LIVING DEMOCRACY IN THEORY AND PRACTICE: GETTING DIRTY IN A LOCAL GOVERNMENT INCORPORATION PROCESS

THOMAS A. BRYER
University of Central Florida

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Dr. XiaoHu Wang, Ms. Marilyn Crotty with the UCF Institute of Government, and research assistance from Conrad Garrison, Charlotte Merritt, Valerie Murphy, and Maritza Concha, for their individual and collect support of the public participation process design and implementation described in the article.

ABSTRACT

Poinciana, Florida is a growing community in Central Florida. The master homeowners association contracted for an incorporation feasibility study to determine whether Poinciana could survive as a city. This article describes the public participation process designed and implemented as part of the feasibility study and articulates the goals, principles, and venues of the design, the challenges or barriers confronted, and suggestions for revisions to statutory guidelines for incorporation are described with the purpose of moving towards the institutionalization of public participation as a cultural norm.

INTRODUCTION

"We want your passion and your questions, and we want you to get your hands dirty and not be afraid to come into this process, to really take the reigns on the future of Poinciana. That's what we want from you." – Statement from the author at a Town Hall meeting, addressing Citizens

What is best for encouraging and facilitating public participation that enables better citizens and better government? Ambiguous requirements that allow for flexibility and imagination in implementation of a participatory process, or narrow requirements that establish specific procedural benchmarks? Perhaps there are alternatives to these two extremes?

This article describes the theory-informed design and implementation of a public participation process as part of a local government incorporation feasibility study. In so doing, it articulates the goals, principles, and venues of the design, the challenges or barriers confronted, and suggestions for revisions to statute with the purpose of moving towards the institutionalization of public participation as a cultural norm. Specifically, this article explores the ways in which the ambiguity of Florida statute may be limiting and how Florida statute might be re-written in order to more effectively encourage and facilitate public engagement in questions concerning the determination of local governance.

If an area wishes to be considered as a candidate to become a new municipality, Florida statute is ambiguous regarding the role of citizens in such a study, stating: “Establishment of appropriate citizen advisory committees, as well as other mechanisms for citizen involvement, by the governing bodies of the units affected is specifically authorized and encouraged.” Other elements of a local government incorporation process are very specific, including financial requirements, boundary standards, population standards, and the preparation of a draft municipal charter that adheres to certain terms and conditions.

Poinciana, Florida is a community in Central Florida that is diverse, large in population and geographic size, and is becoming more populated. It serves as a significant case for the exploration of the question: Is the ambiguity of existing Florida statute regarding public participation in local government incorporation processes sufficient for encouraging and facilitating participation that can lead to better citizens and better government?

To counteract the potential concern with ambiguous statutory language, Innes and Booher (2004, p. 419) summarize the problem with narrowly defined minimum legal requirements for public participation:

> It is time to face facts we know, but prefer to ignore. Legally required methods of public participation in government decision making in the US—public hearings, review and comment procedures in particular—do not work. They do not achieve genuine participation in planning or other decisions; they do not satisfy members of the public that they are being heard; they seldom can be said to improve the decisions that agencies and public officials make; and they do not incorporate a broad spectrum of the public. Worse yet, these methods often antagonize the members of the public who do try to work with them. The methods often pit citizens against each other, as they feel compelled to speak of the issues in polarizing terms to get their points across. This pattern makes it even more difficult for decision makers to sort through what they hear, much less to make a choice using

> public input. Most often these methods discourage busy and thoughtful individuals from wasting their time going through what appear to be nothing more than rituals designed to satisfy legal requirements. They also increase the ambivalence of planners and other public officials about hearing from the public at all. Nonetheless, these methods have an almost sacred quality to them, and they stay in place despite all that everyone knows is wrong with them.

Given this perspective, a question needs to be raised about the role of legal requirements for public participation. By setting the bar low, participatory processes can become a paperwork exercise. For instance, Bryer (2008) observes in one participatory process how a local government body convened a community meeting in fulfillment of a legal requirement. The meeting space was filled with agency officials, developers, and paid development consultants. No citizens were in attendance. Yet, the meeting was checked off the list, and no further action was taken to engage citizens.

This article proceeds by first providing the context for the case study. Second, the article examines the participatory methods used by the author as derived from a brief review of democratic and participation theories. Third, the article examines current practices as found in the literature that were guides in designing the public participation process in the case. Fourth, the actual design of the participation process in this case is revealed, and findings from the process are introduced. Fifth, suggestions for practice and

statute are offered, and questions for further study are identified in conclusion.

CASE INTRODUCTION

Poinciana, Florida is a deed restricted community of more than 50,000 people. The community was formed in the 1970s and has experienced rapid growth in recent years and rapid decline in the 2008/2009 economic downturn and foreclosure crisis. More than 30 percent of the population speaks Spanish as a primary language, and there are gated communities for wealthier and special interest communities. These communities include a 55+ active adult community, as well as a nature colony/nudist resort.

The community is partially governed by a master homeowners association called the Association of Poinciana Villages (APV), which represents approximately 18,000 households. The APV assesses an annual fee of $240 on each household to support its services, including a Public Works and Parks & Recreation Department. In the recent economic downturn, the APV has realized record delinquencies and thus revenue losses. The independent communities have their own governing mechanisms and associated fees. Last and importantly, the community spans across two Florida counties: Polk and Osceola. In 2008, the APV approached the author and his colleagues about conducting a feasibility study to determine the options for possibly incorporating Poinciana as a city.

Democratic Theory—What theories of democracy and participation guide the work?

Form follows function. This is the basic tenet of public participation theory and practice. There are numerous possible functions or objectives of a citizen engagement process (Rosener, 1977). The purpose of an engagement process, as initially defined by the International Association of Public Participation, can be to inform, consult with, engage, collaborate with, or empower citizens (Lukensmeyer & Torres, 2006). Other purposes might include achieving better policies, educating citizens, maintaining political stability, or upholding the rights of citizens (Roberts, 2004). The purpose of intensive and extensive participation can also be to reduce distorted or biased communication (Habermas 1970; Sager, 1994) so no one powerful person or group of people is skewing policy decision outcomes.

For some democratic theorists, the primary objective is to maintain a stable governance system. Pateman (1970) summarizes this view in her review and critique of the theoretical literature: "limited participation and apathy have a positive function for the whole system by cushioning the shock of disagreement, adjustment and change" (p. 7). Thus, according to this perspective, the least amount of participation—limited to voting—is optimal. Legal citizens should exercise their franchise every two to four years and then give up their sovereignty in order to allow duly elected representatives to act on their behalf. Too much participation beyond that could disrupt the informed debate and discourse of elected officials, who are the elite leadership. The masses, according to Schumpeter (1943), are "incapable of action other than a stampede" (p.

