

DRAFT.....DRAFT.....DRAFT.....DRAFT

**Civic Discovery and the Three “Cs” of Public Participation:
Consultation, Consensus, and Collaboration¹**

Gregg B. Walker, Ph.D.²
Oregon State University

Abstract

Writing in *The Power of Public Ideas*, Robert Reich has urged policy decision makers, organizations, and citizens to seek civic discovery: processes through which “citizens debate their future.” This essay examines the extent to which decision makers and organizations, such as agencies, foster civic discovery through public participation. Public participation processes of consultation, consensus, and collaboration are compared. The three processes’ different techniques and philosophies influence communication interaction and learning, and consequently, the role of citizens in policy decision making.

¹ Earlier versions of portions of this essay appear in: Walker, G. B., & Daniels, S. E. (In press). Natural Resource Policy and the Paradox of Public Involvement: Bringing scientists and citizens together. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*; Daniels, S. E., & Walker, G. B. (In press). *Working Through Environmental Conflict: The Collaborative Learning Approach*. Westport, CT: Praeger; Walker, G. B., & Daniels, S. E. (1997) Collaborative public participation in environmental conflict management: An introduction to five approaches. In S. L. Senecah, (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth Biennial Conference on Communication and Environment* (pp. 271-289). Syracuse, NY: State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry; and Walker, G. B., Daniels, S. E., Blatner, K. A., & Carroll, M S. (1996, November). Civic Discovery and Ecosystem-based Management: Collaborative Learning in Fire Recovery Planning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National [Speech] Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

² The author would like to thank Steven E. Daniels, Director of the Western Rural Development Center at Utah State University, for collaborating on many of the ideas in this paper. Any mistakes in this paper, though, are this author’s alone.

DRAFT.....DRAFT.....DRAFT.....DRAFT

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

Civic Discovery and the Three “Cs” of Public Participation: Consultation, Consensus, and Collaboration

Gregg B. Walker, Ph.D.
Oregon State University

1. Introduction

In 1993, shortly after taking office, President Clinton and Vice President Gore heralded the idea of “reinventing government.” Vice President Gore became the leader of the Clinton Administration’s reinvention initiative. The President and Vice President, drawing upon Osborne and Gabler’s book, *Reinventing Government*, wanted government institutions to “empower citizens rather than simply serving them” (Osborne & Gabler, 1992, p. 15).

Six and one-half years later, among the fall colors of the George Washington National Forest in Virginia, President Clinton announced an ambitious idea for America’s public lands. The President called for a plan to protect the nearly 40 million acres of roadless areas throughout the United States’ National Forest system.

On 19 October, six days after the President’s announcement, the U.S.D.A. Forest Service published a notice of intent to implement President Clinton’s roadless areas directive. Urged by the Clinton Administration to take a “fast track” approach, the Forest Service subsequently began the initial public involvement process pursuant to requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As an *Oregonian* article reported on 14 October: “Clinton aides said Wednesday that the U.S. Forest Service will try to speed through hearings and issue regulations that by year’s end would gain protection for all roadless forest tracts 5,000 acres or larger and perhaps some smaller roadless areas within the agency’s 192 million acres nationwide. In addition to a ban on road-building, the agency will consider limits on logging and other development that could cause environmental damage” (Bernton & Hogan, 1999, p. A1).

As part of this “fast track” approach, the Forest Service conducted more than 150 public meetings (primarily open houses and a few hearings) during late fall, 1999. The fast track strategy drew criticism for limiting meaningful public participation. An Associate press article noted that “members of the public had only two days notice of a meeting in Juneau, Alaska, had to draw names from a hat to speak in Portland, Ore., and were told they could not make verbal comments at the Mark Twain National Forest [meeting] in Missouri.” Consequently, Senators Bob Smith of New Hampshire and Fran Murkowski of Alaska told Forest Service Chief Michael Dombeck that the process was “replete with . . . fatal flaws” and “to remedy these fatal flaws, the entire . . . process must be started over” (Hughes, 1999, p. A3).

This rapid, centralized, and controversial public participation strategy was initiated by an agency that the Clinton Administration’s “National Partnership for

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

Reinventing Government” had designated a “high impact agency.” When Vice President Gore met with the head of high impact agencies like the Forest Service, he emphasized that:

You should focus your efforts in three areas: partnerships, the use of information technology, and customer service. . . Yours are the agencies that shape the public's opinion of government and can redeem the promise of self government. Public cynicism about government is a cancer on democracy. Reinvention isn't just about fixing processes, it's about redefining priorities and focusing on the things that matter.
(<http://www.npr.gov/library/announc/hiapage3.html>)

The roadless forest lands issue draws attention to the matter of public participation. Is the Forest Service’s approach an example of reinvention or traditional practice? Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman claims that the roadless lands initiative will feature “one of most extensive public-comment processes ever carried out” (Hogan, 1999, p. A7). Does “extensive public comment” translate into meaningful public participation?

This essay contends that meaningful public participation embraces the values and qualities of civic discovery. Introduced as a concept by professor, economist, and former Labor Secretary Robert Reich, civic discovery emphasizes citizens deliberating about their community’s future (1988). This essay expands Reich’s concept of civic discovery and employs it a foundation for discussing three approaches to public participation in policy decision-making: consultation, consensus, and collaboration.

1. Public Participation as Civic Discovery

Public participation is pre-decisional communication between an agency or organization responsible for a decision and that organization’s relevant public community. Public participation as a term is most often applied to a government organization (e.g., federal agency, city government) and the public. The phrase “pubic involvement” has often been used synonymously with public participation..

A traditional goal public participation activities has been to “inform and educate” citizens so that they will understand why the specific agency’s proposal is the best thing to do. More recently, organizations employing public participation have increasingly sought ways to reduce the “us versus them” dynamic that traditional public participation may foster, and create opportunities for participatory learning. A survey of participation practitioners by the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) has identified the core values of participation as:

- People should have a say in decisions about actions which affect their lives.
- Public participation includes the promise that the public=s contribution will influence the decision.

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

- The public participation process communicates the interests and meets the process needs of all participants.
- The public participation process seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected.
- The public participation process involves participants in defining how they participate.
- The public participation process communicates to participants how their input was, or was not, used.
- The public participation process provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way (Delli Priscolli, 1997).

These key values of public participation correspond well to the idea of civic discovery. Civic discovery is citizen inquiry into controversial and challenging situations. It refers to activities and processes that provide opportunities for communities to debate their future and citizens to learn from one another. It is any citizen forum where "opinions can be revised, premises altered, and common interests discovered" (Reich, 1988, p. 144). Civic discovery fosters democratic governance. As Ernesto Cortes writes, "democracy, at its heart, is distinguished by public conversations about the interests of citizens" (1996, p. 49).

3. Civic Discovery and Communication

Civic discovery implies a view of communication that features the negotiation of meanings. Messages are sent, but the meanings from those messages are generated by people individually and in communities. Through civic discovery people negotiate their meanings and interpretations with those of the other parties. This joint discourse is a primary social process of human life, forming the "webs of social interaction in which we find ourselves and in which we live, move, and have our being" (Pearce, 1994, p. 19).

