natural resource management. *World Development* 27(2): 225–247.

Criticizes prevailing approaches to participation for assuming the existence of a unified, homogeneous, clearly bounded “community,” and proposes an alternative framework based on institutions and Sen's theory of entitlements.

Leach, W.D., N.W. Pelkey, and P.A. Sabatier. 2002. Stakeholder partnerships as collaborative policymaking: evaluation criteria applied to watershed management in California and Washington. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 21(4): 645–670.

Evaluates 44 stakeholder partnerships on the west coast of the USA, finding that they are generally successful.

Levine, P., and R.M. Nierras. 2007. Activists' views of deliberation. *Journal of Public Deliberation* 3(1): 4.

Reports on a series of focus groups with activists and organizers of participatory processes, finding that activists see participation as biased, coopting, and conferring legitimacy on an unjust sponsoring agency.

List, C. 2004. The discursive dilemma and public reason. *Ethics* 116(2): 362–402.

Argues that paradoxes arising in decision theory may or may not be resolvable through deliberation.

List, C. and R.E. Goodin. 2001. Epistemic democracy: generalizing the Condorcet jury theorem. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 9(3): 277-306.

Argues that, contrary to common belief, the Condorcet jury theorem can apply when there are more than two possible options.

Lloyd, D., P. van Nimwegen, and W.E. Boyd. 2005. Letting indigenous people talk about their country: a case study of cross-cultural (mis)communication in an environmental management planning process. *Geographical Research* 43(4): 406–416.

Shows how, in a case study from Queensland, Australia, indigenous people can be effectively excluded from real participation despite lip service given to their inclusion.

Lo, A.Y. 2011. An analysis and democracy: the antecedents of the deliberative approach of ecosystems valuation. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 29: 958–974.

Examines how deliberation can be used to improve the results of contingent valuation surveys.

Lockie, S. 1999. Community movements and corporate images: “Landcare” in Australia. *Rural*

Sociology 64(2): 219–233.

Argues that rather than promoting participation in environmental management, the Australian Landcare program has become an opportunity to promote high-yield agriculture and greenwash corporate activities.

Lockwood, M., J. Davidson, A. Curtis, E. Stratford, and R. Griffith. 2010. Governance principles for natural resource management. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(10): 986–1001.

Lists eight principles for effective participation, based on consultation with stakeholders in Australia.

Logan, B.I., and W.G. Moseley. 2002. The political ecology of poverty alleviation in Zimbabwe's Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE). *Geoforum* 33: 1–14.

Describes the failure of a community-based wildlife conservation program in Zimbabwe, attributing it to unjustified assumptions about “community,” lack of real community power, and lack of resources.

Lowndes, V., L. Pratchett, and G. Stoker. 2001. Trends in public participation: part 1 -- local government perspectives. *Public Administration* 79(1): 205–222.

Lowndes, V., L. Pratchett, and G. Stoker. 2001. Trends in public participation: part 2 -- citizens' perspectives. *Public Administration* 79(2): 445–455.

Reports on research into what governments (part 1) and citizens (part 2) in Britain think about participation, finding that governments feel they lack resources and public support, while the public feels they lack opportunities and trust.

Lupia, A., and M.D. McCubbins. 1998. *The democratic dilemma: can citizens learn what they need to know?* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Shows that the information-gathering processes of average citizens are adequate to effective democratic participation.

Lynn, F.M. 1987. Citizen involvement in hazardous waste sites: two North Carolina success stories. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 7: 347–361.

Describes two cases of successful participatory processes about hazardous waste sites in North Carolina, USA.

Lynn, F.M., and G. Busenberg. 1995. Citizen advisory committees and public policy: what we know, what's left to discover. *Risk Analysis* 15(2): 147–162.

Reviews research on citizen advisory committees, finding that their effectiveness depends heavily on the amount of commitment and authority they get from the sponsoring agency.

Macedo, S. (Ed). 1999. *Deliberative politics: essays on “Democracy and disagreement.”* Oxford University Press, New York.

An edited collection of essays that challenge Gutmann and Thompson's case for deliberative democracy.

MacKenzie, B.F., and B.M.H. Larson. 2010. Participation under time constraints: landowner perceptions of rapid response to the emerald ash borer. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(10): 1013–1022.

Describes a case in which the need for rapid response to an invasive species made it difficult to conduct genuine participation.

Maginn, P.J. 2007. Deliberative democracy or discursively biased? Perth's dialogue with the city initiative. *Space and Polity* 11(3): 331–352.

Evaluates a participatory planning process in the city of Perth, Western Australia, concluding that it fell short because information was presented in excessively technical language and the government dominated the agenda.

Mansbridge, J. 2007. Self-interest in deliberation. *Kettering Review* 25(1): 62–72.

Argues that there is a role for self-interest within deliberation.

McCarthy, D.D.P., D.D. Crandall, G.S. Whitelaw, Z. General, and L.J.S. Tsuji. 2011. A critical systems approach to social learning: building adaptive capacity in social, ecological, epistemological (SEE) systems. *Ecology and Society* 16(3) Available at <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol16/iss3/art18/> (verified 9 January 2012).

Describes two Canadian case studies in which social learning enabled better environmental management.

McCarthy, J. 2005. Devolution in the woods: community forestry as hybrid neoliberalism. *Environment and Planning A* 37: 995–1014.

Describes how neoliberalism has come to endorse participation, leading to some rejections of participation by the left.

McCarthy, J. 2006. Neoliberalism and the politics of alternatives: community forestry in British Columbia and the United States. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 96(1): 84–104.

Shows how the greater success of community forestry in Canada is due to the fact that, unlike the USA, Canada did not get locked into a structure of environmental law that focused on lawsuits as a primary form of participation in the 1970s.

McClosky, M. 1999. Local communities and the management of public forests. *Ecology Law Quarterly* 25: 624.

Argues that participation unfairly advantages those who live closer to the site of the decision and who are more socially privileged.

McClymont, K., and P. O'Hare. 2008. "We're not NIMBYs!" Contrasting local protest groups with idealized conceptions of sustainable communities. *Local Environment* 13(4): 321–335.

Uses two case studies to show that local protest groups are demanding participation and alternative development strategies, not simply saying "not in my backyard."

McComas, K.A., J.C. Besley, and C.W. Trumbo. 2006. Why citizens do and do not attend public meetings about local cancer cluster investigations. *Policy Studies Journal* 34(4): 671–698.

Reports on a survey about why local residents do or do not participate in meetings about cancer clusters, finding that participants are the curious, the fearful, and the available, while non-participants are the uninformed, the indifferent, the occupied, and the disaffected.