283). Thus, it is important as Berelson suggests (1952) to limit participation to ensure that "intensity of conflict [is] limited, social and economic stability [is] maintained, and a pluralist social organization and basic consensus…exist[s]" (Pateman, 1970, p. 6).

At this extreme, citizens are perceived to be best as more passive actors in the governance process and are treated as clients who receive services from expert administrators. If citizens are not satisfied with services they receive, they can show their displeasure when they vote every two to four years. Citizens vote for elected officials, who dictate to expert administrators what policies to implement, and citizens re-authorize the elected officials two to four years later. This is the loop model of democracy (Fox & Miller, 1995; Box, 2004) and is a model with significant limitations in terms of quality of participation and representation of citizen interests (Bryer and Sahin, 2008).

On the other extreme are objectives that require more active forms of public participation. For example, to create better policies or stronger ethical citizens (Cooper, 1991) likely requires participatory mechanisms that are deliberative in nature and through which citizens are empowered (Cooper, Bryer, and Meek, 2006). Citizens are partners with government officials at this extreme.

Between the two poles are a variety of other objectives and functions, which neither lead to fully empowered citizens, nor relegate citizens to the intermittent process of voting as the sole task of citizenship. Arnstein (1969) identifies points along this continuum in her visualization of a ladder of participation. At every rung of the ladder, power is treated as a zero sum game, meaning citizens have

no power at the lowest rung of the ladder but have all the power in relation to government at the top of the ladder. In the center rungs are different degrees of shared power.

Rosener (1977) applies a less normative framework for linking form of participation with function in her construction of a form-function matrix. Certain objectives, such as educating citizens, can be accomplished using a variety of different tools, such as town hall meetings.

Fung (2006) builds on this approach by identifying dimensions of participation within a democracy cube, in which tools of participation are selected based on the joining of three continua. First he asks who should participate, ranging from expert administrators to the diffuse public sphere. Second he considers how much authority the participants should have, ranging from individual participant education (and no authority) to direct authority or control over a policy or management area. Last, he asks what kind of communication and decision mode should be used in the process, ranging from participants listening as a spectator to having participants actively deliberate and negotiate with each other. A variety of techniques and approaches to citizen participation emerge as points along each continuum are combined.

Looking towards larger goals of participatory processes, Cooper, Bryer, and Meek (2006) identify a set of desirable outcomes in citizen-centered collaborative public management: (1) enhanced citizen trust in government, (2) enhanced government trust in citizens, (3) enhanced citizen perception of government legitimacy, (4) enhanced citizen efficacy, (5) enhanced citizen competence, and (6) more responsive government.

These six outcomes can be captured in the categories of better citizens and better government, both in practice and perception.

In suggesting that better citizens and better government are legitimate outcomes to pursue, Cooper, Bryer, and Meek (2006) follow the path established by earlier participatory theorists (Rousseau, 1968; Mill, 1965; Cole, 1920). Participatory theorists are concerned with the institutional arrangements necessary to facilitate extensive citizen participation in society; theorists are also concerned with the "psychological effect on the participants, ensuring that there is a continuing interrelationship between the working of institutions and the psychological qualities and attitudes of individuals interacting within them" (Pateman, 1970, p. 22). No citizen should be perceived by self or others to be inferior to other citizens due to economic, social, or other standing (Rousseau, 1968). Through the participation of politically equal citizens with each other, private interest can be protected and unbiased government pursued as citizens come to recognize that they need each other to some degree in order to achieve private gain within the context of a larger public good. Recognition of such interdependence is a positive step in the development of better citizens (Rousseau, 1968). Participatory processes and institutions are uniquely able to educate citizens to live together better and in recognition of a public good that is to be balanced with a private interest (Mill, 1965; Cole, 1920). These theorists provide the normative framework for selection of participatory methods in the Poinciana case. Table 1 summarizes the goals outlined above for participation processes.

Attracting individuals into a participatory process, however, may require that initiators of the process not focus on the creation of better citizens, or even better government as the terminal goal (Sager, 1994). Doing so may seem unattractive, particularly given the political culture that dominates societies, where participation is grounded in concern of self-interest, not in concern for community (Sandel, 2009). Self-interest rightly understood (de Tocqueville, 2000) allows participatory initiators to attract individuals to a process based on material interest (such as concern for taxes or property values) but to then facilitate a process where individuals each begin to see themselves as a reflection of others (White & McSwain, 1984). Better citizens can be developed once individuals actively define interests in relation to others, rather than concern for objects, material good, or personal property.

Table 1: Goals of Participation

Better Citizens • Government trust in citizens • Citizen efficacy • Citizen competence *Better Government* • Citizen trust in government • Perceived government legitimacy • Responsive government

PARTICIPATORY PRACTICE: PRINCIPLES

There exists a plethora of participatory venues and guiding principles in the literature that provide a framework for the design and implementation of a public participation process. Focus on these principles is suggested to be linked to achievement of the goals summarized in Table 1. The suggested linkage is summarized in Table 2.

Costs of Participation

The idea of participation costs is straightforward (Cooper, 1979). Citizens have to expend money, time, or other resources in order to participate in a public process. For instance, if a meeting is held in the middle of the workday, an individual may have to take time off work, potentially losing income. To get to the meeting, they may need to pay for gas and parking. If a meeting is held in the evening or weekend, a citizen may have to give up valuable time with loved ones. These costs are incurred by citizens to participate. They are balanced with production costs, or the costs to the initiator, such as a government body, to convene or facilitate public participation. For example, what is the cost of staff time, technology, and utilities? In thinking about participation and production costs, the object would be to find an appropriate balance. It will likely cost more to hold a public meeting on a weekend rather than during the business week, but more citizens would likely be able to participate. Is it worth the production cost? An interactive website will cost more to maintain and monitor than, certainly, would no website or a website prepared to simply share information uni-directionally from government to

citizen (Musso, Weare, Hale, 2000). Is it worth the production cost? These are questions that need to be considered.