The negotiation of meanings is critical to the development of a shared understanding. People do not act in isolation; their actions occur within relationships, groups, and communities. An individual's communicative actions are directed at others or affect others, and are interpreted by others. A fundamental goal of civic discovery is shared understanding, a goal acquired through coordinating our meanings and interpretations. As we listen to others explain their views on an issue, for example, we can relate our views to theirs. We can determine to what extent our meanings are similar, different, and possible to coordinate. Shared understanding is not synonymous with agreement. Rather, shared understanding denotes that, at some level, parties understand one another's views and interpretations. For example, two parties may hold fundamentally different views on government policy concerning abortion. They achieve shared understanding when they understand one another's point of view and recognize that they will not likely ever reach agreement on the issue.

3.1 Dialogue and Deliberation

Civic discovery processes emphasize shared understanding through both dialogue and

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

deliberation. When public participation activities values civic discovery, they encourage both dialogue and deliberation.

3.1.1 Dialogue

Dialogue refers to communication interaction between parties that hold discovery, learning, and understanding as their primary goals. Dialogue draws its strength from both the commitment and skills of the interactants. One of the foremost writers on dialogue, the late physicist David Bohm, explains that via dialogue:

a group of people can explore the individual and collective presuppositions, ideas, beliefs, and feelings that subtly control their interactions. It provides an opportunity to participate in a process that displays communication successes and failures. It can reveal the often puzzling patterns of incoherence that lead the group to avoid certain issues or, on the other hand, to insist, against all reason, on standing and defending opinions about particular issues (Bohm, Factor, & Garrett, 1991/1998, p. 1).

Dialogue is open, non-judgmental communication interaction. Participants in a dialogue listen intently, ask questions to learn and understand, and see tremendous worth in the collective wisdom of the participants as a group. In *The Fifth Discipline*, Peter Senge writes that dialogue is essential to team learning. Citing Bohm's work, Senge notes the importance of "thought as a collective phenomenon" (1990, p. 240).

Dialogue is important to civic discovery processes; it is the form of communication interaction that fosters development of a shared understanding of the situation. "Without face-to-face dialogue," Cortes writes, "citizens are relegated to roles as spectators rather than active participators" (1996, p. 49).

3.1.2 Deliberation

Public participation activities occur within some decision-making context, one that may include significant complexity and controversy. Civic discovery processes recognize that, while dialogue is essential, deliberation may be the most critical form of communication interaction. Public deliberation "transforms, modifies, and clarifies the beliefs and preferences of the citizens of a political society" (Christiano, 1997, p. 244).

Dialogue provides a foundation for deliberation. Whereas dialogue emphasizes learning and understanding, deliberation builds upon that learning and understanding as parties begin to debate possible actions and philosophies. Deliberation emerges as parties discover the need to make a decision.

Public deliberation lies at the heart of civic discovery. It is civic discourse that features both inquiry and advocacy; communication interaction among citizens in which meanings converge and diverge, and collective or shared meanings and understandings emerge. Public deliberation is important to working through controversial and problematic situations, setting norms to describe and assess

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

situations, and generating collective meanings and shared understandings about "the boundaries of the possible in public policy" (Majone, 1988, p. 164). Learning is critical to each of these tasks. Too often, though, government agencies so control public participation processes as to thwart learning. As former Harvard University professor and current Secretary of Labor Robert Reich explains, "the failure of conventional techniques of policy making to permit civic discovery may suggest that there are no shared values to be discovered in the first place. And this message -- that the 'public interest' is no more than an accommodation or aggregation of individual interests -- may have a corrosive effect on civic life" (1988, pp. 146-147).

3.2 Inquiry and Advocacy

As noted above, civic discovery processes emphasize both dialogue and deliberation, often as early-stage dialogue that evolves into later-stage deliberation. Throughout civic discovery activities, citizens both inquire and advocate. In *The Fifth Discipline*, Peter Senge distinguishes between "inquiry" and "advocacy." He writes that the most productive learning occurs when people combine skills in these two areas (1990, p. 199). What is needed," Senge asserts, "is blending advocacy and inquiry to promote collaborative learning" (1990, p. 198).

William Isaacs and colleagues observe that "advocacy" comes from the Latin *ad* + *vocare*, meaning "to call towards, to plead a cause, to speak for." "Inquiry" comes from the Latin *in* + *quaerere* and means "to seek within, to seek information, ask a question" (1999, p. 4). They note that "inquiry and advocacy move us up and down the ladder of inference" (1999, p. 4). When inquiry and advocacy are combined, Senge explains, "the goal is no longer 'to win the argument' but to find the best argument" (1990, p. 199). According to Rick Ross and Charlotte Roberts of the Center for Organizational Learning, "when balancing advocacy and inquiry, we lay out our reasoning and thinking, and then encourage others to challenge us." We do so by stating "Here is my view and here is how I have arrived at it. How does it sound to you? What makes sense to you and what doesn't? Do you see any ways I can improve it?" (1999, p. 1). Ross and Roberts emphasize that "balancing inquiry and advocacy means developing a variety of skills. It's as if all the "colors" of conversation could be spread out on an imaginary palette. As the creator of your part of the conversation, you should be able to incorporate styles from all four quadrants of the palette" (1999, p. 1).

Civic discovery provides a standard for comparing the public participation approaches of consultation, consensus, and collaboration. Civic discovery and its emphases on dialogue, deliberative citizen interaction, inquiry, and advocacy encompass values of community and democratic governance.

3. Consultation, Consensus, and Collaboration

Public policy decisions can involve one or more of a variety of processes, ranging from unilateral decision making (where one organization or entity is the sole decision maker and no "public" is involved) to decisions based on pure consensus; durable agreement by all relevant parties or stakeholders. Unilateral decision making is beyond the scope

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

of this discussion. This essay focuses on decision-making situations in which more than one party is involved, including potentially joint decision making situations. Three general types of public participation processes are in multi-party public policy situations: consultation, consensus, and collaboration. Table 1 offers a summary comparison of the three approaches.

4.1. Consultation

Consultation refers to those activities that involve parties in the public policy decision making process without sharing any aspect of the decision itself. It is a legitimate and viable decision-making strategy, but it is not collaborative, nor does it involve any form of consensus. Its basic activities are information gathering and feedback. When a decision authority seeks input from other parties, it will invite feedback on its terms. The decision authority might present a range of possible alternative decisions or propose a specific action and then seek the reactions of other parties, such as those likely affected by the decision. The decision authority may ask for ideas as it begins a planning process. In either case, the decision authority provides opportunities for participation in the decision situation without participating in the process of decision making itself.

4.1.1 Consultation techniques

Formal public participation typifies the consultation strategy. Traditional public participation activities, such as issue “scoping” meetings, public hearings, letter writing “comment” periods, open houses, and the like stem from and maintain decision maker control. These techniques provide people and organizations with opportunities to communicate their concerns to a decision authority. The techniques seek to “inform and educate” and “invite feedback” while offering no guarantee of meaningful citizen input. In these settings, citizens do not know if and how their ideas will be used. Whether or not their comments influence the decision may depend on the benevolence of the decision authority.