- McComas, K.A., and C.W. Scherer. 1999. Providing balanced risk information in surveys used as citizen participation mechanisms. *Society and Natural Resources* 12(2): 107–119.
Reports on a test of including information in a survey so that its results will reflect respondents' more considered opinions and thus qualify as a form of participation.
- McCool, S.F., and K. Guthrie. 2001. Mapping the dimensions of successful public participation in messy natural resources management situations. *Society and Natural Resources* 14(4): 309–323.
Describes the criteria for success stated by participants in resource management in Montana.
- McDaniels, T., and K. Thomas. 1999. Eliciting preferences for land use alternatives: a structured value referendum with approval voting. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 18(2): 264–280.
Reports on an experiment with a “structured value referendum,” designed to promote careful consideration of a problem by referendum voters.
- Measham, T.G. 2009. Social learning through evaluation: a case study of overcoming constraints for management of dryland salinity. *Environmental Management* 43(3): 1096–1107.
Shows how an iterative process of evaluation can promote social learning, using a case study of dryland salinity management in Western Australia.
- Mendelberg, T. 2002. The deliberative citizen: theory and evidence. p. 151–193. *In* Delli Carpini, M., Huddy, L., Shapiro, R.Y. (eds.), *Research in micropolitics, volume 6: political decision making, deliberation and participation*. Elsevier.
Argues that deliberation can correct some cognitive biases, though it may exacerbate others depending on how it is organized.
- Messner, F., O. Zwirner, and M. Karkuschke. 2006. Participation in multi-criteria decision support for the resolution of a water allocation problem in the Spree River Basin. *Land Use Policy* 23: 63–75.
Proposes an integration of participation and formal decision theory, and demonstrates its use in a case of water basin management in Germany.
- Milbrath, L.W. 1981. Citizen surveys as citizen participation mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 17(4): 478–496.
Proposes that surveys are an effective form of participation because they produce more representative coverage of public opinion.
- Miraftab, F. 2004. Public-private partnerships: the Trojan Horse of neoliberal development? *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 24: 89–101.
Uses a case study of housing policy in South Africa to show that participation can be just a way for the state to abdicate responsibility and create openings for corporate profits.
- Mollett, S. 2010. Está listo (are you ready)? gender, race and land registration in the Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve. *Gender, Place, and Culture* 17(3): 357–375.
Explores a case of participation by indigenous people in management of a protected area in Honduras, showing how conservation policies can interact with community gender norms to the detriment of women.

- Moore, S.A. 1996. Defining “successful” environmental dispute resolution: case studies from public land planning in the United States and Australia. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 16: 151–169.
Based on case studies in Western Australia and Montana, USA, describes a variety of possible criteria for success of participation.
- Moore, S.A., and S.F. Rockloff. 2006. Organizing regionally for natural resource management in Australia: reflections on agency and government. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 8(3): 259–277.
Contrasts government-appointed participatory groups in Victoria, Australia with grassroots groups in Western Australia, showing that the government-appointed groups had more staying power.
- Morehouse, B.J., and S. O’Brien. 2008. Facilitating public involvement in strategic planning for wildland fire management. *Professional Geographer* 60(4): 495–507.
- Morehouse, B.J., S. O’Brien, G. Christopherson, and P. Johnson. 2010. Integrating values and risk perceptions into a decision support system. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 19: 123–136.
Describes the development of a wildfire risk model that used lay knowledge and perceptions alongside scientific information, and was accessible to the public to aid in their decision-making.
- Mosse, D. 1994. Authority, gender and knowledge: Theoretical reflections on the practice of participatory rural appraisal. *Development and Change* 25: 497–526.
Examines how participatory processes in international development projects can get captured by the more privileged strata of the local population.
- Mostert, E., C. Pahl-Wostl, Y. Rees, B. Searle, D. Tabara, and J. Tippett. 2007. Social learning in European river-basin management: barriers and fostering mechanisms from 10 river basins. *Ecology and Society* 12(1): 19.
Examines ten river basin management participatory processes in Europe, finding that lack of clarity about stakeholder involvement and lack of institutional commitment were the biggest barriers to social learning.
- Mouffe, C. 1999. Deliberative democracy or agonistic pluralism? *Social Research* 66(3): 745–758.
- Mouffe, C. 2000. *The democratic paradox*. Verso, New York.
Criticizes Habermas's ideal of uncoerced consensus for being unrealistic about power relations, and proposes a model of “agonistic pluralism” in which democracy consists of struggle with legitimate opponents.
- Muñoz-Erickson, T.A., B. Aguilar-González, M.R.R. Loeser, and T.D. Sisk. 2010. A framework to evaluate ecological and social outcomes of collaborative management: lessons from implementation with a northern Arizona collaborative group. *Environmental Management* 45: 132–144.
Proposes an indicator of ecological health to be used as a measurement of participatory processes' success.
- Muro, M., and P. Jeffrey. 2008. A critical review of the theory and application of social learning in participatory natural resource management processes. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 51(3): 325–344.

Critiques the emphasis on social learning in environmental management, suggesting that it is neither as useful nor as necessary as proponents claim.

Mustalahti, I., and J.F. Lund. 2010. Where and how can participatory forest management succeed? learning from Tanzania, Mozambique, and Laos. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(1): 31–44. Using case studies of Tanzania, Mozambique, and Laos, argues that participation in forest management has not lived up to its promise where there is high-value timber that gives governments and corporations an economic incentive to not encourage participation by local stakeholders.

Mutz, D.C. 2008. Is deliberative democracy a falsifiable theory? *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: 521–538.

Charges that proponents of deliberative democracy ignore or evade empirical evidence that questions the effectiveness of deliberation.

Nadasdy, P. 1999. The politics of TEK: power and the "integration" of knowledge. *Arctic Anthropology* 36 (1-2):1-18.

Argues that attempts to integrate traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) into science fail because they try to make the integration happen on science's terms – and that properly speaking, TEK is neither traditional, ecological, nor knowledge.

Nadasdy, P. 2003. Reevaluating the co-management success story. *Arctic* 56(4): 367–380.

Sharply critiques “co-management” partnerships between government agencies and indigenous people, using a case study from the Yukon. Argues that integration of traditional ecological knowledge with science was done in a way that was exploitative and exclusionary toward indigenous people.

National Research Council. 1996. *Understanding risk: informing decisions in a democratic society*. National Academies Press, Washington DC.

Argues that risk management requires extensive attention to problem framing and determining what kind of information is really needed, a process that involves participation, before anyone jumps into conducting technical risk analysis.

Nature. 2000. Benefits of increased public participation. *Nature* 405(6784): 259.

Argues that involving a broad section of the public, not just actively engaged stakeholders, will offset decision-making biases and vested interests.

Neblo, M.A., K.M. Esterling, R.P. Kennedy, D.M.J. Lazer, and A.E. Sokhey. 2010. Who wants to deliberate -- and why? *American Political Science Review* 104(3): 566–583.