Table 2: Principles of Participatory Goals

Goal of Participation	Principle of Participation
Better Citizens	
Government trust in citizens	***Costs of Participation*** Minimize costs of participation ***Trust*** Develop trust between citizens and government, and between citizens and other citizens
Citizen efficacy	***Co-Production*** Develop citizen ownership of the process ***Communicative Rationality*** Ensure unfiltered communication and transmittal of information
Citizen competence	***Co-Production*** Develop citizen ownership of the process
Better Government	
Citizen trust in government	***Costs of Participation*** Minimize costs of participation ***Transparency*** No information hidden from citizens ***Trust*** Develop trust between citizens and government, and between citizens and other citizens
Perceived government legitimacy	***Costs of Participation*** Minimize costs of participation ***Transparency*** No information hidden from citizens
Responsive government	***Costs of Participation*** Minimize costs of participation ***Outreach and Organizing*** Maximize the number of people engaged ***Co-Production*** Develop citizen ownership of the process ***Communicative Rationality*** Ensure unfiltered communication and transmittal of information

Transparency

Transparency is the backbone of public participation. Without the benefit of open and fully disclosed information, citizens who participate in a public process would be effectively handicapped. They would be missing information or receiving distorted information (Habermas, 1970) that could potentially alter their thinking and decision-making, or prevent them from becoming fully educated and thus developed as better citizens (Rousseau, 1968). Transparency requirements vary across government jurisdictions in the United States, but there exists some level of legislative agreement from the federal down to the local level that the public has a right to know about affairs concerning their community and government (Piotrowski, 2007).

Trust

Trust breeds more participation (Yang, 2005), and participation leads to enhanced trust (Cooper, Bryer, and Meek, 2008). There are numerous benefits of social ties that lead to citizen trust in government, government trust in citizens, and citizen trust in other citizens. These include generally stronger communities when trust bonds bridge across types of individuals, and more vibrant economic performance in communities (Putnam, 1993). Development of trust can be seen as both an outcome and a principle of participation; for a participatory process to work well, trust needs to either exist or be developed (Yang, 2005).

Outreach and Organizing

Saul Alinsky (Horwitt, 1989) teaches the difference between outreach and organizing; it is a difference that is both significant and instrumental

for the successful pursuit of a public participation process. To conduct outreach is to advertise a public process or meeting, potentially through such activities as mailing postcards, distributing flyers, or making personal or in-person contact with target groups. This is a question of how does a process initiator actually get members of the public or desired public (Cobb and Elder, 1983) to show up and participate? It is a perennial problem. Outreach has been cited as one of the biggest challenges of producing a successful public participation processes (Chess and Purcell, 1999; Young, Williams, and Goldberg, 1993; Sinclair 1977).

To organize, on the other hand, is to more explicitly target the self-interest of individuals, manipulate them in some ways, in order to get them to want to participate for their own good. Such organizing is seen in the community work of Alinsky (Horwitt, 1989), as well as to a different extent through such contemporary public managers as William Robertson, who successfully manipulated citizens and others in order to engage them in a self- and community-beneficial process (Cooper and Bryer, 2007).

Communicative Rationality

Communicative rationality (Habermas, 1984; 1987) is an idea suggesting that positive human interpersonal relations can be achieved through effective communication, largely as a means to prevent powerful individuals and organizations (such as media, corporations, elected officials) from skewing discourse. Communicative rationality can be realized through open discourse and authentic dialogue (Fung and Wright, 2001). By ensuring a communicative process in which citizens

can engage each other and persons in authority positions openly and transparently, it becomes possible to prevent filtered and biased information flows. If filtered communication dominates a discourse involving citizens, there is a risk that those citizens are operating at the bottom rung of Arnstein's ladder of participation: they can be manipulated to behave in ways that may not be consistent with their own or their community's best interest. Thus, communications need to be opened in such a way to allow for free exchange of ideas and mutual learning.

Co-Production

Last among the principles that guide the work in Poinciana is the idea of co-production (Levine, 1984). Though not an idea that has been used explicitly to describe public participation efforts, its meaning and previous use lends itself to the participatory arena. Ostrom (1996) defines co-production as "the process through which inputs used to provide a good or service are contributed by individuals who are not in the same organization" (p. 1073). Bovaird (2007) narrows the definition: "the provision of services through regular, long-term relationships between professionalized service providers and service users or other members of the community, where all parties make substantial resource contributions" (p. 847). The concept of co-production is typically applied to the delivery or planning of services. For instance, participatory budgeting is a co-production of a government budget, with citizens serving as co-planners. A different example is found in such programs as community policing or neighborhood watch programs, where citizens are asked to co-deliver

services (Bovaird, 2007). Applying the co-production idea to public participation, we can consider ways in which citizens take over at least partial responsibility for organizing their fellow citizens to engage in a participatory process.

PARTICIPATORY PRACTICES: VENUES OF PARTICIPATION

Three venues of participation are briefly outlined below, though there are numerous others available for engaging citizens (see Rosener, 1977; Lukensmeyer & Torres, 2006; Cooper, Bryer, & Meek, 2006; Fung, 2006). The venues reviewed briefly are: (1) town hall meetings, (2) faith-based organizations and community spaces, and (3) internet and web 2.0 technology. Table 3summarizes these venues, noting their alignment with the principles discussed above.

Town Hall Meetings

Town Hall meetings are a staple of American democracy. Citizens join with their friends, neighbors, and colleagues at a common location to hear speakers offer their expertise on an issue, and they in turn ask questions and offer their experiential knowledge of the same issue. These town hall meetings can become venues through which decisions are made, or they can be organized as information sharing undertakings only. Lukensmeyer and Torres (2006) with AmericaSpeaks offer a 21st Century Town Hall meeting model, which utilizes modern, advanced technologies to facilitate citizen deliberation and, possibly, link together citizens who are geographically dispersed. Whether information

sharing or decision making is the purpose, town hall meetings have the potential to bring together a large number of people at one time for the purposes of education.

Faith-Based Organizations and Community Spaces

Likewise, faith-based organizations and places of worship, as well as other community venues, are gathering places for committed and sometimes large groups of people. They are venues through which citizens can become civically engaged, as they look for guidance, purpose, and opportunities for belongingness (Musso, Kitsuse, and Cooper, 2002). Different faiths may be more prone to promoting civic action (Musso et al, 2002), but as gathering places, places of worship are prime locations for outreach and organizing.

Web 2.0 and Internet Technology

The cyber world is as potent a place as the physical world for bringing citizens together to receive information and to engage each other in discussion. More than in the physical world, though, citizens are empowered to direct their participation and the participation of others. Citizens are empowered online to pursue dialogue independent of the prompts offered by a facilitator in the physical world.