Table 1 Comparing Consultation, Consensus, and Collaboration

Factor	Consultation	Consensus	Collaboration
Goal	Information gathering and feedback	An outcome supported by all parties; full agreement	Fair, inclusive process; respectful interaction; Mutual gains outcome
Decision making	Little to no decision space Unilateral; retained by decision authority	Shared decision space as dictated by the decision authority	Shared decision space; shared by the decision authority; joint decision making
Participation	Structured by the decision authority	Structured by the parties; controlled access	Accessible and inclusive
Negotiation	None	Likely, depending on	Fostered; mutual gains

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

procedural rulesinteraction

Power and control	Sought and maintained by decision authority	Shared, as dictated by the decision authority	Shared and negotiated
Philosophy	"Inform and educate" "Command and control"	"Full support of the agreement"	"Active learning-based participation"

(Source: Daniels & Walker , in press).

4.1.2 Consultation benefits

Consultation approaches --formal public participation activities-- have attributes that appeal to administrators and decision makers who want to limit decision space while maintaining power and control. Consultation methods generally provide citizens with relatively easy access to the policy process; most anyone can write a comment letter. Open houses and public hearings are generally well-publicized, and the behavioral expectations and opportunities are predictable. Consultative methods may be efficient in terms of time and expense. The Forest Service's "fast track" public participation approach to the roadless forest lands question seems quite efficient as measured by time.

4.1.3 Consultation limitations

The consultative strategy and its traditional public participation techniques give rise to the various limitations: the uncertainty over how citizen comments are used, the limited impact that comments have on the outcome, the quasi-arbitration authority of the deciding official, the formality of the communication environment, etc.

Citizen Input Ambiguity. One aspect of traditional public participation is that the participants cannot tell how their input changes the agency decision. After the comment period on the proposed action ends, the agency or government entity retreats into its internal deliberations, and only some weeks or months later does the final decision and supporting documentation emerge. Citizens have no way of knowing what decision would have emerged without their input, nor do they have any insight into how seriously (or perfunctorily) their comments were received (Steelman & Ascher, 1997). Furthermore, citizens do not see how their ideas--their "local" knowledge--stand in comparison with the "expert" knowledge of agency scientists. And in situations not characterized by considerable trust and goodwill, citizens may conclude, perhaps cynically, that their comments did not make any difference. They may believe that the proposed action or preferred alternative was a "done deal" and that the public participation activities were pro forma, reflecting what Lynn (1990) calls a "right-to-hear-what-has-already-been-decided approach" (pp. 95-96).

Limited Constructive Impact. In fact, research substantiates the sense that most traditional public participation has few positive impacts. Surveys of participants indicate that many participants feel that their input had little or not impact (Lyden, Twight, & Tuchmann, 1990; USDA Forest Service, 1990). Participants are often dissatisfied or

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

mistrustful (Dixon, 1993). Citizens prefer interactive participation methods that involve two way communication and shared decision making over formal public hearings or letter writing (Force and Williams, 1989; Daniels and Walker, 1996). They believe that traditional public meetings may become venting sessions motivated out of generalized resentment and mistrust of public officials (Twight, 1977); and that such meetings do little to dispel stereotyped perceptions of disagreement with agency positions (Twight & Paterson, 1979).

The Agency as Arbitrator. Rather than fostering mutual learning among agency decision makers, scientists, and citizens, traditional public participation methods in public policy decision making have at times escalated conflict among agencies, stakeholders, and unaffiliated citizens. For example, the game theoretic incentives embedded in traditional public participation increase the likelihood of extreme behaviors. Agency decision making resembles conventional arbitration with the deciding official acting as a arbitrator, and different public groups making their cases before the arbitrator in an effort to affect the decision.

In conventional arbitration, the disputants present their case to the arbitrator (or arbitration panel). Disputants do not interact with each other; they answer only the arbitrator's questions. After hearing the disputants' cases, the arbitrator makes a decision somewhere within the range of the disputants' positions (Elkouri and Elkouri, 1985; Cooley, 1986).

In public policy situations, this structure encourages disputants to take extreme positions and employ strong language, following the assumption that the agency decision maker as arbitrator will somehow split the difference between the different groups. In order to move the decision in their desired way, each group must be more forceful and compelling than the others. The old maxim of "the squeaky wheel getting the grease" is applicable to these incentives; the group that squeaks the loudest gets the influence on the outcome. Such "squeaks" may have little to do with scientific and technical knowledge applicable to the situation; the agency as arbitrator may respond to "pressure politics" in ways that diminishes scientific as well as citizen interests. Learning-oriented agency, scientist, and citizen interaction may be critical to including meaningful knowledge--scientific and traditional (local and indigienous)--as an important part of the policy decision making process.

Formal Communication Processes. The relatively formal nature of communication during consultative processes also tends to affect the quality of the information that the agency receives. In order to comment at a hearing-type meeting, a participant must speak for the record, which is often equivalent to making a short speech into a microphone before a relatively large assembly. Given the proportion of people in whom such public speaking produces anxiety, it is likely that the quality and quantity of the comments is reduced by such a formal protocol, and that only the most motivated people will overcome their fears and address the group. As a result, the comments tend to be more extreme than they might be in a setting where dialogue is more natural.

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

There may also be substantial attitudinal barriers to participation in traditional consultative processes, even if the structural barriers are low. Some portions of a population may feel sufficiently alienated, frustrated, intimidated, or under-powered that they do not enter the process at all.

Highly structured, rule-governed public participation processes encourage formal communication. Correspondingly, they foster and reward “advocacy” over “inquiry.” Traditional public participation methods offer incentives for parties to lobby and advocate their point of view, to amass evidence, to “debate” their case. The competent communicator may be a strategic adversarial advocate, one who can prove that his or her position is superior to others.

Consultation does not correspond well to the tenets of civic discovery. Rather than fostering social learning, meaningful citizen interaction, and community growth, consultation emphasizes centralized organizational decision making. Consultation techniques may be traditional and efficient, but they exhibit “command and control communication” rather than the dialogue and deliberation of civic discovery.

3. Consensus

As decision authorities and citizens have become disenchanted with the consultative strategy, “consensus” has emerged as an alternative approach for public participation in public policy decision making. Consensus is typically defined as “either approval [of the agreement] or the absence of active opposition by each interest” (Dukes, 1996, p. 52). Consensus refers to an outcome in which an agreement, settlement, or solution is generated that all participating parties can support, or at least will not oppose. Consequently, even though the public policy conflict literature freely uses the phrase “consensus process” (e.g., Susskind & Cruikshank, 1987; Ozawa, 1991), consensus refers to a type of decision rather than to a particular process.

