

National Collaborating Centre for
Healthy Public Policy

education housing incom
community employment
public transportation

DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES INVENTORY OF RESOURCES

Preliminary version—for discussion



National Collaborating Centres
for Public Health
Centres nationaux de collaboration
en santé publique

*Institut national
de santé publique*

Québec 

DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES INVENTORY OF RESOURCES

NATIONAL COLLABORATING CENTRE
FOR HEALTHY PUBLIC POLICY

OCTOBER 2009



National Collaborating Centres
for Public Health

Centres nationaux de collaboration
en santé publique

*Institut national
de santé publique*

Québec 

AUTHOR

François-Pierre Gauvin, Ph. D.
National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy

DATE

October 2009

The aim of the National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy (NCCHPP) is to increase the use of knowledge about healthy public policy within the public health community through the development, transfer and exchange of knowledge.

The NCCHPP is part of a Canadian network of six centres financed by the Public Health Agency of Canada. Located across Canada, each Collaborating Centre specializes in a specific area, but all share a common mandate to promote knowledge synthesis, transfer and exchange.

The production of this document was made possible through financial support from the Public Health Agency of Canada and funding from the National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy (NCCHPP).

The views expressed here do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Public Health Agency of Canada.

This document is available in electronic format (PDF) on the web site of the National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy at www.ncchpp.ca.

La version française est disponible sur le site Internet du CCNPPS au www.ccnpps.ca.

This is a preliminary document. We invite readers to send their comments to ncchpp@inspq.qc.ca.

The data contained in this document may be cited provided the source is indicated.

FOREWORD

This inventory of resources was developed in response to interest in deliberative processes expressed by public health actors, many of whom are interested in the role deliberative processes can play in support of efforts to promote healthy public policy.

This inventory is intended to launch inquiry into the subject of deliberative processes as applied to public policy and thus does not claim to be exhaustive. The inventory will be updated periodically to reflect developments in this field.

For those interested in deliberative processes, this inventory contains information aimed at:

- Facilitating access to existing resources
- Describing the main deliberative trends
- Examining the deliberative mechanisms that seem most promising

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	AN OVERVIEW OF DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES	1
1.1	Tools of democratic governance	1
1.2	Tools for applying research-based knowledge	3
2	THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES	5
3	BIBLIOGRAPHIC SEARCHES.....	7

1 AN OVERVIEW OF DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES

Deliberative processes as tools for guiding and supporting policy making are a subject of growing interest. In the context of this inventory, “deliberation” is defined as the critical examination of an issue involving the weighing of reasons for and against a course of action. Deliberation can involve a single individual, but the deliberative processes under discussion here involve group deliberation. Thus, the objective is for participants to establish a dialogue and/or come to a rationally motivated agreement.

An overview of the literature reveals that the resources focused on deliberative processes vary widely according to the various schools of thought, disciplines, and sectors. This diversity is also reflected in the multiplicity of ways of conceptualizing deliberative processes (e.g. taking into account the participants, their degree of involvement in the process, the point at which deliberations take place, etc.).

This said, two main deliberative trends relevant to public policy can be identified. Within the first trend, deliberative processes are viewed as tools of democratic governance. Within the second trend, deliberative processes are viewed mainly as tools for promoting the use of research-based knowledge. These two trends are not mutually exclusive, for they include certain points of convergence. The following section presents resources that provide an introduction to these two trends.

1.1 TOOLS OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

Deliberative processes are generally viewed as tools of democratic governance. This trend is rooted in reflections on deliberative democracy that have been flourishing since the 1980s. Resources focused on this subject generally place emphasis on the participation of civil society in government decision making (e.g. to define a problem, identify priorities, allocate resources or evaluate the implications of various policy options). Deliberation thus promotes not only agreement among various actors affected by a policy, the emergence of an informed and engaged public, and the taking into account of the public’s perspective, but also transparency, legitimacy and accountability in decision making.

Articles

Abelson J, Forest PG, Eyles J, Smith P, Martin E, & Gauvin FP (2003). Deliberations about Deliberative Methods: Issues in the design and evaluation of public participation processes. *Social Science and Medicine*, 57(2): 239-251. [doi: 10.1016/S0277-9536(02)00343-X] Online: http://www.cprn.com/documents/20819_en.pdf [Consulted on 2009-02-10]

Sintomer Y & Blondiaux L (2002). L’impératif délibératif. *Politix – Revue des sciences sociales du politique*, 15(57): 17-35. Online: http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/polix_0295-2319_2002_num_15_57_1205 [Consulted on 2009-02-10]