Table 3: Applying Principles of Participation in Practice

Principles of Participation	Venues of Participation
Costs of Participation Minimize costs of participation	Town Hall Meetings Faith Based Organizations Community Meetings Web 2.0 and Interactive Website
Transparency No information hidden from citizens	Web 2.0 and Interactive Website Faith Based Organizations Community Meetings
Trust Develop trust between citizens and government, and between citizens and other citizens	Community Meetings
Outreach and Organizing Maximize the number of people engaged	Town Hall Meetings Faith Based Organizations Community Meetings
Co-Production Develop citizen ownership of the process	Web 2.0 and Interactive Website Faith Based Organizations Community Meetings
Communicative Rationality Ensure unfiltered communication and transmittal of information	Web 2.0 and Interactive Website

Kakbabase, Kakabadse, and Kouzmin (2003) report on the emergence of the field of electronic direct democracy; though tracing

electronic democracy back to the 1960s, it is apparent that scholars and practitioners are still discovering the possible uses for continually evolving information and interactive technologies. Internet technologies can be used for simple sharing of information or the facilitation of interactions (Musso, Weare, and Hale, 2000); mobile texting technology can be used to mobilize "smart mobs" for civic action (Rheingold, 2002); virtual worlds can be used to mimic physical worlds to allow for simulated interactions (Wyld, 2008). Whatever the technology, the benefits are potentially far reaching as Kakabadse et. al. (2003) summarize:

> New interactive media can accommodate dialogue that flows, in a circular fashion, among interested stakeholders and groupings. This kind of exchange has the potential to return the meaning of "dialogue" to its Socratic usage. In this way, IT promises new ways to build consensus and common ground and to energize the citizenry. Regular dialogue and feedback keep citizens and officials in touch with the ebb and flow of public values and judgments. The value of citizen feedback, combined with new media technologies, has several distinct advantages: It has the capacity to enlarge the scope of political dialogue, and it serves as an educational process that brings issues into public focus and allows them to be defined (London, 1994). Besides engaging citizens, feedback also promotes a deeper commitment to and understanding of public policy—and it allows public officials to consider a broader

range of policy options on any given issue, based on the real-life concerns and testimonies of everyday citizens (London, 1004; Van de Donk & Meyer, 1995).

Summary of Participation Venues

These three venues—town hall meetings, faith based organizations and other community spaces, and information technology—have the potential to contribute to the education and betterment of citizens and government. Such education can enhance the quality of policies created and implemented, in turn furthering the betterment of citizens. In the next section, these venues and principles are placed in the context of the design of the public participation process in Poinciana, Florida.

DESIGN OF THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

In this section, the ways in which the principles and venues defined above are applied in the Poinciana case are described (see Table 3 for a summary). It is worth noting here that the total budget for public participation expenses (not including staff time) was $10,000, which is a comparatively modest sum.

Town Hall Meetings

Three town hall meetings were designed to kick off the incorporation feasibility study in Poinciana. The purposes of the meetings were to educate the citizenry about the study process, educate the citizenry in basic government structure and civics, and address any questions or concerns.

Four presenters from the study team made brief presentations about the study process, financial feasibility analysis, and the public involvement opportunities.I In the two hour meeting, a full hour was devoted to questions and answers. Two participation principles were addressed through the use of the town hall meeting method: (1) costs of participation, and (2) outreach and organizing.

Costs of Participation

A primary goal of the town hall meetings was to get as many people in the door as possible in order to direct them to the interactive website (discussed below) and ask for their assistance in reaching out to other members of the community. As such, it was important to keep the costs of participation low.

The study team faced a couple of important challenges in ensuring a high rate of participation in the meetings. First, as with many communities, the team was confronted with a mix of hourly wage earners, retired residents, and salaried professionals. It would be cost prohibitive from the citizen perspective to ask that all three types of individuals be able to show up to a single meeting or multiple meetings scheduled at the same time. Thus, the study team chose to conduct two primary meetings, with one on a weekday evening and one on a Saturday morning. The production costs in terms of staff time were much greater, but the object was to reduce costs for citizens and make it easier for them to show up.

The second challenge was the language division in the community. Roughly 30 percent of the Poinciana population speaks Spanish as a primary language. First, the study team decided to

offer translation services at the two primary town hall meetings. To further reduce the costs of participation for this large portion of the community, a third Spanish-language town hall meeting was prepared.

Outreach and Organizing

Having designed the meetings to reduce the costs of participation, the next charge for the study team was to conduct adequate outreach and organizing to get people in the meeting room. The plan for outreach and organizing was grounded in a three-tier strategy: (1) direct mail postcards, (2) attendance at church services to address congregations, (3) attendance at community meetings. The second two are discussed in the section that follows this one.

The Association of Poinciana Villages maintains a database of all households within their jurisdiction; the vast majority of Poinciana residents live within the APV jurisdiction. To reach this population, a direct mail, color print, standard size postcard was delivered to the approximately 17,100 households. The initial database contained approximately 17,500 addresses; 400 were determined to not be consistent with United States Postal Service records. Once mailed, an additional 400-500 were returned as undeliverable. The total cost for this outreach was approximately $6,000, with about $5,000 being for postage.

The postcard contained both Spanish and English language information to be inclusive of both communities. The front was colored with an image of the American flag, suggesting a patriotic or civic duty to participate. On the back, on the side for address and stamp, a brief description of the

project was written, along with contact information for one of the primary study team members, and the project website.

Approximately 600 citizens participated in the first two primary town hall meetings held on a Saturday morning and Thursday evening. Participants were roughly 50 percent female.[1] A full 70 percent were age 55 or over, with 30 percent age 25-54. No racial or ethnic category dominated the meetings; 32 percent were black, 31 percent Hispanic, and 29 percent white. Just shy of 100 percent of attendees were homeowners, and more than 80 percent had lived in the community for more than 3 years. Annual income levels ranged from under $10,000 (12 percent) to more than $150,000 (less than 1 percent). Most reported income between $10,000 and $50,000 (49 percent).

Faith Based Organizations and Community Meetings

Community meetings and engagement with the faith-based community, described below, were methods that enabled pursuit of trust development, reduced participation costs, effective outreach and organizing, and empowerment of citizens through co-production.