Challenges the idea that the public is too disengaged and apolitical for extensive participation, showing that if offered a real chance for genuine participation, lots of people – especially those disaffected from the existing political process – will take the opportunity.

Ney, S., and M. Thompson. 1999. Consulting the frogs: the normative implications of cultural theory. p. 206–223. *In* Thompson, M., Grendstad, G., Selle, P. (eds.), *Cultural theory as political science*. Routledge, London.

Describes the substantive benefits that come from having a diverse set of worldviews represented in a decision-making process.

- Niemeyer, S. 2004. Deliberation in the wilderness: displacing symbolic politics. *Environmental Politics* 13(2): 347–372.
 Argues that deliberation can help people overcome “symbolic politics” of fighting over influence, and enable consideration of the real substantive issues.
- Niemeyer, S., S. Ayirtman, and J. HartzKarp. 2013. Understanding deliberative citizens: the application of Q methodology to deliberation on policy issues. *Operant Subjectivity* 36(2): 114–134.
 Uses a before-and-after Q method study to examine how opinions about repair or replacement of a bridge in Perth, Australia changed as a result of deliberation.
- Niemeyer, S., and J.S. Dryzek. 2007. The ends of deliberation: Metaconsensus and intersubjective rationality as ideal outcomes. *Swiss Political Science Review* 13(4): 497–526.
 Uses a case study from Queensland to show that even when deliberation can't achieve consensus, it may at least achieve metaconsensus – agreement on the problem framing and mutual respect between stakeholders.
- Nightingale, A. 2003. Nature-society and development: social, cultural and ecological change in Nepal. *Geoforum* 34: 525–540.
 Shows how a participatory process in Nepal empowered local elites over more marginalized members of the community.
- Norton, B.G., and B. Hannon. 1998. Democracy and sense of place values in environmental policy. *In* Light, A., Smith, J.M. (eds.), *Philosophy and geography III: philosophies of place*. Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD.
 Argues that focusing on the idea of “sense of place” will promote localized participatory democracy and ensure that democracy protects the environment.
- Nurse-Bray, M., H. Marsh, and H. Ross. 2010. Exploring discourses in environmental decision making: an indigenous hunting case study. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(4): 366–382.
 Examines how a participatory plan in Queensland, Australia failed because indigenous and non-indigenous participants brought wildly different problem framings, concerns, and worldviews to the table.
- O’Hara, S.U. 1996. Discursive ethics in ecosystems valuation and environmental policy. *Ecological Economics* 16: 95–107.
 Describes a case of environmental roundtables in New York, USA that illustrate Habermas's theory of deliberative democracy.
- O’Neill, J. 2001. Representing people, representing nature, representing the world. *Environment and Planning C* 19: 483–500.
 Argues that proxy representation is unfortunately necessary when protecting entities, such as the natural environment, that can't participate in deliberation.
- O’Neill, S. 2000. The politics of inclusive agreements: towards a critical discourse theory of democracy. *Political Studies* 48: 503–521.
 Examines the type of political and economic equality that is a prerequisite to deliberation of the sort

that Habermas proposes.

Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the commons: the evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gives an overview of community-based resource management systems that defy predictions of a “tragedy of the commons,” and proposes several design principles for enabling such management systems to grow and thrive.

Ottonelli, V. 2010. What does the discursive paradox really mean for democracy? *Political Studies* 58: 666–687.

Argues that the paradoxes of group decision theory can't be resolved by deliberation.

Paehlke, R. 2004. Democracy and environmentalism: opening a door to the administrative state. *In* Paehlke, R., Torgerson, D. (eds.), *Managing Leviathan*. Broadview, Peterborough, ONT.

Argues that environmentalism has been good for democracy because it has pushed for more participation in environmental decision-making.

Pahl-Wostl, C., M. Craps, A. Dewulf, E. Mostert, D. Tàbara, and T. Taillieu. 2007. Social learning and water resources management. *Ecology and Society* 12(2): 5.

Examines how social learning occurred on several levels in European river basin management groups.

Painter, M. 1992. Participation and power. p. 21–35. *In* Munro Clark, M. (ed.), *Citizen participation in government*. Hale and Iremonger, Sydney.

Argues that the shift toward participation is largely a method of cooptation of critical protest, and thus that stakeholders take a big risk when they choose to engage in participatory forums.

Parkins, J.R. 2010. The problem with trust: insights from advisory committees in the forest sector of Alberta. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(9): 822–836.

Uses a case study from Alberta, Canada to show that high levels of trust among participants can be harmful, because it leads to marginalizing and ignoring any dissent from the prevailing consensus.

Parkinson, J. 2001. Deliberative democracy and referendums. p. 131–152. *In* Dowding, K., Hughes, J., Margetts, H. (eds.), *The challenges to democracy: ideas, involvement and institutions*. Palgrave, London.

Critiques the adequacy of referendums as a way of achieving deliberative democracy.

Parkinson, J. 2003. Legitimacy problems in deliberative democracy. *Political Studies* 51: 180–196.

Examines different solutions to the problem of conducting deliberative democratic processes for very large populations.

Paveglio, T.B., P.J. Jakes, M.S. Carroll, and D.R. Williams. 2009. Understanding social complexity within the wildland-urban interface: a new species of human habitation? *Environmental Management* 43(6): 1085-1095.

Shows how community bonds built through one participatory process (in this case, writing a community wildfire protection plan) can enable communities to go on to solve other problems more effectively.

Pelletier, D., V. Kraak, C. McCullum, U. Uusitalo, and R. Rich. 1999. The shaping of collective values through deliberative democracy: an empirical study from New York's North Country. *Policy Sciences* 32: 102–131.

Uses a case study from New York, USA to show how deliberation can change people's views on an issue.

Pellizzoni, L. 2001. The myth of the best argument: power, deliberation and reason. *British Journal of Sociology* 52(1): 59–86.

Argues that Habermas's ideal of persuasion by the best argument is an illusion, but that pragmatic compromises (rather than principled consensus) are still possible.

Pellizzoni, L. 2003. Uncertainty and participatory democracy. *Environmental Values* 12: 195–224.

Argues that uncertainty makes consensus through deliberation unlikely, and that we should seek local compromises instead.

Petersen, D., M. Minkler, V.B. Vásquez, and A.C. Baden. 2006. Community-based participatory research as a tool for policy change: a case study of the Southern California Environmental Justice Collaborative. *Review of Policy Research* 23(2): 339–353.

Reports on a case in California, USA in which environmental justice was enhanced through community participation in a research project on air pollution.

Peterson, M.N., M.J. Peterson, and T.R. Peterson. 2005. Conservation and the myth of consensus. *Conservation Biology* 19(3): 762–767.

Argues that demands for consensus in participatory processes are coercive and tend to favor the status quo, and proposes an alternative argumentation-based ideal of participation.

