

Policies and strategies for institutional participatory governance

José G. Vargas-Hernández, M.B.A; Ph.D.

ORC ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0938-4197>

Research professor Postgraduate and Research Division

Instituto Tecnológico Mario Molina Pasquel y Henríquez, Unidad Académica Zapopan

Camino Arenero 1101 C.P. 45019 El Bajío, Zapopan, Jalisco.

jose.vargas@zapopan.tecmm.edu.mx; jgvh0811@yahoo.com, jvargas2006@gmail.com

M. C. Omar C. Vargas-González

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6089-956X>

Instituto Tecnológico de México, Campus Cd. Guzmán

Cd. Guzmán, Jalisco 49000 México

omar.vg@cdguzman.tecnm.mx

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the implications of policies and strategies for institutional participatory governance framework. It begins assuming the relevance of the policy analysis leading to the design and implementation of policies and strategies which have effect on the institutional participatory governance. The method employed is the analytic – descriptive used to develop reflective thinking based on the theoretical, conceptual, and empirical literature. After a careful policy analysis, it is concluding that the design and implementation of policies and strategies are critical to develop and institutional participatory governance framework.

Keywords: Institutional participatory governance, policy analysis, strategic design, and implementation.

Introduction

Participatory governance is a perspective of democracy and sustainability in public policy with citizen participation. Participation is linked to governance concerning the policy process from being the elected representatives, experts, and bureaucratic to the inclusion of citizens and the recognition of experiential forms and expert knowledge.

Participatory development and democracy approaches are variant initiatives in different contexts linked to policy and governance. Participatory governance is characterized by the creation of new institutions supported by a participative policies and strategy approach. Institutions include different actors, stakeholders and representatives in the consultation, deliberation, and decision-making processes to analyze the conditions for participatory governance arrangements, the institutional designs and cultural cooperation development at all the levels of policy making, representing institutions that have already experienced in practice.

There are ongoing discussions and debates on public participation and creating methods and tools for participatory governance processes through the implementation of representative democracy in some contexts of institutional policymaking. Well informed and knowledgeable participants in the debates become more technical in content and policy processes strategic adaption in a long-term orientation.

The technocratic positivist approach to policy analysis is inherent to the orthodox concept of government. Science provides arguments for policy analysis advocacy, political disputes, and contra expertise (Jennings 1987; Sclove 1995). Participatory state initiated governance arrangements articulate institutional forms for interactive policy analysis, decision making, agenda setting in which non-state actors actively engage in formal political institutions (Rowe & Frewer 2004). Participatory governance arrangements are instrumentally set in policy design and implementation (Papadopoulos & Warin, 2007, p. 446). Participatory governance arrangements and practices take place in the design and implementation of policies aimed to urban rehabilitation and regeneration, social inclusion, community development and safety, and so forth.

At the core of the policy and strategy debates of institutional participatory governance are the issues and concerns of the state formation, liberal democracy, public participation, civil society organizations, economic development, citizenship capabilities, social inclusion and equity, sustainable environment, etc., all of which may lead to the implementation of different types of development programs.

The theoretical studies of participatory governance have engaged in dialogue beyond their boundaries in open structures for cooperation and negotiations with other stakeholders, agencies, and public participation without considering the transaction cost and undermining policy strategic performance (Harter, 1982; Harmon, 1995; Roberts, 2002; Mee, 1997; Ansell, 2011). At the participatory policy making level and strategy, the participatory governance has been proved to be positive (Singleton, 2002; Innes & Booher, 1999; Freeman, 1997; Wondolleck & Yaffee, 2000; Gunningham, 2009; Kelly, 2004).

The increasing public participatory democracy to become influential in policy making must undergo through political and strategic administrative reforms and changes that affect the functions' performance of citizens within the decision making processes. The institutions of participatory governance may affect diverse economic, social, environmental sustainability, institutional, and policymaking environments. Consensus-based models are useful and praised for the mitigation of naturally occurring conflicts emerging during policy and strategy formulation and decision-making processes.

The neo-Tocquevillian role marks out contemporary governance policies. Regional institutional building and pluralistic policy and strategic approach are elements of the neo functional multilevel governance model which differs from the intergovernmentalism perspective based on the nations state. A multilevel governance construct can be termed as cross-border governance (Kramsch and Hooper 2004; Strüver 2004; Leresche and Saez 2002).

Resources and capabilities are a factor of reform aimed to create the state capacity to manage the participatory institutions and implement the public policies and strategies. Institutional participatory governance may affect positive outcomes of public policies, democratic rights, deliberation, and decision making processes, liberal democracy, citizen learning, and social well-being. The nature of life politics issues often creates conflictive situations requiring the adjustments and opening opportunities for participation at different levels. For example, conservation become possible through coordination and conservation policies and strategies at various levels and creating opportunities for participation.