5.1. Is There Consensus on Consensus?

The Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (ODLCD) defines consensus as:

An agreement that is reached by identifying the interests of all concerned parties and then building a solution that maximizes satisfaction of as many of the interests as possible. The process does not involve voting, rather a synthesis and blending of proposed solutions. Consensus does not mean unanimity in that it may not satisfy each participant’s interests equally or that each participant supports the agreement to the same degree. Consensus is considered to be the best decision for all participants because it addresses all interests to some extent (Tarnow, Watt, & Silverberg, 1996, p. 113).

Contrast this definition with the varied characterizations of consensus that appear in the small-group decision-making literature. In this area, consensus has been

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

characterized in a variety of ways, including: (1) the majority's will determined by democratic voting procedures; (2) unanimous agreement (consent or support); (3) the absence of any objection, (4) parties' commitment to implement a decision while not fully agreeing with the decision (partial consensus); (5) public support for a decision while maintaining opposition privately; and (6) group compliance (Ellis & Fisher, 1993).

The ODLCD, in its booklet, *Collaborative Problem-Solving and Consensus Building in Resource Management and Planning*, explains that "consensus does not mean that all members are equally enthusiastic about a decision." Consensus may involve different levels of support. The ODLCD provides a six-item scale and notes that consensus can occur as long as no party is at level six (Tarnow, Watt, & Silverberg, 1996, p. 9):

- (1) Wholeheartedly agree
- (2) Good idea
- (3) Supportive
- (4) Reservations - need to talk more about it
- (5) Serious concerns but will stand aside
- (6) Cannot participate in the decision and will work to block it.

As this scale implies, consensus refers to the degree of support an agreement receives, not the process through which agreement is reached. Consensus decisions can result from highly collaborative processes, but they can also stem from very structured processes imposed by a decision authority.

The latter can lead to false or superficial consensus. This type of consensus occurs when an agreement is made without all parties accepting the decision. It also may involve a particular party submitting to internal group pressures to agree, such that consensus emerges based on "groupthink" (Janis, 1992). Participants may also submit to consensus because an external authority pressures them to do so, and threatens them with a negative consequence if they do not reach agreement. This is "dictated" consensus, an artificial consensus based on external pressure to conform. Such consensus seems incompatible with ideals of democratic governance and civic discovery.

5.2. Consensus and Pluralism

Consensus, whether viewed as unanimous agreement or group solidarity, can be a problematic notion in a decision-making situation where the participants value pluralism and diversity. First, consensus may not be possible, given plural values. Second, it may also not be a particularly desirable goal, given an emerging emphasis on creating institutions that can embrace and accommodate diverse viewpoints. Third, it is not a prerequisite to making progress on vexing problems in public policy decision making. And fourth, civic discovery processes of democratic governance may be required "because even rough consensus is not a plausible political ideal" (Gaus, 1997, p. 234).

Nicholas Rescher critiques consensus from a pluralist perspective. He asserts

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

that “consensus among people, be it global or local in scope, international or familial, is in general unattainable” (1993, p. 4). To the extent that pluralism is an inevitable and inherent feature of complex and controversial policy decision situations, achieving genuine consensus may be fantasy. “We must learn to live with dissensus with pluralism in matters of opinion,” Rescher writes, “and we must and can bring to realization frameworks of social inclination that make collaboration possible despite diversity and that facilitate co-operation in the face of dissensus” (1993, p. 4).

Related to Rescher’s concerns is Habermas’ distinction between *de facto* consensus and rational consensus. *De facto* consensus occurs fortuitously or spontaneously as a result of the group interaction. These moments are useful because they provide clear direction for the group’s efforts and can increase group cohesiveness as participants recognize that there are issues that unite them. Rational consensus results from either explicit institutional design or norms that emphasize conformity or discourage dissensus. This latter form of consensus flies in the face of pluralist thinking because it either presumes monism (i.e., the presence of a single overriding value or a universally adhered to value hierarchy) or employs some form of pressure—either logical or social—that quiets competing viewpoints (Rescher, 1993).

Rescher is not opposed to consensus, nor is this author. Consensus, though, does not guarantee civic discovery and if dictated, may thwart it. *De facto* or “emergent” consensus, when it occurs, likely ensures a strong, well-supported decision. As Rescher notes, “consensus can, in some conditions, provide us with the reassurance of being on the right track” (1993, p. 43). Rational or dictated consensus, on the other hand, places institutional pressure on parties to conform and agree. This pressure discourages diversity of views and debate, key tenets of civic discovery. Rescher asserts that “consensus is not something on which we should insist so strongly as to make it a pervasive imperative for current concern. A universal consensus . . . is not a practical goal but merely a hopeful aspiration” (p. 43).

When applied to public policy decision making, Rescher’s ideas generate a provocative challenge. Can we design institutions and processes that are as pragmatic and tolerant as pluralism demands? The demand for pragmatism comes from the need to have effective public policy grounded in processes of civic discovery. The tolerance that pluralism demands will in turn demand a large measure of civility and maturity from the participants. Citizens will be challenged as they attempt to function effectively in processes that require 1) that they interact with people with differing worldviews, 2) that they articulate their values and goals persuasively, but not defensively, 3) that they craft solutions that represent quality public policy, and 4) that they are sensitive to the impact of the decision on groups who will be negatively impacted by it, or who were advocating for an alternative outcome.

Many citizens have limited experience in forums that honor pluralism and civic discovery. In fact, in many countries and communities the common models of policy formation are far more combative and confrontational than a pluralist approach would advise. Consequently, making progress in public participation and policy development

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

is not merely a matter of learning new skills--some old attitudes and assumptions will need to be "un-learned" as well. As part of this learning, citizens in civic discovery processes realize that consensus is not essential to meaningful policy progress. As James Bohman explains, "the key to accommodating pluralism in public deliberation is this: to consider a political decision legitimate, citizen deliberators need not make the strong assumption that their deliberative process makes it more likely that the outcome is one on which all would ultimately and ideally converge . . . rather, outcomes and decisions allow an ongoing cooperation with others of different minds that is at least not unreasonable" (1996, p. 100).

Rescher's ideas raise doubts about the efficacy of consensus decisions to endure over time, particularly if diversity is not respected in all of its significant forms. When consensus becomes a "god term" in public policy decision making it risks evolving into dictated consensus, a decision-making process in which consensus is mandated by the decision authority or as a condition of participation.

A better alternative is emergent consensus, or consensus that grows out of collaborative interaction. As parties engage challenging public policy situations through collaboration, they will discover those areas on which they can achieve consensus. Consensus agreements reached through collaboration are likely more genuine and enduring than dictated consensus because the parties generate agreements on their own. Civic discovery processes value emergent consensus.

6. Collaboration

When Michael Dombeck became Chief of the Forest Service in the U.S. Department of Agriculture in January 1996, he told Forest Service employees that "collaborative stewardship" would be one of the key features of his administration and resource management philosophy. His message was consistent with "collaboration" and "consensus" themes coming from other federal agencies. Under the Clinton administration, the Environmental Protection Agency has initiated a program in alternative dispute resolution that emphasizes using mediation and facilitation to promote collaborative problem solving among stakeholders. Similarly, the Bureau of Land Management, a U. S. Department of Interior agency, has launched a nationwide program that features collaboration and consensus as part of land management decision making.