Books and monographs

- Bekker M (2007). *The Politics of Healthy Policies: Redesigning health impact assessment to integrate health in public policy*. Delft: Eburon Academic Publishers, 240 pp. [ISBN-13: 978-9059721999]
- Bohman J & Rehg W (1997). *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. The MIT Press, 477 pp. [ISBN-13: 978-0262522410]
- Callon M, Lascoumes P, & Barthe Y (2001). *Agir dans un monde incertain: Essai sur la démocratie technique*. Paris: Le Seuil, 357 pp. [ISBN-13: 978-2020404327]
- Dryzek JS (2002). *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations*. Oxford University Press, 208 pp. [ISBN-13: 978-0199250431]
- Elster J (1998). *Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge University Press, 296 pp. [ISBN-13: 978-0521596961]
- Fung A & Wright EO (2003). *Deepening Democracy: Institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance*. London: Verso Press: 324 pp. [ISBN-13: 978-1859844663]
- Fischer F (2003). *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive politics and deliberative practices*. Oxford University Press, 280 pp. [ISBN-13: 978-0199242641]
- Fishkin J & Laslett P (2003). *Debating Deliberative Democracy*. Wiley-Blackwell, 248 pp. [ISBN-13: 978-1405100434]
- Gastil J & Levine P (2005). *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for effective civic engagement in the twenty-first century*. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass, 336 pp. [ISBN-13: 978-0787976613]
- Hajer MA & Magenaar H (2003). *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding governance in the network society*. Cambridge University Press, 324 pp. [ISBN-13: 978-0521530705]

Organizations

The NCCHPP has identified several organizations interested in deliberative processes as tools of democratic governance. We have indicated in parentheses whether these organizations have a French (FR) and/or an English (EN) website.

North America

Canada

Canadian Community for Dialogue and Deliberation
<http://www.c2d2.ca> (FR/EN)

Institut du nouveau monde
<http://www.inm.qc.ca> (FR)

Canadian Policy Research Networks

<http://www.cprn.com> (FR/EN)

United States

Center for Deliberative Democracy (Stanford University)

<http://cdd.stanford.edu> (EN)

Loka Institute

<http://www.loka.org> (EN)

National Issues Forums

<http://www.nifi.org> (EN)

Europe

Denmark

Danish Board of Technology

<http://www.tekno.dk> (EN)

International

International Association for Public Participation

<http://www.iap2.org> (EN)

1.2 TOOLS FOR APPLYING RESEARCH-BASED KNOWLEDGE

Deliberative processes can also be viewed as tools for promoting the use of research-based knowledge. Interest in this trend has grown alongside the movement to promote evidence-based policy making. Such deliberative processes focus on the participation of experts and decision makers and are aimed at building bridges between the worlds of research and policy making. Thus, deliberation allows for the co-production and co-interpretation of research, while taking into account the decisional context. Another argument invoked within this trend is that deliberation allows for the detailed examination of different types of evidence that can guide decision making (e.g. scientific, organizational and political evidence).

Articles

Lavis JN (2006). Moving Forward on Both Systematic Reviews and Deliberative Processes. *Healthcare Policy*, 1(2): 59-63. Online:

<http://www.longwoods.com/product.php?productid=17877&cat=412&page=1> [Consulted on 2009-01-30]

Pineault R, Tousignant P, & Roberge D (2007). Involving Decision-Makers in Producing Research Syntheses: The case of the research collective on primary healthcare in Quebec. *Healthcare Policy*, 2(4): 1-17. Online:

<http://www.longwoods.com/product.php?productid=18867> [Consulted on 2009-02-09]

Books and monographs

Canadian Health Services Research Foundation (2006). *Weighing up the evidence: Making evidence-informed guidance accurate, achievable, and acceptable*. Ottawa, 17 pp. Online: http://www.chsrf.ca/other_documents/pdf/weighing_up_the_evidence_e.pdf [Consulted on 2009-01-30]

Lomas J, Culyer T, McCutcheon C, McAuley L, & Law S (2005). *Conceptualizing and Combining Evidence for Health System Guidance*. Ottawa: Canadian Health Services Research Foundation, 50 pp. Online: http://www.chsrf.ca/other_documents/pdf/evidence_e.pdf [Consulted on 2009-01-30]

Denis JL, Lehoux P, & Champagne F (2004). "A Knowledge Utilization Perspective on Fine-Tuning Dissemination and Contextualizing Knowledge," in Lemieux-Charles L & Champagne F (eds.). *Using Knowledge and Evidence in Health Care: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. University of Toronto Press, pp. 18-40. [ISBN-13: 978-0802089328]

Organizations

The NCCHPP has identified a few organizations interested in deliberative processes as tools for applying research-based knowledge. We have indicated in parentheses whether these organizations have a French (FR) and/or an English (EN) website.

North America

Canada

Canadian Health Services Research Foundation, Decision Support Synthesis Program

http://www.chsrf.ca/dss/framework_e.php (FR/EN)

Institutes of Health Economics, Consensus Development Conferences Program

<http://www.ihe.ca/research/consensus-development-conference-program> (EN)

United States

National Institutes of Health, Consensus Development Program

<http://consensus.nih.gov> (EN)

Europe

United Kingdom

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence

<http://www.nice.org.uk> (EN)

International

Evidence-Informed Policy Network

<http://www.who.int/rpc/evipnet> (EN)

2 THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES

To date, few rigorous assessments have been carried out that would allow us to determine which mechanisms are most suited to and most effective in various issues and contexts. However, many researchers and organizations have considered the issue of deliberative process assessment. Moreover, some have proposed standard criteria and frameworks allowing for assessment of the context, the functioning, and the impact of deliberative processes.