Peterson, R.B., D. Russell, P. West, and J.P. Brosius. 2010. Seeing (and doing) conservation through cultural lenses. *Environmental Management* 45: 5-18.

Gives lessons from anthropology for improving participation.

Petts, J. 2006. Managing public engagement to optimize learning: reflections from urban river restoration. *Human Ecology Review* 13(2): 172–181.

Explains how to “optimize” participation in order to promote social learning, through maintaining openness to different perspectives.

Petts, J. 2008. Public engagement to build trust: false hopes? *Journal of Risk Research* 11(6): 821–835.

Explains how participation won't automatically build trust, but it can if done right.

Pimbert, M.P., and B. Gujja. 1997. Village voices challenging wetland management policies: experiences in participatory rural appraisal from India and Pakistan. *Nature and Resources* 33(1): 34–42.

Describes a case study of successful participation in water management in Pakistan.

Pincione, G., and F.R. Tesón. 2011. *Rational choice and democratic deliberation: a theory of discourse failure*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Argues that irrationality and strategic behavior are inevitable, thus dooming any attempt at reasonable

deliberation.

- Pini, B., and F. Haslam McKenzie. 2006. Challenging local government notions of community engagement as unnecessary, unwanted, and unproductive: case studies from rural Australia. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 8(1): 27–44.
Reports, describes, and rebuts Australian officials' views that participation is unnecessary, unwanted, and unproductive.
- Pini, B., S. Wild River, and F. Haslam McKenzie. 2007. Factors inhibiting local government engagement in environmental sustainability: case studies from rural Australia. *Australian Geographer* 38(2): 161–175.
Reports on the main barriers faced by Australian officials in implementing participation – capacity, commitment, coordination, and community.
- Poisner, J. 1996. A civic republican perspective on the National Environmental Policy Act's process for citizen participation. *Environmental Law* 26: 53.
Evaluates the opportunities for participation created under the USA's National Environmental Policy Act according to civic republican criteria and finds that they fall short.
- Poteete, A.R. 2009. Defining political community and rights to natural resources in Botswana. *Development and Change* 40(2): 281–305.
Gives a positive review of expanded community-based natural resource management in Botswana.
- Prater, C.S., and M.K. Lindell. 2000. Politics of hazard mitigation. *Natural Hazards Review* 1(2): 73–82.
Argues for the importance of communities seizing the opportunity to participate as much as possible.
- Predmore, S.A., M.J. Stern, M.J. Mortimer, and D.N. Seesholtz. 2011. Perceptions of legally mandated public involvement processes in the U.S. Forest Service. *Society and Natural Resources* 24(12): 1286–1303.
Surveyed US Forest Service personnel, finding that they generally saw information provision as the most important part of participation, and many felt that the public's input was irrational and biased.
- Prell, C., K. Hubacek, and M. Reed. 2009. Stakeholder analysis and social network analysis in natural resource management. *Society and Natural Resources* 22: 501–518.
Using a case study in the Peak District of England, explores how social network analysis can be used to identify a diverse set of stakeholders for participation.
- Prell, C., M. Reed, L. Racin, and K. Hubacek. 2010. Competing structure, competing views: the role of formal and informal social structures in shaping stakeholder perceptions. *Ecology and Society* 15(4): 34.
Using a case study in the Peak District of England, explores how social network analysis can be used to identify a diverse set of stakeholders for participation.
- Pritikin, T.T. 1998. A citizen's view: the nuts and bolts of co-partnerships. *Human Ecology Review* 5(1): 51–53.

Gives a list of desirable characteristics of a participation process from the point of view of a lay participant.

Quaghebeur, K., J. Masschelein, and H.H. Nguyen. 2004. Paradox of participation: giving or taking part? *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 14: 154–165.

Based on a case study in Vietnam, argues that participation often involves making laypeople do extra work for the sponsoring agency's vision.

Quong, J. 2002. Are identity claims bad for deliberative democracy? *Contemporary Political Theory* 1: 307–327.

Argues that identity-based claims (e.g. “this policy is bad because it threatens my group's identity”) should be admissible in deliberation.

Rabe, B.G. 1988. The politics of environmental dispute resolution. *Policy Studies Journal* 16(3): 585–601.

Reviews the pros and cons of negotiated dispute resolution in environmental conflicts.

Rabe, B.G. 1991. Beyond the NIMBY syndrome in hazardous waste facility siting: the Albertan breakthrough and the prospects for cooperation in Canada and the United States. *Governance* 4(2): 184–206.

Reviews a successful case of participation in the siting of a hazardous waste facility in Alberta, Canada.

Ralston, S.J. 2009. Deweyan democracy and pluralism: a reunion. *Social Philosophy Today* 25: 223–240.

Defends John Dewey's theory of democracy as a way of life.

Ramsey, K. 2008. A call for agonism: GIS and the politics of collaboration. *Environment and Planning A* 40(10): 2346–2363.

Describes a case study of water management in Idaho, USA, which illustrates how the use of geographic information systems in participatory processes can restrict the perspectives that are considered and silence contested meanings.

Reed, M.S., A.C. Evely, G. Cundill, I. Fazey, J. Glass, A. Laing, J. Newig, B. Parrish, C. Prell, C. Raymond, and L.C. Stringer. 2010. What is social learning? *Ecology and Society* 15(4). Available at <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss4/resp1/> (verified 19 July 2013).

Gives an overview of social learning and how it can be produced by participation.

Reich, R.B. 1985. Public administration and public deliberation: an interpretive essay. *Yale Law Journal* 94(7): 1617–1641.

Uses an example of public workshops in Washington state, USA to illustrate the importance of participation in environmental management.

Reidel, J.A. 1972. Citizen participation: Myths and realities. *Public Administration Review* 32(3): 211–220.

Confronts advocates of participation with nine “realities,” focusing on how government is unlikely to give real power to participation, and accuses participation advocates of trying to gain illegitimate power through the back door.