Executive Branch agencies and Chief Dombeck stress the importance of people working together as part of the development of sound policy. This is certainly vital in the natural resource arena. For example, federal and state agencies that embrace ecosystem management as their natural resource management orientation, must "recognize resource planning as a forum for public deliberation on the shape of a common future . . . planning needs to combine diverse viewpoints, ranging from perspectives of those who use public lands to views of those whose culture is shaped by the land" (Cortner & Shannon, 1993, p. 16). People can work together and deliberate through collaborative processes. Agency managers, such as foresters, "are

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

realizing that collaborative approaches may be their best and only chance to influence the direction of natural resource policy" (Selin et al., 1997, p. 25).

6.1. Defining Collaboration

But just what is collaboration? Negotiation scholar Barbara Gray defines collaboration within a public policy decision making context:

Collaboration involves a process of joint decision making among key stakeholders of a problem domain about the future of that domain. Five features are critical to the process: (1) the stakeholders are interdependent, (2) solutions emerge by dealing constructively with differences, (3) joint ownership of decisions is involved, (4) stakeholders assume collective responsibility for the future direction of the domain, and (5) collaboration is an emergent property. (1989, p. 11)

Gray's definition suggests the dynamic nature of collaboration. Collaborative processes are not static; they unfold and change through the interaction of participants. Collaborative processes are more like jazz improvisations than clearly orchestrated symphonies of co-ordinated effort. Parties in a collaborative process accept some degree of unpredictability and ambiguity in the policy situation. At times that is both frustrating and disconcerting, but whether collaborative behaviors emerge depends first and foremost on the participants, and there is no way (or ethical reason) to force them to interact collaboratively. Collaboration cannot be forced, scheduled, or required; it must be nurtured, permitted, and promoted.

Collaboration is a fundamentally a process in which interdependent parties work together to affect the future of an issue of shared interests (Gray, 1989). More specifically, Gray (1985) sees collaboration as "the pooling of appreciations and/or tangible concerns, e.g., Information, money, labor, etc., by two or more stakeholders to solve a set of problems which neither can solve individually" (p. 912). Drawing upon Gray's ideas, Selin and Chavez (1995) assert that "collaboration implies a joint decision making approach to problem resolution where power is shared, and stakeholders take collective responsibility for their actions and subsequent outcomes from those actions" (p. 190). In collaborative conflict management and decision making activities, people have meaningful opportunities for "voice," that is, to communicate as participants in significant ways. Their ideas and interactions matter in both the process and outcome of the situation.

6.2 Key Features of Collaboration

A collaborative process, as the above discussion indicates, is fundamentally different than competitive conflict resolution and decision-making processes, such as litigation, lobbying, or highly structured unilateral decision making. As a decision making organization (e.g., a government agency) interacts with citizens and stakeholder groups (its publics), it has strategic options that emphasize either a fundamentally competitive or collaborative approach. As an citizen involvement strategy, collaboration differs considerably from the consultation public participation model of open houses, public

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

hearings, and comment periods. A number of key aspects of collaboration clarify these differences:

- (1) *Collaboration is less competitive* and more accepting of additional parties in the process because they are viewed as potential contributors more than as potential competitors.
- (2) *Collaboration is based on joint learning* and fact finding; information is not used in a competitively strategic manner.
- (3) *Collaboration allows underlying value differences to be explored*, and there is the potential for joint values to emerge.
- (4) *Collaboration resembles principled negotiation*, since the focus is on interests rather than positions.
- (5) *Collaboration allocates the responsibility* for implementation across as many participants in the process as the situation warrants.
- (6) *Participants in a collaborative process generate conclusions* through an interactive, iterative, and reflexive process. Consequently, it is less deterministic and linear.
- (7) *Collaboration is an on-going process*; the participants do not just meet once to discuss a difference and then disperse. However, collaborations may have a limited life span if the issues that brought the participants together are resolved.
- (8) *Collaboration has the potential to build individual and community capacity* in such areas as conflict management, leadership, decision making, and communication competence (Daniels & Walker, in press).

These distinctions between collaboration and traditional public participation can be encapsulated into two philosophical differences. First, a public policy decision making organization, such as the Forest Service or the Environmental Protection Agency, cannot adequately address the issues at hand by working independently. Collaborators could bring to the process a number of additional resources the agency needs: different perspectives on both the problem at hand and potential solutions, understanding of rapidly changing social values, scientific data, indigenous knowledge, political clout, agreement and coordination of other agencies and private parties, finances, volunteer labor, and so on. Using natural resource policy as an example, since the focus of land management is changing from specific resources (stands of trees, herds of big game, grazing acreage) to ecosystems, collaboration appears better suited to planning and implementation tasks than traditional public involvement. Collaboration arranges the relationships between the stakeholders in a manner that more closely matches the resources and responsibilities that each brings to the process. Just as ecosystem management emphasizes "system" relationships in the natural world, collaborative processes can illuminate "system" relationships in the social world.

Secondly, collaboration values cooperation, while consultation and traditional public participation emphasize competition. While there has been no a priori reason for traditional public involvement to develop along a competitive orientation, it nonetheless

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

has. Consultative public participation policy is firmly embedded in the adversarial comment/appeal/litigate/legislate mentality that characterizes much of public policy politics. A call for collaboration is not a naive proposal that ignores the current venom and rancor; rather it raises the possibility that energy currently devoted to competitive behaviors can, in some instances, be channeled into developing new approaches to public policy, whether in health care, education, or natural resource management.

There are two keys to shifting the relationships in public policy decision-making away from competition and toward collaboration: correctly select those situations where collaboration is an appropriate strategy and structure the process to encourage and reward cooperation rather than competition. Not all situations are amenable to collaboration. The complexity of public policy decision making situations suggests many reasons why in any given setting collaboration may be difficult or inappropriate. Perceptions of time, money, staff resources, limited decision space, and history all may discourage collaboration (Daniels et al., 1993). In the environmental policy arena, some scholarship indicates that collaboration may be successful in the minority of cases (Amy, 1987; Buckle & Thomas-Buckle, 1986). It is also unrealistic to merely announce that a collaboration is beginning, and expect the current relationships and patterns of behavior to change. Collaboration requires innovative kinds of decision building structures that will have to be designed with considerable attention to the incentives they create. If they do not establish clear rewards for collaboration and disincentives for competition, there is no reason to expect much change.

Collaboration does not demand that participants set their self-interest aside, nor does the success of collaboration hinge on their doing so. Quite the contrary: participants are expected to clearly voice their interests and energetically work to achieve them. The key is that their efforts are oriented not in opposition to those of their fellow participants, but in concert. An environment needs to be created in which exploring differences is encouraged rather than hindered. To the extent that differences are not openly addressed, they may fester below the surface and become the impetus for discontent with process and dissatisfaction with the results. To counter this, collaboration structures disputant interaction to encourage integrative negotiation and dialogue. The interaction is "dialectical" to the degree that it is motivated by the desire to examine issues critically by means of fair, just, and orderly procedures (Wenzel, 1990, p. 21). In other words, collaboration enacts the tenets and values of civic discovery.