Policy analysis

The meaning of institutional participatory governance convergences with public policies related to socio intercultural participation and development, etc. (Nagy, 2015.; Sørensen, Kortbek and Thobo Carlsen, 2016; Jancovich, 2011, 2015, 2017; Bonet and Négrier, 2018). Participatory governance as negotiated rule-making enhances the flow of information and promotes policy performance (Lubell, 2000) although its improvement has been questioned. The institutional ambiguity results empirically from the rules and norms shaping politics and policy making regarding specific participatory governance issues considered problematic.

The core of participatory governance is the inclusion of stakeholders in the non-state policy making, such as the popular participatory governance methods used of public meetings and the advisory committees (Adams, 2004; Wang & Wart, 2007). The participatory governance methods used by some institutions in policy making processes have generally been beneficial. Participatory governance institutions in the context of high demand for public resources and inserted in policy making processes may be able to manage expectations even in the slow intensity change. Policy making in participatory governance institutions is a critical factor of contemporary democratic governance of institutions reshaping the state, democratic life, civil society, and social well-being.

Culture plays a crucial role in participatory governance and public policies. Institutional participatory governance is the foundation of sustainable values on natural and cultural resources initiatives shaped by democratization of public policies and strategic decisions aimed to further improve the institutional framework of responsibilities. The third wave of democratization introduces as innovation the voices of the citizens into the complexity of the policymaking processes.

Participatory governance is articulated to cultural heritage and connected to institutions and cultural policies at the margin of governance. Cultural participation is a conceptual, operational, and interpretative foundations of cultural human rights based on institutional participatory governance policies such as the encouragement of social inclusive transformation. The emerging patterns of institutional transformation and participation in policy making and politics are intimately related. Participation in policy analysis for participatory democracy attempts to consider the analytic processes and stimulate a plural debate.

The institutional analysis of the cultural policy orientation of participatory governance in new forms of cultural organization should respond from the bottom-up practices created and developed by citizens, communities social and nongovernmental organizations, private companies, etc. The development of organizational cultural resources as an active engagement in emerging practices, are based on public and civil partnerships and institutional participatory governance from the perspectives of argument-based policy involving public institutions and authorities, community and civil society organizations, and other relevant actors and stakeholders.

The community driven development transforms decision-and policy making in local institutions for local participatory governance. Marginalized groups in local communities have not always good representation in institutional participatory governance initiatives and programs, leading to policies that tend to privilege only the attending groups.

Citizens engage in public concerns and issues getting involved in the formulation, selections, and oversight of policy. Policy making focusing on citizen involvement in accountability and transparency as the guiding principles to form the basis of programs that should be implemented to prevent corruption cases and resources leakage.

Institutional participatory governance is concerned with the exercise of citizens to have voice and vote allowed by the state-sanctioned institutional processes leading to resulting in the implementation of public policies that produce individual changes with an impact on the wellbeing of the citizen's lives. Civil society organizations and citizens actively engage in state-sanctioned policymaking formulation, deliberative and decision functions based on authority assigned and resources available. Mobilized citizens that attend meetings to deliberate and vote over resources and spending allocation policies, make decisions for public policies, and elect local and community representatives. The selected policies are implemented under the citizenship-based oversight organizations.

Collaborative participatory governance is an innovation in policy making processes including the role of civil society (Baltà Portolés, 2017) in the innovation and implementation of public policies and programs. Public-civil partnerships, public-private partnerships require a dialogue for institutional participatory governance to include the condition to define a common goals and agenda related to both individuals and communities and leading to new public policies development. Sudden events focusing political and public policy issues and concerns in governmental agendas may lead to policy reforms and new institutional participatory governance arrangements shape decisions in specific policy domains (Busenberg 2001).

The level of public participation accepted to be effective can be achieved by the dialogue between citizens and other actors involved in participatory governance to strengthen opportunities in decision making and policy analysis, design, and implementation. The participation of citizens is related to confidence in democracy to get involved in policy making processes, cast the vote, and getting a mandate to make budget decisions on (Sveriges Kommuner och Landsting, SKL, 2009). Policy making and activism are concerned about the specific contexts that better suite participatory governance to reframe process of transformation, although there is lack of knowledge about types of institutions given the

limited resources available for institutional building. Policymakers and scholars sustain those institutional participatory institutions improve the democratic public life.

The interactive relationships of public policies manifested in the phenomena of participatory governance attempt to support the implementation of change through the bottom-up initiatives that can create instrumental solutions for the formation (Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003: 13). The rules governing institutional participatory governance efforts must be created matching the policy situation.