- Renn, O. 2006. Participatory processes for designing environmental policies. *Land Use Policy* 23: 34–43.
Gives an overview of Habermas's model for participation and deliberation, as applied to a Swiss case study.
- Renn, O., T. Webler, and H. Kastenholz. 1998. Procedural and substantive fairness in landfill siting: a Swiss case study. p. 253–270. *In* Löfstedt, R., Frewer, L. (eds.), *The Earthscan reader in risk and modern society*. Earthscan Publications, London.
Gives a detailed case study of a structured decision-making process involving lay participants and expert witnesses for siting a landfill in Switzerland.
- Renn, O., T. Webler, H. Rakel, P.C. Dienel, and B.B. Johnson. 1993. Public participation in decision making: a three-step procedure. *Policy Sciences* 26: 189–214.
Proposes a three-step participation process in which laypeople articulate concerns, experts offer information, and laypeople judge proposed solutions – and shows how this process can break down in situations of high social inequality.
- Renn, O., T. Webler, and P.M. Wiedemann. 1995. Fairness and competence in citizen participation: evaluating models for environmental discourse. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
Articulates standards for fair and competent participation based on Habermas's theories, then applies them to evaluating a range of common participation mechanisms.
- Robards, M.D., and A.L. Lovecraft. 2010. Evaluating comanagement for social-ecological fit: indigenous priorities and agency mandates for Pacific walrus. *Policy Studies Journal* 38(2): 257–279.
Using a case study of marine mammal management in Alaska, shows how government dominance of agenda-setting and definition of key terms can exclude stakeholders (notably native people) from effective participation.
- Roberts, N. 2004. Public deliberation in an age of direct citizen participation. *American Review of Public Administration* 34(4): 315–353.
Reviews the key arguments for and against participation.
- Roberts, R. 1995. Public involvement: from consultation to participation. p. 221–246. *In* Vanclay, F., Bronstein, D.A. (eds.), *Environmental and social impact assessment*. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester.
Contrasts mere consultation of the public with real participation, and gives a framework for incorporating appropriate participation into different stages of a decision-making process.
- Robertson, D.P., and R.B. Hull. 2003. Public ecology: an environmental science and policy for global society. *Environmental Science and Policy* 6: 399–410.
Gives a conceptual framework for “public ecology,” which is ecological science with extensive public involvement.
- Robson, M., and S. Kant. 2009. The influence of context on deliberation and cooperation in community-based forest management in Ontario, Canada. *Human Ecology* 37(5): 547–558.

- Reviews the contextual factors that produced differences in two forest management participatory processes in Ontario, Canada.
- Robson, M., J. Rosenthal, R.H. Lemelin, L.M. Hunt, N. McIntyre, and J. Moore. 2010. Information complexity as a constraint to public involvement in sustainable forest management. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(12): 1150–1169.
Uses a case study from Ontario, Canada to show how the complexity of technical information can be a barrier to effective participation.
- Rockloff, S.F., and S.A. Moore. 2006. Assessing representation at different scales of decision making: rethinking local is better. *Policy Studies Journal* 34(4): 649–670.
Examined the qualities that citizens desire in representatives, and found that they are more favorable to representatives participating in decision-making at broader, as opposed to more local, scales.
- Rodela, R. 2011. Social learning and natural resource management: the emergence of three research perspectives. *Ecology and Society* 16(4) Available at <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol16/iss4/art30/> (verified 20 January 2012).
Gives a review of how social learning is presented in the environmental management literature.
- Rogers, G.O. 1998. Siting potentially hazardous facilities: what factors affect perceived and acceptable risk? *Landscape and Urban Planning* 39: 265–281.
Reports on a survey showing that creating a fair and inclusive decision-making process did more to increase the acceptability of a hazardous facility than shifting the cost-benefit ratio by offering monetary compensation.
- Rosener, J.B. 1981. User-oriented evaluation: a new way to view citizen participation. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 17(4): 583–596.
Advocates evaluating participation processes in terms of their achievement of goals stated by the participants.
- 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.
Reports on a study of California coastal commission hearings, showing that public participation had a significant impact on decisions.
- Rowe, G., and L.J. Frewer. 2000. Public participation methods: a framework for evaluation. *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 25(1): 3–29.
Presents a framework for assessing public participation mechanisms in terms of their process and outcomes, and applies it to a selection of common mechanisms, finding that community advisory groups and citizens' juries get the best marks.
- Rowe, G., and L. Frewer. 2004. Evaluating public-participation exercises: a research agenda. *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 29: 512–556.
Presents a frameworks for evaluating participatory processes, and the results of a meta-analysis of published evaluations.

- Rowe, G., and L. Frewer. 2005. A typology of public engagement mechanisms. *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 30: 251–290.
Organizes participation mechanisms according to criteria of participant selection method, facilitation of elicitation of views, response mode (closed-ended or open-ended), flexibility of information input, medium of information transfer (face-to-face or mediated), and facilitation of aggregation.
- Rowe, G., and J.G. Gammack. 2004. Promise and perils of electronic public engagement. *Science and Public Policy* 31(1): 39–54.
Assesses the pros and cons of using the internet for participation.
- Rutherford, M.B., M.L. Gibeau, S.G. Clark, and E.C. Chamberlain. 2009. Interdisciplinary problem solving workshops for grizzly bear conservation in Banff National Park, Canada. *Policy Sciences* 42: 163–187.
Reports on a structured participatory decision-making process at Banff National Park.
- Ryan, R.L., and E. Hamin. 2008. Wildfires, communities, and agencies: stakeholders' perceptions of postfire forest restoration and rehabilitation. *Journal of Forestry* 106(7): 370–379.
Describes the factors that lead to public interest in participation in decision-making, rather than just learning private actions to undertake, in the context of restoration after major wildfires in the western USA.
- Rydin, Y. 2003. *Conflict, consensus, and rationality in environmental planning: an institutional discourse approach*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Describes the use of discourse in participatory approaches to environmental decision-making.
- Ryfe, D.M. 2002. The practice of deliberative democracy: a study of 16 deliberative organizations. *Political Communication* 19: 359–377.
Compares 16 organizations conducting participatory processes, concluding that while they are extremely diverse, they share tendencies to make participation self-selected, and to emphasize action-oriented outcomes.
- Sabel, C., A. Fung, and B. Karkkainen. 1999. Beyond backyard environmentalism: how communities are quietly refashioning environmental regulation. *Boston Review*: 1–17.
Describes a shift in US environmental policy toward the federal government providing support, information, and a legal framework for local communities to work on their own issues.
- Saito-Jensen, M., and C. Jensen. 2010. Rearranging social space: Boundary-making and boundary-work in a joint forest management project, Andhra Pradesh, India. *Conservation and Society* 8(3): 196.
Analyzes how the institution of formal participation in forest management in India involved drawing new boundaries that disrupted traditional ways of using the forest.
- Sanders, L.M. 1997. Against deliberation. *Political Theory* 25(3): 347–376.
Argues that deliberation is unable to address inequalities of power and access, and therefore is an inherently conservative, rather than egalitarian, approach to decision-making.