6.3 Collaborative Potential

A collaborative approach, such as collaborative learning (Daniels & Walker, in press); open decision-making (Sirmon et al., 1995); search conferencing (Diemer & Alvarez, 1995), mutual gain negotiation (Fisher & Ury, 1991; Susskind & Field, 1996); and transformative mediation (Bush & Folger, 1994), feature the parties placing significant value on the their relationship, the parties' willingness to trust and share power, open and constructive communication interaction, and creative approaches to resource distribution. Assessing these and related factors can determine the degree of collaborative potential in a given controversial policy decision situation.

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

Collaborative potential can be defined as the opportunity for parties to work together assertively in order to make meaningful progress in the management of controversial and conflict-laden policy situation. The appropriateness of a collaborative approach reflects two general notions. First, there is an opportunity for meaningful, respectful communication interaction between the disputants. Second, a mutual gain or integrative outcome is possible, that is, that the fundamental structure of the dispute offers the potential for both or all sides to achieve their objectives (Lewicki et al., 1999).

Collaborative potential can be assessed via any of a number of frameworks, the “conflict map” (Wehr, 1979); the conflict dynamics continuum (Carpenter & Kennedy, 1988); the Progress Triangle (Walker, 1996; Daniels & Walker, in press); or any other suitable approach, such as a civic discovery framework based on the tenets presented earlier in this paper. Regardless of the framework employed, the assessment should help the analyst determine: (1) the current potential for collaboration, and (2) the extent to which certain aspects of the situation need to be changed in order to establish good potential for collaboration. There is no “formula” to this assessment process. Rather, the analyst has to assess the situation as comprehensively as possible given available resources to do so, such as time, access to people for interviews, review of documents, and so on. In policy conflict situations, though, the willingness of parties to try to work together and the degree of decision space the relevant decision makers are willing to share are key factors.

6.4. Decision Space

A critical assessment area concerns issues of decision authority and decision space. Assessment needs to reveal who has jurisdiction in the public policy decision situation; who has legal imperative to make or block a policy decision in that situation. Jurisdiction is related to decision authority--the individual or organization that has the legal or organizational duty to manage or regulate the situation.

Decision space stems from decision authority. Those parties with decision authority must clarify how much of the decision process and outcome they can share with other parties. The extent to which a decision authority can open up and share its decision making process defines the decision space. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency, as a regulatory agency, enforces environmental laws such as the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act. The EPA can make decisions about clean water and clean air issues and impose those decisions on affected parties, or the EPA can invite affected and interested parties to work with the agency to determine how clean water and clean air standards can best be met. In the latter case, the EPA creates meaningful decision space while retaining its decision authority.

Sharing decision space involves sharing a form of power. While the deciding agency retains its authority by law to make the decision (e.g., under NEPA a forest supervisor signs a record of decision), citizens can participate actively in the construction of that decision. Meaningful decision space is critical to a viable collaborative process. Consultative processes do not necessarily include any shared

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

decision space. Any agency can consult with the public (e.g., invite comments in writing or at a hearing) without any assurance of how those comments might be part of the decision process. Emergent consensus reflects shared decision space; dictated consensus may embody a decision space facade.

6.5. Collaboration and Social Learning

Collaborative processes that are inclusive, sincere, and thorough offer some important potential in achieving that balance. Collaboration involves interdependent parties identifying issues of mutual interest, pooling their energy and resources, addressing their differences, charting a course for the future and allocating implementation responsibility among the group. As such, collaboration is fundamentally a process for social learning (Reich, 1985) and coming to learned judgment by working through controversial policy situations (Yankelovich, 1991).

The complexity and controversy of policy decision situations often produce gridlock and policy paralysis. Public policy debates in such areas as the environment and health care can be so contentious that the best outcome some policymakers can envision is *equilibrated dislike*: "everyone is equally mad, so we must have made a good decision". But out of complexity and controversy can come creative and innovative outcomes; decisions emerging from learning-oriented collaborative public participation. Problem definition, systems thinking, and solution generation activities comprise meaningful social learning processes as constituencies sort out their own and other parties' values, orientations, and priorities. Ronald Heifetz and Riley Sinder explain that "because constituents may cling rigidly to one way of viewing the solution, the work of defining and solving problems must provoke learning. The act of sorting out their values and points of view on a complex issue, of debating the merits of various competing frames for the problem, is itself part of the adjustment process by which constituents achieve solutions" (1988, p. 189).

Collaboration may allow the discovery of shared values, but only if the participants "walk the talk." Agency personnel or community leaders must convene a process that is more than simply collaborative by decree; rather, collaborative behaviors will have to be modeled by the conveners, encouraged by the process, including group norms and behavior.

Enthusiasm for collaboration should not be grounded in a presumption that it is either quick or easy; in fact, experience shows that it is often neither (Daniels et al., 1993). Under the best of circumstances collaboration taxes our collective ability to communicate competently, to debate constructively, and to explore issues thoroughly. The integrative nature of collaboration requires that experts minimize jargon and acknowledge the fundamental value preferences that their views inevitably reflect. It also requires that citizens give generously of their time, that they openly engage worldviews and political preferences different from their own (and often in conflict with them), and that they be responsible and pragmatic in terms of the demands they place on agency personnel and the public purse. In short, it requires that all participants exhibit behaviors that embody the highest ideals of civic engagement and discovery,

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

something that we all fall short of accomplishing.

6.6. Collaboration and Civic Communication

As this essay's discussion of collaboration implies, collaboration and competent communication seem inseparable. Effective collaboration relies on participants communicating well. While consultation promotes "command and control communication," collaborative processes feature "communication as civic engagement."

To the extent that government organizations and citizens want to foster civic discovery through collaboration, they need to promote and model civic communication. The natural resource policy arena provides an example. The new natural resource management orientations, such as ecosystem-based management, emphasize deliberative communication akin to "civic science" (Lee, 1993). In confronting the inevitable tensions between science and politics in order to manage ecosystems well, natural resource professionals must be both "idealistic about science and pragmatic about politics" (Lee 1993, p. 161). In ecosystem-based management, science and politics are forever wedded; "ecosystem-scale science requires political support to be done" (Lee, 1993, p. 165). Political support hinges, in part, on involving the public in meaningful ways.

Effective public participation, though, is more than simply encouraging "citizen dialogue" or "good communication." It depends on communication competence; that is, parties communicating appropriately and effectively (Lustig & Koester, 1993; Cupach & Canary, 1997). Public participation efforts need to be structured to emphasize collaborative communication interaction, dialogue, learning, and opportunities to work through differing viewpoints. Public participation approaches that are philosophically consistent with civic discovery and government reinvention will stress learning, competent communication, dialogue, and deliberation as features of structured discussion that respects both scientific/technical and traditional knowledge.