The participatory development principle in institutional governance policy aimed to the establishment of democracy models and sharing responsibility on common decision making, implies the notion of decentralization and de-etatization of power structures as structural reformation challenges (Sternfeld 2013). A decentralized structure of governance provides an amount of power bringing local governance closer to the citizens (Alfaro, 2010), which may add more complexity and bureaucracy in decision and policy making processes. Power and leadership exerting the control over institutional levers lead to political consensus and the integration of policy actions to be carried out by political coalitions.

In attempting to measure the normative and complexities of the institutional participatory governance program, must be considered the capabilities, the dynamics of civil society organizations, reforms of the state, democracy issues of deliberation, interest mediation, representation, policy outcomes and social wellbeing.

Public participation is a political matter and is the distribution of political power among the political and bureaucratic actors aimed to enable the capabilities of citizens in developing public engagement in accepting the rights regarding decision making, negotiation and policy formation processes. Participatory governance matters in terms of resources and capabilities of citizens, state reforms, civil society publics, representative democracy, and public policy. The new political spaces are in relation to formal governance arrangements to provide official setting place of politics and policy making described as political institutions of representative democracy when this one form is unable to cope with unrulred societal problems.

Public participatory changes in public governance include provisions canalized through rising participatory debates in increased and strengthened representative democracy at various levels of decision-making and policy formation at various levels. Public debates can have a significant impact on institutional policies and arrangements with different results among the policy domains and countries. In some cases, and issues, the result may be to rework in regulatory approaches across several domains of life politics and the creation of the new government agency.

Participatory governance institutions act as generators to link citizens to each other, involving them into policy networks, expanding the contacts and developing bonds of solidarity and social capital (Alexander 2006). Participatory governance institutions have a positive effect on the abilities to mobilize civil social organizations in any community to develop constituency service access to new policy networks and creating alliances. Political coalitions get involve in participatory practices supporting social actors and non-profit civil aimed to develop a city –wide inclusion policy.

Public participation of citizens in old and new formal and informal networked organizations and networks, may provide improved access to policy formation and decision-making processes (Trägårdh and Vamstad, 2009). Politically-elected representatives use to have a paternalist and elitist role in decision-making processes (Hertting and Klijn, 2018) resulting in a passive public participation under the arguments of technical efficiency, pragmatic functionalism, and policy knowledge (Montin and Granberg, 2013). Other forms of participatory knowledge production are often related to specific interests, concerns part of the implementation of conservation policies in cases where they only benefit a limited group of people instead of a broader group.

The participatory governance mechanisms involve citizens in decision-making processes over the allocation of funding between local communities and the design of public policies, monitoring and evaluating public spending (Speer 2012, 2379). The use of some mechanisms for developing and strengthening the public participation and citizenship influence in policy process and decision making (Hertting and Klijn, 2018) lead to improve the complementary elements of representative democracy and more participative governance.

The institutional participatory governance model in decision making process ensures the preconditions of decentralization functions of the state and the participation principle. A process analysis includes diverse issues and aspects involved of public participation such as transparency, credibility, reliability, the execution of job description, the needed political and citizenship positions during the participation in the decision making processes. However, public participation is not limited to policy making-process.

The trend of participatory governance regeneration should be a priority in urban areas in a tendency of instrumental approach for short term planning and consistency, design, formulation and implementing of communication and consultation in participatory governance policy. The participatory governance reflects the involvement of the stakeholders in the design and implementation of public policies at all levels of governance (Sørensen, Kortbek and Thobo-Carlsen 2016). Institutional actors in policy communities of sustainable urban planning and renewal projects are concerned with participation in policy making and implementation of urban initiatives undergoing consultation of social organizations and civil society.

Governance and participation are approaches of city governing including the inclusion model prevailing and the complementary practices contributing to the governability of the city in the presence of explicit and comprehensive policy. The inclusion of nonpolitical actors is framed by exogenous constraints, rules, pressures, institutional and governance arrangements concerning the urban and metropolitan governments, institutional resources, cognitive, normative, and political pressures related to the promotion of the inclusive policy-making at the different levels of government, transnational, supranational, international, national, regional, local, etc.

Urban participatory governance process may support the interventions of the effectiveness in smart city as a living lab experiment based on the co-creation of a behavioral change aimed to strengthening the reciprocal trust between policy makers and citizens and adopting

participatory practices (Cagri, Veiga Simão, Granato, 2020). Community decision and policy making is related to citizens in actions of participatory practices, challenging the beliefs that links participatory practices and institutional development.