Outreach and Organizing

Poinciana has a fairly dense population of churches, both English language and Spanish language. Study team members made cold phone calls to church pastors, reverends, or other church officials seeking time during, before, or following their church services. The initial idea was to use these opportunities to conduct mini-town hall meetings with these targeted groups. Once the team

got in the door of the churches, it became apparent that the venue was better for shorter announcements intended to draw people to larger meetings or to invite church members to organize smaller meetings outside of the time of the Sunday service. Over the course of the start of the study process, a total of six churches were visited: two English-language and four Spanish-language. One of the English-language churches was of considerable size and held three services each Sunday morning; a member of the study team attended two of the three services.

In addition to the church meetings, members of the study team were available to attend meetings of various community groups. For instance, the Poinciana Residents for Smart Change (a small group of concerned residents), had a member of the research team out on two separate occasions to discuss the study process. Study team members also addressed meetings of a local Chamber of Commerce group, a realtor group, and independent neighborhood/community groups. As with the church meetings, the purpose here was to reach out to a diverse set of stakeholders. By working with small groups, it became possible to appeal to the particular interests of the group, whether they were business related, faith related, or otherwise.

Trust

Before making contact with church officials, it was important to be prepared for being persistent and willing to conduct face-to-face meetings with church leaders who never heard of the process initiator prior to that time. Contact was first made with church officials by phone, or, if non-responsive by phone, a personal visit was made to the church location. Building trust before entering a

church environment can ensure that the initiator has a champion on the inside who can give the initiator's message credibility. Also, it is useful, based on experience in this project, to understand the kind of church service prior to entering the worship space. [2] Likewise, understanding the unique interests and socio-cultural dynamics of communities for community-based meetings can help develop trust. Failure to do so can be devastating. For instance, integrating remarks regarding property values in discussions with realtors, tax implications for residents inside a gated community, and business enhancements with the Chamber of Commerce can provide the impression or demonstration of caring.

Participation Costs

Participation costs are reduced when meeting facilitators go out to locations that are easier for people to get to, or where people already are. Though such active efforts throughout a community cost the process initiators and facilitators more to produce, the total number of people engaged and participating actively can be increased significantly than would otherwise be the case.

Co-Production

The notion of co-production is captured in a recent email from a study team member to a group of engaged citizens. “Please, also, know that even though my colleagues and I are facilitating this process, we cannot do it alone. Public participation is a partnership. We need your assistance to get the word out. As registered members of the website, I know you are committed to being a part of the future of Poinciana. Commit as well, if you can, to bringing three to five other people from Poinciana either to the meeting on March 19 or to the website, where they should register to participate in the discussion forum and have their voice heard.”

Beyond a call to engaged citizens to help engage others, the study team, with its modest budget for public participation, called on engaged citizens to convene their own meetings to discuss incorporation ideas and to host members of the study team at their churches. Citizens were encouraged to invite members of the study team to these meetings to address concerns, respond to questions, and hear ideas. Citizens were asked to share in the responsibility of designing, facilitating, and implementing the public participation process. In short, they were empowered.

This notion of co-production is a potential shock to citizens, who may be accustomed to have things done for or to them. Thus, work needs to occur to transform the individual and collective attitudes regarding responsibility in a polis. For instance, it is noted above that Poinciana is a diverse set of neighborhoods. There are special interest gated communities, such as for active 55 and over adults and for nudists. In reaching out to those communities, the study team sought to

empower individuals. The team could organize meetings for them, but instead we sought to have community members organize meetings at locations comfortable for them, including their churches. This provided the team with champions, or at least hosts, for our efforts.

Web 2.0 and Interactive Website

The two purposes of an interactive website (http://www.poincianafuture.org/) were to: (1) facilitate transparency, communicative rationality, and co-production, and (2) to reduce the costs of participation. The website was softly launched in late December of 2008. It was announced at a small community meeting with about a dozen people in attendance. The full launch occurred in early February, when postcards advertising the website's existence started to be delivered to residents. An individual needs to be registered on the website in order to engage through the interactive features. This was a very specific decision, as it is hypothesized that discourse would be more civil if individuals were not permitted to be anonymous (a subject not addressed in this article). In February, the month of the site was fully launched, 119 Shout Box/wall comments were made, and 33 Forum posts were offered. In September, the most recent month, 94 Shout Box comments were made, and 25 forum posts were written. As of September 30, 2009, there were 379 registered users of the website. The work is continuing in the project, and it is anticipated that these numbers will increase or remain steady as the next phases are implemented.

Transparency

To facilitate transparency, the site included pages for Frequently Asked Questions, downloadable documents related to the study, and information about the study team. Additionally, all physical world meetings were video recorded; videos were posted on the website using third party services YouTube and ScreenCast. These parts of the website were uni-directional and required no interaction between the study team and citizens.

Communicative Rationality and Co-Production

On the other hand, to facilitate citizen-to-citizen interaction and prevent filtered or the perception of filtered communication, the website contained a variety of tools. A "shout box" was located on the front page, where users could write whatever was on their mind, including critiques of the study team, questions about the process, or ideas about the possible incorporation of Poinciana. Discussion forums were used to enable users to suggest ideas or raise questions. Forum topics were broadly categorized into "questions," "concerns," and "anticipations" and were intended for users to initiate discussion threads. Another discussion topic was reserved for the study team to initiate questions. For instance, Florida statute requires that a charter be written as part of the feasibility study. Using the discussion forum, the study team asked citizens to engage in discussion regarding elements of the potential future city charter. In these ways, public participation on the website can be seen as co-produced.

Participation Costs

Like the community-based meetings, use of an interactive website enabled citizens to participate more at a time and place of their choosing. Comments heard on the website were treated in as legitimate a manner as comments received during face-to-face meetings. As with any effort to reduce participation costs, the production costs were quite high in order to maintain the website, pay for server space, and regularly monitor website interaction. In Poinciana, the website allowed for individuals to engage in the process and remain informed, without having to sacrifice time away from work or family.

BARRIERS TO GOAL ACHIEVEMENT: OBSERVATIONS FROM THE FIELD

There exist significant socio-cultural barriers to achieving the goals of better citizens and better government; these barriers were demonstrated in Poinciana. The first barrier is the alienation of individuals from their nature as social beings, as imposed upon individuals by the dominant cultural norms of materialism and rugged and self-interested (not rightly understood) individualism. It was observed above that promoting participation with citizens by focusing on goals of improving citizens would likely not be successful, as citizens are more interested in that which is material and tangible (Sager, 1994). Instead, focusing on issues such as tax burdens and property values can be more fruitful in getting people engaged. This is what the process initiators in Poinciana did, at least complicit with citizens who served as co-producers of the process.