7. Conclusion

In 1993 President Clinton and Vice President Gore called upon federal government agencies to reinvent themselves. This reinvention emphasized better responsiveness to and involvement of citizens. Public policy decision making in 2000 and beyond continues to face the reinvention challenge, at every level of government. As government agencies and organizations change, they need to consider closely ways in which public participation can be reformed. Methods used in the past to meet regulatory demands may have been appropriate in some management decision situations, but they are inadequate to deal with the complexity of public policy situations and the need for social learning.

Consultation and its traditional public participation activities will not ensure quality discourse and constructive civic dialogue. Consultation approaches maintain traditional rationalist command and control models of organizational power and hierarchical communication (Bradley, 1999). Reinventing public participation is necessary to provide citizens with meaningful opportunities to be a part of public policy decision

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

making. Public policy conflicts, Dukes (1996) observes, are "socially constructed, dynamic organisms, whose actors, issues, and consequences are invariably shaped and transformed by the means available and used to contest them" (p. 9). Consultation, with its emphasis on command and control communication, does not respond well to the dynamic and complex nature of public policy situations. Processes for public participation must promote an engaged community, responsive governance, problem solving, and opportunities for building sustainable relationships (Dukes, 1996). To make progress on all these goals, communication as civic engagement seems essential, what Barber (1984) calls "honest, responsible, public talk." As Barber observes, 'talk has the power to make the "I" of private self-interest into a "we" that makes possible civility and common public action"' (p. 189).

Consultation does not foster civic discovery. Consensus may, but only if it emerges from collaborative interaction. Collaborative processes offer the best opportunities for enacting the values of civic discovery. Doing so can support transformative governance (Dukes, 1996) and civic renewal (Potapchuk, Crocker, & Schechter, 1999). Furthermore, designing and implementing collaborative public participation processes that honor civic discovery is consistent with a variety of initiatives emerging throughout the United States, including the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council's four rights of public participation: the right to know (more, the right to legitimate and authoritative participation, the right to independent exercise, and the right to implement or act (Cox, 1999).

For the past eight years I have been working off-campus with agencies, non-profit organizations, and communities to promote collaboration in natural resource decision making. I have discovered that the on-going progress of collaborative efforts relies on a variety of factors, four of which seem particularly critical. First, collaboration relies on insightful leadership. Leaders within the decision-making agencies and communities need to be committed to, and perhaps even passionate about, collaboration. Without strong leadership, collaborative efforts may not be sustainable or respected. Second, collaboration gains strength from a shared vision. To the extent that parties can discover shared goals, those goals as part of a collective vision can provide a foundation for working through immediate conflicts. Third, collaborative processes need to be inclusive, maintaining an open door. In the face of a history of mistrust, some parties may be wary and skeptical of a collaborative approach. Conveners, leaders, and participants need to be patient, keeping the door open to those who may have doubts. Fourth, meaningful collaboration requires a commitment to active learning (Richard & Burns, 1998). In my work on Collaborative Learning, a method a colleague and I have developed, refined, taught, and applied for a number of years (Daniels & Walker, in press), I have never encountered a government official, interest group representative, or local citizen who was opposed to learning. I have found people to be very receptive to mutual, active, and open-minded learning. Learning builds civic capital, the currency communities invest in collaboration (Potapchuk & Crocker, 1999).

In the beginning of this paper I drew attention to the controversy over President

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

Clinton's proposal to designate 40 million acres in the National Forest system as protected roadless areas. I noted Secretary of Agriculture Glickman's claim that roadless lands planning process would include "one of most extensive public comment processes ever carried out" (Hogan, 1999, p. B1). I wondered whether "extensive public comment" meant meaningful, "reinvented," and "transformative" public participation.

By now, perhaps too many pages later, that answer should be clear. The Forest Service public participation strategy is consultative, with all the trappings of traditional public participation. No matter how admirable or reprehensible one considers the President's proposed action, the public participation approach is not collaborative nor does it exemplify civic discovery. Imagine an alternative approach that promotes civic discovery: instead of public hearings, regional dialogues; instead of open houses, community workshops, and in addition to comment letters, internet discussion groups. None of these techniques would ensure the satisfaction of all, but participation would be more inclusive and accessible than traditional activities. Communication interaction would be dynamic and learning-oriented, and learning-oriented. If civic discovery and transformative governance are important to decision authorities and citizens alike, innovative public participation methods need to be designed and implemented, whether the policy issues are national, regional, or local in scope.

References

- Amy, D. (1987). *The politics of environmental mediation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bernton, H., & Hogan, D. (1999, 14 October). Clinton acts to protect forests. *The Oregonian*, A1.
- Bohm, D., Factor, D., & Garrett, P. (1991). Dialogue: A proposal. <http://www.teleport.com/~mears/proposal.html>
- Bohman, J. (1996). *Public deliberation: Pluralism, complexity, and democracy*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Bohman, J., & Rehg, W., eds. (1997). *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Bradley, R. (1999). Collaboration, complexity, and chaos. *National Civic Review*, 88(3), 23-28.
- Buckle, L. G., & Thomas-Buckle, S. (1986). Placing environmental mediation in context: Lessons from "failed" mediations. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 6, 55-70.
- Bush, R. A. B., & Folger, J. P. (1994). *The Promise of Mediation: Responding to Conflict Through Empowerment and Recognition*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carpenter, S., & Kennedy, W. J. D. (1988). *Managing Public Disputes: A Practical Guide to Handling Conflict and Reaching Agreements*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Christiano, T. (1997). The significance of public deliberation. In Bohman, J., & Rehg, W. (Eds.). *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. Cambridge, MA:

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

- The MIT Press.
- Cooley, J. W.. (1986). Arbitration versus mediation--explaining the differences. *Judicature*, 69, 263-269.
- Cortes, E. J. (1996). Community organization and social capital. *National Civic Review*, 85(3): 49-53.
- Cortner, H. J., & Shannon, M. A. (1993). Embedding public participation in its political context. *Journal of Forestry* 91(7), 14-16.
- Cox, J. R. (1999, July). Reclaiming the "indecorous" voice: Public participation by low-income communities in environmental decision-making. Paper presented at the Biannual Conference on Communication and the Environment, Flagstaff, AZ.
- Cupach, W. R., & Canary, D. J. (1997). *Competence in Interpersonal Conflict*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Daniels, S. E., & Walker, G. B. in press. *Working Through Environmental Policy Conflict: The Collaborative Learning Approach*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Daniels, S. E., & Walker, G. B. (1996). Collaborative learning: Improving public deliberation in ecosystem-based management. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 16, 71-102.
- Daniels, S. E., Walker, G. B., Boeder, J. R., & Means, J. E. (1993). Managing ecosystems and social conflict. In R. Everett & J. Tripp, (Eds.), *Ecosystem Management: Principles and Applications*, Vol. II (pp. 347-359). Portland, OR: USDA, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.
- Delli Priscolli, J. (1997). Participation and Conflict Management in Natural Resource Decision-Making. In B. Solberg & S. Miina (Eds.), *Proceedings: Conflict Management and Public Participation in Land Management*. Joensuu, Finland: European Forest Institute.
- Diemer, J. A., & Alvarez, R. C. (1995). Sustainable community--sustainable forestry: A participatory model. *Journal of Forestry* 93(11), 10-14.
- Dixon, K. M. (1993). *The Relationship of Benefits and Fairness to Political Confidence in the U.S. Forest Service*. M.S. Thesis, School of Renewable Natural Resources, University Arizona, Tucson.
- Dukes, E. F. (1996). *Resolving Public Conflict: Transforming Community and Governance*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Elkouri, F., & E. A. Elkouri. (1985). *How Arbitration Works*, 4th ed., Bureau of National Affairs, Washington, D. C.
- Ellis, D. G., & Fisher, B. A. (1993). *Small Group Decision Making: Communication and the Group Process*, 4th ed. New York:: McGraw Hill.
- Fisher, R. Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to Yes* (2nd ed.). New York: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Force, J. E., and Williams, K. L. 1989. A profile of National Forest planning participants, *Journal of Forestry*, 87, 33-38.
- Gaus, G. F. (1997). Reason, justification, and consensus: Why democracy can't have it all. In Bohman, J., & Rehg, W. (Eds.). *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Gray, B. (1985). Conditions facilitating interorganizational collaboration. *Human Relations* 38, 911-936.
- Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