- Sandman, P.M. 1990. Getting to maybe: some communications aspects of siting hazardous waste facilities. p. 233–245. *In* Glickman, T.S., Gough, M. (eds.), *Readings in risk. Resources for the Future*, Washington DC.
Gives nine principles for sponsoring agencies to help them remain open to public participation.
- Santos, S.L., and C. Chess. 2003. Evaluating citizen advisory boards: the importance of theory and participant-based criteria and practical implications. *Risk Analysis* 23(2): 269–279.
Evaluates US Department of Defense citizen advisory boards based on both theoretical criteria (derived from Habermas) and participant-generated criteria.
- Schlozman, K.L., N. Burns, S. Verba, and J. Donahue. 1995. Gender and citizen participation: is there a different voice? *American Journal of Political Science* 39(2): 267–293.
Reports on a US-wide survey showing few differences in how, why, and when men and women participate.
- Selin, S.W., M.A. Schuett, and D. Carr. 2008. Modeling stakeholder perceptions of collaborative initiative effectiveness. *Society and Natural Resources* 13(8): 735–745.
Reports on a survey of participants in US Forest Service participatory processes, finding that ratings of success are most influenced by the quality of leadership, and that overall assessments are inflated relative to assessments of specific aspects of the process.
- Semmens, A.A. 2005. Engendering deliberative democracy: women’s environmental protection problems. *Human Ecology Review* 12(2): 96–105.
Argues that deliberative democracy is a masculine ideal that is unable to truly empower women.
- Serrat-Capdevilla, A., A. Browning-Allen, K. Lansey, T. Finan, and J.B. Valdés. 2009. Increasing social–ecological resilience by placing science at the decision table: the role of the San Pedro Basin (Arizona) decision-support system model. *Ecology and Society* 14(1): 37.
Describes a success story of a watershed planning partnership that developed a watershed model together.
- Setälä, M., K. Grönlund, and K. Herne. 2010. Citizen deliberation on nuclear power: a comparison of two decision-making methods. *Political Studies* 58: 688–714.
Reports on a study showing that deliberation over nuclear power in Finland produced lasting shifts of opinion that were similar regardless of whether the deliberative groups were asked to write a collective statement or not.
- Shannon, M.A. 1991. Resource managers as policy entrepreneurs: governance challenges of the urban-forest interface. *Journal of Forestry*: 27–30.
Argues for the importance of “policy entrepreneurs” who will facilitate the starting of conversations among stakeholders.
- Shindler, B.A., and K.A. Cheek. 1999. Integrating citizens in adaptive management: a propositional analysis. *Conservation Ecology* 3(1): 9.
Reports on a meta-analysis of qualitative studies of what makes participation work well.
- Shindler, B.A., and J. Neburka. 1997. Public participation in forest planning: 8 attributes of success.

- Journal of Forestry 95(1): 17–19.
Reports on a survey of US Forest Service personnel and citizens about what factors lead to successful participation.
- Sieber, R. 2006. Public participation geographic information systems: a literature review and framework. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 96(3): 491–507.
Gives an overview of the history and potential pitfalls of participatory GIS.
- Simon, W.H. 1999. Three limitations of deliberative democracy: identity politics, bad faith, and indeterminacy. p. 49–57. *In* Macedo, S. (ed.), *Deliberative politics: essays on Democracy and disagreement*. Oxford University Press, New York.
Argues that deliberative democracy falls short because activists don't want to grant their opponents legitimacy by deliberating with them, there's nothing to be done about people deliberating in bad faith, and deliberative democracy leaves too many policies open-ended.
- Simonsen, W., M. Robbins. 1999. *Citizen participation in resource allocation*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.
Describes how to conduct several common types of participatory mechanisms.
- Sletto, B.I. 2009. “We drew what we imagined”: participatory mapping, performance, and the arts of landscape making. *Current Anthropology* 50(4): 443–476.
Describes participatory mapping projects in Trinidad and Venezuela, showing how such processes can interact with and disrupt (or be disrupted by) power relations within communities and between communities and outsiders.
- Smiley, S., R. de Loë, and R. Kreutzwiser. 2010. Appropriate public involvement in local environmental governance: a framework and case study. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(11): 1043–1059.
Describes a variety of contextual factors that influence the type and depth of participation that should be conducted, and illustrates them with an Australian case study.
- Smith, G. 2003. *Deliberative democracy and the environment*. Routledge, New York.
Argues that deliberative democracy can ensure the achievement of environmental protection.
- Sneddon, C., and C. Fox. 2008. Struggles over dams as struggles for justice: the World Commission on Dams (WCD) and anti-dam campaigns in Thailand and Mozambique. *Society and Natural Resources* 21(7): 625–640.
Describes how the World Commission on Dams' statement in favor of participation in dam planning was embraced or denied by stakeholders at different scales in Thailand and Mozambique.
- Sobels, J., A. Curtis, and S. Lockie. 2001. The role of Landcare group networks in rural Australia: exploring the contribution of social capital. *Journal of Rural Studies* 17: 265–276.
Gives a positive review of Australia's Landcare program as a venue for participation.
- Solitare, L. 2005. Prerequisite conditions for meaningful participation in brownfields redevelopment. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 48(6): 917–935.
Uses six case studies of brownfields redevelopment in Boston and Houston to show what factors

encourage public participation.

Speller, G., and N. Ravenscroft. 2005. Facilitating and evaluating public participation in urban parks management. *Local Environment* 10(1): 41–56.

Describes a case of successful participation in the management of a park in Britain.

Stagl, S. 2006. Multicriteria evaluation and public participation: The case of UK energy policy. *Land Use Policy* 23: 53–62.

Shows how formal multicriteria analysis can be used to stimulate deliberation.

Steelman, T.A., and M.E. DuMond. 2009. Serving the common interest in U.S. forest policy: a case study of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act. *Environmental Management*.

Reports on a case study showing that, contrary to predictions, the Health Forests Restoration Act in the US did not reduce the level of participation in forest management.

Stiftel, B. 1983. Dialogue: Does it increase participant knowledgeability and attitude congruence? p. 61–77. *In* Daneke, G.A., Garcia, M.W., Delli Priscoli, J. (eds.), *Public involvement and social impact assessment*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Based on a series of case studies in North Carolina, USA, concludes that deliberation has little effect on participants' knowledge about the issue and convergence of their opinions.

Stirling, A. 2006. Analysis, participation and power: justification and closure in participatory multi-criteria analysis. *Land Use Policy* 23: 95–107.

Suggests a tension between the substantive, normative, and instrumental values of participation when deciding on the balance between structured decision-making processes versus open deliberation.

Stokes, S.C. 1998. Pathologies of deliberation. p. 123–139. *In* Elster, J. (ed.), *Deliberative democracy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Explains how deliberation can produce perverse outcomes, especially when powerful outside interests influence participants' opinions.

Streich, G.W. 2002. Constructing multiracial democracy: to deliberate or not to deliberate? *Constellations* 9(1): 127–153.

Argues that, contrary to the many critiques of deliberation, deliberation is an effective way to resolve racial conflicts.

Striegnitz, M. 2006. Conflicts over coastal protection in a National Park: Mediation and negotiated law making. *Land Use Policy* 23: 26–33.

Describes a case of successful mediation over a coastal management in Germany.