Articles

Beierle TC (1999). Using Social Goals to Evaluate Public Participation in Environmental Decisions. *Policy Studies Review*, 16(3–4): 75–103. [doi:10.1111/j.1541-1338.1999.tb00879.x]

Carpini MXD, Cook FL, & Jacobs LR (2004). Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation, and Citizen Engagement: A review of the empirical literature. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7: 315-344. [doi:10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.121003.091630]

Chess C (2000). Evaluating Environmental Public Participation: Methodological questions. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 43(6): 769-784. [doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2005.04.002]

Culyer AJ & Lomas J (2006). Deliberative Processes and Evidence-Informed Decision Making in Healthcare: Do they work and how we might know? *Evidence and Policy*, 2(3): 357-371. [doi:10.1332/174426406778023658]

Halvorsen KE (2001). Assessing Public Participation Techniques for Comfort, Convenience, Satisfaction, and Deliberation. *Environmental Management*, 28(2): 179-186. [doi:10.1007/s002670010216]

Petts J (2001). Evaluating the Effectiveness of Deliberative Processes: Waste management case studies. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 44(2): 207–226. [doi:10.1080/09640560120033713]

Ryfe DM (2005). Does Deliberative Democracy Work? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8: 49-71. [doi:10.1146/annurev.polisci.8.032904.154633]

Rowe G & Frewer LJ (2004). Evaluating Public Participation Exercises: A research agenda. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, 29(4): 512-556. [doi:10.1177/0162243903259197]

Books and monographs

Abelson J & Gauvin FP (2006). Assessing the Impacts of Public Participation: Concepts, evidence and policy implications. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks, 52 pp. Online: http://www.cprn.com/documents/42669_en.pdf [Consulted on 2009-02-03]

Abelson J and the Effective Public Consultation Team (2004). Towards More Meaningful, Informed and Effective Public Consultation. Final Report to the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation. Online: http://www.chsrf.ca/final_research/ogc/pdf/abelson_e.pdf [Consulted on 2009-02-11]

Davies C, Wetherell M, Barnett E, & Seymour-Smith S (2005). Opening the Box: Evaluating the Citizens Council of NICE. Report prepared for the National Coordinating Centre for Research Methodology, NHS Research and Development Programme: Open University, 272 pp. Online: http://www.pcpoh.bham.ac.uk/publichealth/methodology/docs/invitations/Citizens_council_Mar05.pdf [Consulted on 2009-02-11]

OECD (2005). Evaluating Public Participation in Policy Making. Paris: OECD Publications. [ISBN-13: 978-9264008946]

3 BIBLIOGRAPHIC SEARCHES

For those wishing to pursue their investigation into deliberative processes, the following information can facilitate your research.

Key-terms

There is no terminological consensus when it comes to discussing deliberative processes. In practice, many terms are used, sometimes interchangeably, which complicates the indexing of publications and bibliographic searches.

For example, the MeSH descriptor leading to identification of certain articles indexed by PubMed is “consumer participation.” This descriptor thus refers to the participation of individuals and communities in decisional processes, but it is important to remain vigilant since such participation is not always “deliberative.”

We thus suggest a series of key-terms that are commonly used in the literature:

- Deliberative process (Processus délibératif)
- Deliberative dialogue (Dialogue délibératif)
- Deliberative democracy (Démocratie délibérative)
- Discursive analysis (Analyse discursive)

This said, your research efforts will likely be more fruitful if you use the name of a deliberative mechanism. Below are a few examples:

- Consensus conference (Conférence de consensus)
- Citizens’ panel (Panel de citoyens)
- Citizens’ jury (Jury de citoyens)
- Scenario workshop (Atelier de scénario)
- Deliberative poll (Sondage délibératif)

Databases and search engines

The databases and search engines covering social sciences literature (e.g., Social Sciences Index, Sociological Abstracts and Political Science Abstracts), health sciences (e.g., PubMed) and environmental sciences (e.g., ScienceDirect and Ingenta) reference a wealth of publications on deliberative processes. Some search engines also cover a multitude of fields relevant to deliberative processes (e.g., Google Scholar, Current Contents and ProQuest). That said, it is important to adapt one’s search strategy to the terms used by the various data bases and search engines.

Scientific journals

Some scientific journals were identified as having published articles or dossiers on deliberative processes. Below are a few examples:

Healthcare Policy

<http://www.longwoods.com> (EN)

Health Policy

<http://www.elsevier.com/locate/healthpol> (EN)

Journal of Public Deliberation

<http://services.bepress.com/jpd> (EN)

Politix : Revue des sciences sociales du politique

<http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/revue/polix> (FR)

Public Understanding of Science

<http://pus.sagepub.com> (EN)

Science, Technology, & Human Values

<http://sth.sagepub.com> (EN)

Social Science & Medicine

www.elsevier.com/locate/socscimed (EN)