In so doing, the Poinciana process was over-burdened by the cultural norms that are barriers to

more social and collective thinking about communities. Citizens, particularly in gated and otherwise isolated sub-divisions, continually asked some variation of the following question: How much will I have to pay to subsidize the lifestyle of people outside my neighborhood? The values orientation expressed in this question was one of self- and short-term concern. Residents who expressed these values also expressed some variation of the theme that they had paid their dues, their taxes, and their hard work to get where they are; why should they pay for someone else's park, street light, and so on?

The second barrier is the intensity of forces that generate "bad" and dependent citizens, rather than facilitate the development of better citizens. Citizens may not be educated well enough or competent enough to participate in a deliberative process; efforts to educate may not be successful if there are intensive manifestations of distrust and if citizen efficacy is so low that they see no point in exerting any effort.

To capture the intensity of these issues in Poinciana, three survey questions were asked of town hall participants in order to assess the values and inclinations of the people who had been engaged in the process. Citizens were asked to what extent they thought they could make a difference by participating in a meeting like the town hall meeting. Nearly 85 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they could make a difference. This response stood in stark contrast to a question on trust. When asked how often they could trust government to do the right thing, approximately 50 percent reported that they could trust government not at all or only some of the time. Only 13 percent

reported they could trust government all of the time, and 37 percent reported most of the time they could trust government to do the right thing.

The trust question is significant, as the study team needed to overcome apparent distrust in bringing citizens into the process. When the team asked for a partnership in the participation process, distrustful citizens may not have believed the genuinely open invitation. When the team committed to transparency, distrustful citizens still believed that it was hiding something, or pursuing a hidden agenda. The trust data present a significant challenge; there was hope, though, in the efficacy question, where the vast majority of citizens felt they could make a difference. To a large extent, as well, the study team was working with a blank slate. Nearly 45 percent of citizens reported that the town hall meeting was their first ever public or community meeting experience.

Observationally, trust has been a particularly challenging barrier to overcome, particularly in the gated community environment. The apparent lack of trust in government damages the credibility of the process initiator even before work begins and despite good intentions. Comments from one resident on the project website exemplify these challenges: “We have seen on a national scale that financial contributions to politicians’ campaigns can negatively influence the best interest of the voters. We are wary. We are skeptical. Our trust has not been earned. . . Please keep in mind, that we have learned from the politics on a National Level that we cannot trust the politicians or those associated with them. And both parties have demonstrated that our lack of trust is well founded.”

It seems particularly troubling to observe lack of trust generalized liberally even to academic contractors hired to conduct an objective study. The lack of trust among some residents (by no means all, or even the majority) prevents residents from seeing the study as an objective, fact-driven process. “You do in fact have a dog in this hunt, we know it, and you need to admit it.” Most other residents, particularly outside the gated communities, are more complimentary and show a willingness to suspend judgment, at least, to allow the study process to unfold. It seems clear through these examples that a barrier that confronted the study team in Poinciana was put in place long before the team ever arrived.

Another example relates to the apparent dependence some citizens have on government. The Spanish-language community in Poinciana is significant in size. After one meeting, a member of the study team was notified that members of this community felt that they were not being paid attention to and that their concerns were not being heard. Indeed, word of a community protest was being whispered. The response: “We are working with an open table. There is a time and place for adversarial action, but this is not one of them. Come to the table, and help us do a better job including the Spanish-language community.” The concern was that the study team was not directly doing enough to convene meetings, print flyers in Spanish, or conduct outreach. Below is a passage from the website where these concerns are expressed:

> Citizen: Who is supporting the residents of Poinciana? Who will print the required information in Spanish before all the

important decision are taken? Who is in charge of informing the residents? Can someone respond please…

Response: We are working with our expanding network of interested residents to inform about all meetings. Please help us to spread the word. Working together, we can make sure all residents have the opportunity to be fully informed participants in deciding the future of Poinciana. Ultimately, Poinciana is your community and possible future city; we require your participation and your help to support the residents and get your friends and neighbors involved.

We are working to translate all documents. If you have suggestions for how we can do that better, please let me know. If you are available to volunteer your time to help, we would happily work with you as well. This is a partnership, and we require your assistance to ensure that the future of Poinciana is something that residents want. Thank you for your participation!

Citizen: Yes, I am willing to participate. I suggest to prepare a flyer in English and Spanish with information about strong mayor and city council, city incorporation and taxes...these are the main concerns that I see in the community. This flyer should be delivered door to door to make sure all residents are aware of this process. Just let me know when we can talk I have people who are willing to help but this needs to be done before the March 19 meeting.

In the end, the study team created and copied a flier. The citizen assembled a team of other citizens to deliver the flier to households in the community. A partnership was realized in this case, as a demonstration of the principle of co-production. Despite the "happy" ending, the episode demonstrated the barrier of low self-expectations and dependence on others to do what citizens might otherwise do, correlating potentially then with low levels of citizen competence and efficacy (indicators of better citizens) and unresponsive government (an indicator of better government).

The Spanish-language community is the subject of another example that reflects a combination of barriers, including social isolation, materialism, and self-interested values and behavior. One community member described "invisible walls" separating elements of the community; in some cases the walls were very visible, manifesting as gates and security guard booths. The incorporation study process provided the first time residents of the diverse Poinciana area had any reason to interact with each other, beyond informal recognitions at the gas station pump or grocery store line.

At one town hall meeting, a sizeable bloc of Spanish-language residents showed up, as did residents from the various neighborhoods and sub-divisions, including the gated 55+ community. Meeting organizers had arranged for a bilingual resident volunteer to serve as a translator at the meeting. When the meeting started, the translator asked anybody who needed assistance to locate in one section of the meeting hall, so she could translate for them with relatively little disruption to the flow of the meeting. As it turned out, numerous

individuals showed up late to the meeting, including those who needed translation services, and they spread out around the room. In time, demands started being shouted from the audience for translation assistance, even, according to one resident, from individuals who were bilingual and perfectly capable of understanding English. As demands escalated, passions became more intense. Another non-Spanish speaking resident stood up and shouted that, "You are in America. Learn English!" Residents on both "sides" soon started marching out of the hall en masse. Meeting organizers learned their lesson and partnered with the local school district to receive translation assistance radios and headsets for all future meetings at no cost. The larger lesson learned, though, was that the "sides" present in the room represented actual socio-cultural divisions in the community, which seemed exacerbated by self-interest and social isolation.