Stringer, L.C., A.J. Dougill, E. Fraser, K. Hubacek, C. Prell, and M.S. Reed. 2006. Unpacking “participation” in the adaptive management of social-ecological systems: a critical review. *Ecology and Society* 11(2): 39.

Gives case studies of successful participation in Thailand, Botswana, and Australia.

Sturtevant, V., and P. Jakes. 2008. Collaborative planning to reduce risk. p. 44–63. *In* Martin, W.E., Raish, C., Kent, B. (eds.), *Wildfire risk: Human perceptions and management implications*.

- Resources for the Future, Washington DC.
Describes 15 case studies of collaborative wildfire risk planning from the USA.
- Sultana, F. 2009. Community and participation in water resources management: gendering and naturing development debates from Bangladesh. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 34: 346–363.
Using a case study of arsenic contamination in groundwater in Bangladesh, shows how conventional participation can exclude women and reproduce existing power structures.
- Sundqvist, G., and M. Elam. 2010. Public involvement designed to circumvent public concern? the “participatory turn” in European nuclear activities. *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 1(4): 8.
Argues that participation ends up becoming just another way for the state to push its own agenda, excluding any truly critical perspectives, using a case study of nuclear power in Europe.
- Sunstein, C.R. 2005. Group judgments: statistical means, deliberation, and information markets. *New York University Law Review* 80: 962.
Argues that deliberation can exacerbate biases in decision-making.
- Surowiecki, J. 2004. *Wisdom of crowds: Why the many are smarter than the few and how collective wisdom shapes business, economies, societies and nations*. Random House, New York.
Presents a range of evidence showing that groups can make better, more accurate decisions than individuals, and gives suggestions on harnessing the power of the wisdom of crowds.
- Syme, G.J., and B.S. Sadler. 1994. Evaluation of public involvement in water resources planning: a researcher-practitioner dialogue. *Evaluation Review* 18(5): 523–542.
Uses a case study from Western Australia to illustrate how evaluation of participation can itself be participatory.
- Sze, J., J. London, F. Shilling, G. Gambirazzio, T. Filan, and M. Cadenasso. 2009. Defining and contesting environmental justice: socio-natures and the politics of scale in the Delta. *Antipode* 41(4): 807–843.
Describes a participatory planning process in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in California, analyzing how the process's structure effectively excluded environmental justice concerns.
- Tàbara, D., D. Saurí, and R. Cerdan. 2003. Forest fire risk management and public participation in changing socioenvironmental conditions: a case study in a Mediterranean region. *Risk Analysis* 23(2): 249–260.
Gives a case study of successful participatory GIS in forest fire management in Spain.
- Taddei, R. 2011. Watered-down democratization: modernization versus social participation in water management in Northeast Brazil. *Agriculture and Human Values* 28(1): 109–121.
Shows how participation came to be seen as a component of modernization by water management authorities in Brazil.
- Tauxe, C.S. 1995. Marginalizing public participation in local planning: an ethnographic account. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 61(4): 471–482.

Uses a case study from North Dakota to show how government and business interests can coopt participation to advance their own agendas.

Thompson, D.F. 2008. Deliberative democratic theory and empirical political science. *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: 497–520.

Questions the applicability of much empirical research to deliberative democracy theory, and gives suggestions on conducting more useful research.

Torgerson, D. 1986. Between knowledge and politics: three faces of policy analysis. *Policy Sciences* 19: 33–59.

Describes a historical development from faith in the ability of knowledge to supersede politics, to a critique that knowledge is just another form of raw politics, to a synthesis in which knowledge and politics work together in participatory processes.

Tuler, S.P. 2000. Forms of talk in policy dialogue: distinguishing between adversarial and collaborative discourse. *Journal of Risk Research* 3(1): 1–17.

Distinguishes “good” and “bad” forms of talk in participatory processes based on whether they are monologic or dialogic.

Tuler, S.P., and T. Webler. 1999. Voices from the forest: what participants expect of a public participation process. *Society and Natural Resources* 12: 437–453.

Based on interviews with stakeholders in forest planning in the northeastern USA, proposes seven principles that participants think make for a good participatory process.

Twight, B.W., and M.S. Carroll. 1983. Workshops in public involvement: do they help find common ground? *Journal of Forestry* 81(11): 732–735.

Evaluates workshops held by the US Forest Service, showing that attendees and non-attendees had similar substantive views, and similar overestimations of the gap between their views and those of the Forest Service.

Ulbig, S.G., and C.L. Funk. 1999. Conflict avoidance and political participation. *Political Behavior* 21(3): 265–282.

Reports on a survey showing that a desire for conflict avoidance explains people's failure to engage in some forms of political participation.

Umemoto, K. 2001. Walking in another's shoes: Epistemological challenges in participatory planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 21: 17–31.

Points to potential pitfalls, and gives tips on avoiding them, with respect to cultural diversity in participatory processes.

Uphoff, N. 2000. Understanding social capital: learning from the analysis and experience of participation. p. 215–249. *In* Dasgupta, P., Serageldin, I. (eds.), *Social capital: a multifaceted perspective*. World Bank, Washington DC.

Describes the forms of social capital formed in the context of participatory irrigation management in Sri Lanka.

Van den Hove, S. 2006. Between consensus and compromise: Acknowledging the negotiation

- dimension in participatory approaches. *Land Use Policy* 23: 10–17.
 Advises a pragmatic approach to the decision between consensus and compromise in participatory decision-making.
- Vaughan, E., and M. Siefert. 1992. Variability in the framing of risk issues. *Journal of Social Issues* 48(4): 119–135.
 Argues that participation will only work if there is effort to bridge the different issue frames that different stakeholders bring with them.
- Vroom, V.H., and A.G. Jago. 1978. On the validity of the Vroom-Yetton model. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 63(2): 151–162.
 Uses feedback from managers on recent decisions to validate the usefulness of the Vroom-Yetton model in determining what level of participation is best for a given decision.
- Vroom, V.H., and P.W. Yetton. 1973. *Leadership and decision-making*. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh.
 Sets out a decision model for deciding what level of participation is necessary in a given situation.
- Wagner, C.L., and M.E. Fernandez-Gimenez. 2008. Does community-based collaborative resource management increase social capital? *Society and Natural Resources* 21(4): 324–344.
 Uses a survey in Colorado, USA to show what circumstances lead to participation building up social capital.
- Walker, G.B., S.L. Senecah, and S.E. Daniels. 2006. From the forest to the river: citizens' views of stakeholder engagement. *Human Ecology Review* 13(2): 193–202.
 Reports on surveys asking participants what kind of participatory process they preferred, in Pennsylvania and the Pacific Northwest, USA.
- Walkerden, G. 2006. Adaptive management planning projects as conflict resolution processes. *Ecology and Society* 11(1): 48.
 Describes how to incorporate negotiation over value conflicts into an adaptive management project.
- Wang, X. 2001. Assessing public participation in U.S. cities. *Public Performance and Management Review* 24(4): 322–336.
 Reports on a survey of public officials in the USA, asking what types of participation their city government uses.
- Watson, D.J., R.J. Juster, and G.W. Johnson. 1991. Institutionalized use of citizen surveys in the budgetary and policy-making processes: a small city case study. *Public Administration Review* 51(3): 232–239.
 Using a case study from Colorado, USA, explains how to use surveys as a form of participation.
- Webler, T., J. Tanguay, and S.P. Tuler. 2004. Competing perspectives on public participation in National Park Service planning: The Boston Harbor Islands National Park Area. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration* 22(3): 91–113.
 Describes three different views of what makes participation successful in one case study in Boston, USA.