- Heifetz, R. A., & Sinder, R. M. (1988). Political leadership: Managing the public's problem solving. In R. B. Reich (Ed.), *the Power of Public Ideas* (pp. 179-204). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hogan, D. (1999, 03 November). Senators tee off on the president over protection of roadless areas. *The Oregonian*, B1.
- Hughes, J. (1999, 14 December). GOP senators assial Clinton forest plan, saying 'start over'. *Corvallis Gazette-Times* (AP), A3.
- Isaacs, B., Hanig, R., Harinish, V., & Woolley, A. W. (1999). Listening and dialogue. Society for Organizational Learning. <http://learning.mit.edu/pratool/listening.html>
- Janis, I. L. (1992). *Groupthink*, 2nd ed. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lee, K. (1993). *Compass and Gyroscope: Integrating Science and Politics for the Environment*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Lewicki, R., Minton, J., & Saunders, D. (1999). *Negotiation*, 3rd ed. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.
- Lustig, M., & Koester, J. (1993). *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication Across Cultures*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Lyden, F. J., Twight, B. W., & Tuchmann, T. E. (1990). Citizen participation in long-range planning. *Natural Resources Journal*, 30, 123-138.
- Lynn, F. M. (1990). Public participation in risk management decisions: The right to define, the right to know, and the right to act. *Issues in Health and Safety*, 95, 95-101.
- Majone, G. (1988). Policy analysis and public deliberation. In R. B. Reich (Ed.), *The Power of Public Ideas* (pp. 157-178). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- National Partnership for Reinventing Government (1998, September). High impact agencies: A background paper. (<http://www.npr.gov/library/announc/hiapage3.html>)
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government*. New York: Penguin.
- Ozawa, C. (1991). Recasting science: Consensual processes in public policy making. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Pearce, W. B. (1994). *Interpersonal Communication: Making Social Worlds*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Potapchuk, W. R., & Crocker, J. (1999). Exploring the elements of civic capital. *National Civic Review*, 88(3), 16-20.
- Potapchuk, W. R., Crocker, J., & Schechter, W. H. (1999). The transformative power of governance. *National Civic Review*, 88(3), 48-56.
- Reich, R. B. (1985). Public administration and public deliberation: An interpretive essay. *Yale Law Journal*, 94, 1617-1641.
- Reich, R. B. (1988). Policy making in a democracy. In R. B. Reich (Ed.), *the Power of Public Ideas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rescher, N. (1993). *Pluralism: Against the Demand for Consensus*. Oxford, UK: Claredon/Oxford University Press.
- Richard, T., & Burns, S. (1998). Beyond "scoping": Citizens and San Juan Forest managers, learning together. *Journal of Forestry*, 96(4), 39-43.
- Ross, R., & Roberts, C. (1999). Balancing inquiry and advocacy. Society for Organizational Learning. <http://learning.mit.edu/pratool/inquiry.html>
- Rubin, J. Z., Pruitt, D. G., & Kim, S. H. 1994. *Social Conflict*, 2nd ed. New York: Random House.

Walker / Civic Discovery and Public Participation

- Selin, S., & Chavez, D. (1995). Developing a collaborative model for environmental planning and management. *Environmental Management*, 19, 189-195.
- Selin, S. W., Schuett, M. A., & Carr, D. S. (1997). Has collaborative planning taken root in the National Forests? *Journal of Forestry* 95(5), 25-28.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: the Art & Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Sirmon, J., Shands, W. E., & Liggett, C. (1995). Communities of interests and open decisionmaking. *Journal of Forestry*, 91(7), 17-21.
- Steelman, T. A., & Ascher, W. (1997). Public involvement methods in natural resource policy-making: Advantages, disadvantages, and trade-offs. *Policy Sciences*, 30(2), 71-90.
- Susskind L., & Cruikshank, J. (1987). *Breaking the Impasse: Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes*. New York: Basic Books.
- Susskind, L., & Field, P. (1996). *Dealing with an Angry Public: The mutual gains approach*. New York: The Free Press.
- Tarnow, K., Watt, P., & Silverberg, D. (1996). *Collaborative Approaches to Decision Making and Conflict Resolution*. Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development.
- Tarnow, K., & Watt, P. (1996). *Collaborative Problem-Solving and Consensus Building in Resource Management and Planning*. Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development.
- Twight, B. W. 1977. Confidence or more controversy: wither public involvement? *Journal of Forestry*, 75, 93-95.
- Twight, B. W., & Paterson, J. J. (1979). Conflict and public involvement: measuring consensus. *Journal of Forestry*, 77, 771-774.
- USDA Forest Service. (1990). *Critique of Land Management Planning, Vol. 2. National Forest Planning: Searching for a Common Vision*. Washington D.C.: FS-453.
- Walker, G. B. (1997, April). Assessing collaborative and transformative potential via the "Progress Triangle:" A framework for understanding and managing conflicts. Paper presented at the 6th Annual Alternative Dispute Resolution Conference, Seattle, WA.
- Walker, G. B., & Daniels, S. E. (in press). Natural resource policy and the paradox of public involvement: Bringing scientists and citizens together. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*.
- Walker, G. B., & Daniels, S. E. (1997, July). Collaborative public participation in environmental conflict management: An introduction to five approaches. In S. L. Senecah, (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth Biennial Conference on Communication and Environment* (pp. 271-289). Syracuse, NY: State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry.
- Wehr, P. (1979). *Conflict Regulation*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Wenzel, J. W. (1990). 'Three perspectives on argument: Rhetoric, dialectic, and logic. In R. Trapp & J. Schuetz (Eds.), *Perspectives on Argument: Essays in Honor of Wayne Brockriede*, Waveland Press, Prospect Heights, Illinois.
- Yankelovich, D. (1991). *Coming to Public Judgment: Making Democracy Work in a Complex World*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.