These barriers offer some insight into the process as it has occurred in the first phase. Lessons for statute and future processes can be, perhaps, anticipated. Importantly, no two participation processes are the same. The framework design might stay the same, as might the core participation methods and venues, but each process and each process facilitator needs to remain flexible to respond to changing environmental and political conditions. These and other thoughts regarding public statute that guides public participation efforts are discussed next.

SUGGESTIONS FOR PRACTICE

Ultimately the larger objective of participation processes is to facilitate enough trust building, educative, and transparent government processes that citizens would begin to expect to contribute to their continuation as part of a new political culture of civic responsibility and concern for community along with concerns for private interest. From this perspective, state statute would one day be irrelevant. As a society, we are not there yet, and so it is important to consider how best to encourage if not require the facilitation of such citizenship behavior.

Florida statute is ambiguous with respect to public participation in incorporation feasibility studies. Participation is "specifically authorized and encouraged." Elsewhere in Florida statute, such as in land use planning requirements, public participation is limited to public hearings, which have limited ability to achieve the kinds of outcomes defined in this article (Cooper, Bryer, and Meek, 2006; Bryer and Sahin, 2008; Redman, 1973). We might suggest then that the ambiguity in statute related to incorporation feasibility studies is restricted certainly to the imaginations of a participatory process initiator but perhaps more to the defined requirements and expectations found elsewhere in statute.

Perhaps, then, the ambiguous language found in the Florida incorporation feasibility study language is best. The language might encourage innovation and new thinking, without concern for boxes to check. Ambiguity, though, without direction can be equally as problematic as narrowly defined and required methods of participation.

Higher minimum standards or measurement scales might be developed instead, so that process initiators are measuring citizen, social, and policy outcomes, rather than process inputs and outputs (e.g. number of meetings and number of people in attendance).

Grounded in the experiences of the Poinciana project, several standards might be suggested for writing statute. For instance, rather than require that two public hearings or town hall meetings be conducted (narrow, specific requirement) or that that the engagement of the public is encouraged (ambiguous standard), statutory language can require that: "sufficient public engagement methods be used to ensure the cost to citizens for involvement are low, all study or governing documents are accessible to all, and freedom of expression is maintained for all members of the public." Statutory language can further state that: "Members of the public are to be included in planning the use of and implementing any public engagement method."

The language offered above defines objectives to be met, rather than inputs to be checked off a list, with the objectives themselves aligned with the overall goals of better citizens and better government and associated principles of participation (see Table 2). Language remains somewhat ambiguous, in that no specific public engagement method is required, thus allowing for local context and need to inform creative participatory method decisions. To ensure local context is actually integrated into the design of a participation process, rather than having a cookie cutter process implemented, statute can require documentation of effort to determine local context

and how the objectives are met. Such documentation can be required as part of an official local government incorporation feasibility report, or as part of a land use decision process, or any other policy area in which public participation is required. By way of example, process initiators can be asked to document how they lowered the costs of participation for citizens who do not speak English, or for the population of citizens who are single parents or homebound.

A challenging objective expressed in the suggested statutory language is the maintenance of freedom of expression. In the Poinciana case, the study team visited one community several times, and they requested that the meeting be conducted in a way that would enable free and open exchange of ideas. The local hosts—citizens who co-produced the engagement—rejected the idea, and opted for a standard theatre-style or lecture-style seating arrangement, with standard question and answer format. The potential problem here was that louder citizens who opposed the study process may have intimidated those who would otherwise have spoken up. Would such an outcome meet the standards of the proposed statute? Likewise, by requiring that members of the public be part of the planning and implementation of the public engagement process, what would happen if no or few people actually volunteer to play such a role? To prevent such questions from derailing a local government incorporation process, or other policy or planning initiative, the final statutory provision that might be included is: "In the event any provision of this statute is not met, a detailed explanation of effort is required." This provision would prevent process initiators from performing a bare minimum of

activity to attempt accomplishment of the goals expressed in statute but would also protect them in case the local context prevents achievement of goals (such as intense forms of distrust).

Intense distrust was one of the primary challenges confronted in the Poinciana case. Whether the study team was associated with a disliked local homeowners association, with national political officials, or with politicians or government officials in general, a sizeable portion of the population engaged in the process expressed distrust in the work the study team was conducting. Had statutory language such as that proposed above been in place, citizens would potentially have more reason to trust the study team in at least a transactional and legal manner. As currently written, the author and his team remarked to citizens that they were engaging the public beyond what is required by statute. Without assurances about the purposes of the engagement in regulation, citizens who seemed distrustful never fully believed or trusted that the team was being fully open and transparent. The motivation of the team was continually questioned.

CONCLUSION

The Poinciana case suggests there are many pitfalls that can derail the best intentions, including lack of trust, language barriers, cultural differences, and competing interests. The feasibility study process is not yet complete, so it is not possible to make final conclusions in that regard. However, public participation, we might suggest, never has an end point. If Poinciana incorporates and becomes a city, a new set of research and practical questions

emerge. Assuming at least some citizens begin to think and act as part of a collective and come to expect openness and opportunities for participation in governmental affairs, what are the implications for a potential future city?

In terms of the current process, questions remain to be asked about the use of limited resources. Have the resources been used well? Likewise, is it efficacious to consider public participation as a co-production process? What are the different citizenship outcomes that are achieved when participation is co-produced and when it is more directly done to citizens. What are the benefits and drawbacks of asking citizens to contribute intensively to the design and implementation of public participation? There are other questions that can be asked and that will be asked (e.g. the role of communication style in achieving citizenship outcomes, the strategies employed to bridge class, language, and education differences, and the ability to overcome intense barriers of trust).

Ultimately, we can conclude that the requirements of statute were met in this process, but such requirements were ambiguous, with no accountability for the achievement of particular objectives or goals. The proposed outcome- or objective-based statutory language can serve as a supportive legal framework for the creation of a political culture defined by an empowered, trustworthy, and competent citizenry and a responsive, legitimate, and trustworthy government.

ENDNOTES

[1] Survey data were collected from town hall meeting participants. Responses were received from

356 citizens, an approximately 60 percent response rate. No personal identifying information was collected on the survey, and survey results were made publicly available.

[2] When making my presentation to the church audience and discussing my commitment to ensuring all stakeholders have a voice in the process, I was greeted with shouts of "Amen!" and "Alleluias!"—unexpected and new territory for an academician who typically "preaches" before relatively subdued students.

REFERENCES

Arnstein, S. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation, *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 34(4), 216-224.

Berelson, B. R. (1952). Democratic Theory and Public Opinion, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 16(3), 313-330.

Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond Engagement and Participation: User and Community Coproduction of Public Services, *Public Administration Review*, 67(5), 846-860.

Box, R. C. (2004). Alternatives to Representative Primacy and Administrative Efficiency, *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 26(4), 588-608.

Bryer, T. A. (2008). Building Capacity for Public Participation in Planning: Lessons from Two Counties in Florida. Presented at the *Learning Democracy by Doing* conference, Toronto, Canada.

Bryer, T. A. and I. Sahin. (2008). Reonceptualizing Representation for the Administrative Role: Implications for Public Participation. Presented at the *Southeast Conference of Public Administration*, Orlando, FL.

Chess, C. and K. Purcell. (1999). Public Participation and the Environment: Do We Know What Works? *Environmental Science and Technology*, 33(16), 2685-2692.

Cobb, R. W. and C. D. Elder. (1983). *Participation in American Politics: The Dynamics of Agenda-Building*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cole, G. D. H. (1920). *Social Theory*, Methuen: London.

Cooper, T. L. (1979). The Hidden Price Tag: Participation Costs and Health Planning, *American Journal of Public Health*, 69(4), 368-374.

_____. (1991). *An Ethic of Citizenship for Public Administration*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Cooper, T. L. and T. A. Bryer. (2007). William Robertson: Exemplar of Politics and Public Management Rightly Understood, *Public Administration Review*, 67(5), 816-824.

Cooper, T. L., T. A. Bryer, and J. W. Meek. (2006). Citizen-Centered Collaborative Public Management, *Public Administration Review*, 66(Special Issue), 76-88.

_____. (2008). Outcomes Achieved through Citizen-Centered Collaborative Public Management. In Rosemary O'Leary and Lisa Bingham (eds.) *Big Ideas in Collaborative Public Management*, Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

de Tocqueville, A. (2000). *Democracy in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fox, C. J. and H. T. Miller. (1995). *Postmodern Public Administration: Toward Discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance, *Public Administration Review*, 66(Special Issue), 66-75.

Fung, A. and Wright, E. O. (2003). Deepening Democracy: Innovation in Empowered Participatory Governance, *Politics & Society*, 29(1), 5-41.

Innes, J. E. and D. E. Booher. (2004). Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century, *Planning Theory & Practice*, 5(4), 419-436.

Habermas, J. (1970). On Systematically Distorted Communication, *Inquiry*, 13(3), 205-218.

_____. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol. 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, Heinemann: London.

_____. (1987). *The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol. 2: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*, Boston: Beacon Press.

Horwitt, S. D. (1989). *Let Them Call me Rebel: Saul Alinksy—His Life and Legacy*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kakabadse, A., N. K. Kakabadse, and A. Kouzmin. (2003). Reinventing the Democratic Governance Project Through Information Technology? A Growing Agenda for Debate, *Public Administration Review*, 63(1), 44-60.

Levine, C. (1984). Citizenship and Service Delivery: The Promise of Coproduction, *Public Administration Review*, 44, 178-187.

London, S. (1994). Electronic Democracy: A Literature Survey. Paper prepared for the Kettering Foundation, Santa Barbara, CA.

Lukensmeyer, C. J. and L. H. Torres. (2006). Public Deliberation: A Manager's Guide to Public Deliberation, Washington, DC: IBM Center for the Business of Government.

Mill, J. S. (1965). *Collected Works*, J. M. Robson (ed.), Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Musso, J., A. Kitsuse, and T. L. Cooper. (2002). Faith Organizations and Neighborhood Councils in Los Angeles, *Public Administration and Development*, 22, 83-94.

Musso, J., C. Weare, and M. Hale. (2000). Designing Web Technologies for Local Governance Reform: Good Management or Good Democracy? *Political Communication*, 17, 1-19.

Ostrom. E. (1996). Crossing the Great Divide: Coproduction, Synergy, and Development, *World Development*, 24(6), 1073-1087.

Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and Democratic Theory*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Piotrowski, S. (2007). *Governmental Transparency in the Path of Administrative Reform*, Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life, *The American Prospect*, 13, 35-42.

Redman, E. (1973). *The Dance of Legislation*, New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Rheingold, H. (2002). *Smart Mobs: The Next Social Revolution*, Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.

Roberts, N. (2004). Public Deliberation in an Age of Direct Citizen Participation, *American Review of Public Administration*, 34(4), 315-353.

Rosener, J. (1977). Citizen Participation: Tying Strategy to Function. *Citizen Participation Certification for Community Development: A Reader on the Citizen Participation Process*, Washington, DC: National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.

Rousseau, J. J. (1968). *The Social Contract*, M. Cranston (trans.), Penguin Books.

Sager, T. (1994). *Communicative Planning Theory*, Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing.

Sandel, M. (2009). *Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?* London: Allen Lane.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1943). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, London: Geo. Allen & Unwin.

Sinclair, M. (1977). The Public Hearing as a Participatory Device. In D. W. Sewell and J. Coppock (eds.), *Public Participation in Planning*, 105-123, London, Wiley & Sons.

Van de Donk, Wim B. H. J. and O. M. T. Meyer. (1995). Digitalizing Decision Making in a Democracy: For Better or For Worse. In Wim B.H.J. Van de Dink, I. th. M. Snellen, and P. W. Tops (eds.), *Orwell in Athens: A Perspective on Informatization and Democracy*, 221-230, Amsterdam: IOS Press.

White, O. F., and C. J. McSwain. (1983). Transformational Theory and Organizational Analysis. In G. Morgan (ed.), *Beyond method: Strategies for social research*,, 292-305. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Wyld, D. C. (2008). Government in 3D: How Public Leaders Can Draw on Virtual Worlds, Washington, DC: IBM Center for the Business of Government.

Yang, K. 2005. Public Administrators' Trust in Citizens: A Missing Link in Citizen Involvement Efforts, *Public Administration Review*, 65(3), 273-285.

Young, C. W., G. Williams, M. Goldberg. (1993). *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Public Meetings and Workshops: A New Approach for Improving DOE Public Involvement*; Argonne, IL: Argonne National Laboratory, Environmental Assessment and Information Division, USDOE.

AUTHOR PROFILE

Thomas A. Bryer is an assistant professor in the Department of Public Administration at the University of Central Florida. His research interests include civic engagement, cross-sector collaboration, and bureaucratic responsiveness. Recent publications include titles in *Public Administration Review*, *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, *Public Performance and Management Review*, and *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.