- Webler, T., and S.P. Tuler. 2001. Public participation in watershed management planning: views on process from people in the field. *Human Ecology Review* 8(2): 29–39.
Describes four different views of what makes participation successful in one case study of watershed management in Massachusetts, USA.
- Webler, T., and S.P. Tuler. 2002. Unlocking the puzzle of public participation. *Bulletin of Science, Technology, and Society* 22(3): 179–189.
Reviews a variety of criteria for good participation.
- Webler, T., and S.P. Tuler. 2006. Four perspectives on public participation process in environmental assessment and decision making: combined results from 10 case studies. *Policy Studies Journal* 34(4): 699–722.
Describes four perspectives on what makes a good participation process, found across ten case studies around the USA.
- Webler, T., S.P. Tuler, and R. Krueger. 1999. What is a good public participation process? five perspectives from the public. *Environmental Management* 27(3): 435–450.
Describes five different views of what makes participation successful in one case study of forest management in the northeastern USA.
- Weeks, E.C. 2000. The practice of deliberative democracy: Results from four large-scale trials. *Public Administration Review* 60(4): 360–372.
Reports on four experiments with large-scale deliberation, showing some promise.
- Whitebook, J. 1979. The problem of nature in Habermas. *Telos* 40: 41–69.
Criticizes Habermas for losing his critical theory predecessors' emphasis on reconciliation with nature.
- Whitelaw, G., H. Vaughan, B. Craig, and D. Atkinson. 2003. Establishing the Canadian Community Monitoring Network. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 88: 409–418.
Gives an overview of a long-term citizen science project in Canada.
- Wiesenfield, E., and E. Sánchez. 2002. Sustained participation: a community based approach to addressing environmental problems. p. 629–643. *In* Bechtel, R.B., Churchman, A. (eds.), *Handbook of environmental psychology*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
Describes examples of successful bottom-up participation in Venezuela.
- Wildavsky, A. 1994. How cultural theory can contribute to understanding and promoting democracy, science, and development. p. 137–164. *In* Serageldin, I., Taboroff, J. (eds.), *Culture and development in Africa*. World Bank, Washington DC.
Argues that Grid-Group Cultural Theory can help to ensure that all important perspectives on an issue are included in a participatory process.
- Wilder, M. 2010. Water governance in Mexico: political and economic apertures and a shifting state-citizen relationship. *Ecology and Society* 15(2): 22.
Describes how neoliberalism led to a shift away from state management toward participation in irrigation policy in Sonora, Mexico.

- Wilson, R.K., and T.W. Crawford. 2008. Tracking collaboration: Forest planning and local participation on the San Juan National Forest, Colorado. *Local Environment* 13(7): 609–625.
Reports on a case study of participation in forest management in Colorado, USA, showing that it generated learning and increased social capital.
- Wilson, S.M., L. Rice, and H. Fraser-Rahim. 2011. The use of community-driven environmental decision making to address environmental justice and revitalization issues in a port community in South Carolina. *Environmental Justice* 4(3): 145–154.
Uses a case study of a port expansion in South Carolina, USA to show how participation can be used to enhance environmental justice.
- Wittmer, H., F. Rauschmayer, and B. Klauer. 2006. How to select instruments for the resolution of environmental conflicts? *Land Use Policy* 23: 1–9.
Gives a set of pragmatic considerations for selecting a level of participation.
- Wondolleck, J.M., and S.L. Yaffee. 2000. Making collaboration work: lessons from innovation in natural resource management. Island Press, Washington, DC.
Gives a set of lessons learned from the experience of participation in environmental management.
- Wood, N.J., J.W. Good, and R.F. Goodwin. 2002. Vulnerability assessment of a port and harbor community to earthquake and tsunami hazards: integrating technical expert and stakeholder input. *Natural Hazards Review* 3(4): 148–157.
Reports on a case study of participatory earthquake planning workshops in Oregon, USA.
- Yack, B. 2006. Rhetoric and public reasoning: an Aristotelian understanding of political deliberation. *Political Theory* 34(4): 417–438.
Argues for the importance of rhetoric in public deliberation.
- Young, I.M. 1989. Polity and group difference: a critique of the ideal of universal citizenship. *Ethics* 99(2): 250–274.
Argues that existing models of democracy seek a homogenized universal perspective, but instead we should seek to recognize and support difference between the perspectives of people in different social positions.
- Young, I.M. 1995. Communication and the other: beyond deliberative democracy. p. 134–152. *In* Wilson, M., Yeatman, A. (eds.), *Justice and identity: antipodean practices*. Allen and Unwin, St. Leonards, NSW.
Argues that existing models of deliberation are excessively narrow, and thus exclusionary, in the types of talk that they allow.
- Young, I. M. 1997. Asymmetrical reciprocity: on moral respect, wonder, and enlarged thought. *Constellations* 3(3): 340–363.
Argues that trying to take the standpoint of another (rather than just respecting and sympathizing with their position) can lead to a flattening of difference and assimilation of marginalized perspectives into the dominant worldview.

- Young, I.M. 2001. Activist challenges to deliberative democracy. *Political Theory* 29(5): 670–690.
Assesses activists' claims that deliberative democracy is just a means for perpetuating the status quo and coopting critical challenges.
- Yung, L., M.E. Patterson, and W.A. Freimund. 2010. Rural community views on the role of local and extralocal interests in public lands governance. *Society and Natural Resources* 23(12): 1170–1186.
Reviews the way that different stakeholders may make strategic choices about what scale to organize decision-making at, based on assumptions about which side would win at that scale.
- Zander, K.K. 2013. Understanding public support for indigenous natural resource management in northern Australia. *Ecology and Society* 18(1): 11.
Reports on a survey finding significant willingness to support indigenous natural resource management in the general population of Australia.
- Zurita, L. 2006. Consensus conference method in environmental issues: relevance and strengths. *Land Use Policy* 23: 18–25.
Reports on a consensus conference model for participation developed in Denmark.