Competitiveness and growth in neo-liberal urban policies are radical by can be hybridized with social and environmental policies, concerns and issues opening the economic development policies to participatory governance with the inclusion of non-economic actors. The right created and invited places and spaces to present the problems, expose the arguments, discuss, make decisions and policies, and develop trust among all the actors and stakeholders should be the institutions aimed to enhance the participatory governance.

New urban policies aimed to economic development make up political measures in competitiveness and innovation supported in the coexistence of social cohesion, growth, and solidarity farmed by the politics of development with the coexistence of participatory governance practices and including the consultation programs of urban renewal projects. Village assemblies do not necessarily lead to deliberation, decision and policy making processes to participatory governance and self-government to prepare development plans.

The most relevant actors involved in institutional participative governance are the citizens, civil society, nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations with initiatives of flexible forms of responding to public needs and issues, reshaping local policies, and contributing to local development. However, representatives of civil society, non-governmental and social organizations are held more responsible, in some issues and concerns, that the citizens in general or government representatives questioning the power and mandate of regulations and public policies, changing their roles and functions from governing to regulating or monitoring and the issues of indemnity. The exercise competencies of low politics at regional and local levels have no legislative powers, meanwhile the government authorities with police powers are considered police powers.

Government representatives can formally use created participation spaces to have control over the lack of satisfaction and eventual resistance of civil society with policy making decisions (Venter, 2006). In this situation, government is becoming powerlessness questioning the degree of the mandate for the regulation and monitoring roles. Participation in governance decisions and policy making has the purpose to obtain agreement from as many actors and stakeholders as possible, to overcome resistance and mitigate conflicts. Sometimes, government authorities are not prepared and willing to accept or tolerate criticism and response to a situation that may be spiraling out of control and challenged with the arising needs despite the knowledge and expertise of government officials.

Institutional participatory governance processes present numerous problems and questions that are significant at local decision making and autonomy levels in introducing appropriate principles, ruling mechanisms of participation, designing, and shaping public policies, representing, and sharing responsibilities as an appeal of democracy (Held, 2006: 261). A process analysis includes diverse issues and aspects involved of public participation such as transparency, credibility, reliability, the execution of job description, the needed political and citizenship positions during the participation in the decision making processes. However, public participation is not limited to policy making-process.

A model of local participatory governance may be based on the advice of experts creating committees made up of experts, volunteer residents, and professionals, who receive the mandate to develop policy and project proposals. Participatory actions involving the different sectors, are a response to the economic, socio-political, and environmental crisis, may be people-oriented local and regional policies. The model of participative governance framework based on shared ownership provides support for other institutional participative governance models that respond to the needs of local non-institutional and the development of new policy design and formation frameworks that ensures the long-term sustainability and adaptability of a new institutional participative governance format.

Participation of people at regional cross border participatory governance happening in reference to participatory actions framed by the inclusion of the different policy design, decision making and deliberation. Policy deliberation on new institutional and organizational participatory governance designs and new partnerships configurations should endeavor but not endanger. The emerging decisions from public deliberation and representative participation governance processes to ensure integration and implementation into public policies aimed to achieve substantive and sustainable goals and outcomes.

Some of these participatory governance forms are deliberative and included in the participatory arrangements with not tight regular processes of policies and representative institutions while others are more linked to policy making in representative institutions (Hertting and Kugelberg, 2018:1). Policy making areas of institutions and governments that can make use of formal arrangements for participatory governance tend to increase, although it may be difficult to replace the spontaneous participation emerging from a plural society driven by the state participatory initiatives and exercises. It is more likely to happen during the regulation phases where the concerned publics have a relevant function.

More formal arrangements of participatory governance are aimed to democratize policy-and decision making and recreation of trust in contested policy issues and areas withing a broad context than other forms of political participation and participatory governance practices.

The deliberative process expands the political and policy debates in the public sphere, with new forms of engagement, listening and speaking affecting all the involved government officials and citizens exchanging information, learning, and arguing rather than politicians. A deliberative process to be effective, according to Carson et al. (2005), must have influence on decision and policy making, be inclusive of diverse values and provide equal opportunity to participate and quality on deliberation, open access to information and dialogue, frame issues an option to search common grounds. The citizens' involvement in public participative governance and representative democracy in policy-making is in the interest of both citizens and political representatives.

Good governance is transparent and includes public participation in design policies, decision making, evaluation of programs and projects. Participatory institutions and publics consisting of citizens mobilizing themselves around democratic values that allow civil society organizations to participate into formal delivery and policy making process and promote the adoption of state institutions to protect these new practices (Wampler and Avritzer 2004).

Polycentric institutional participatory governance focusing on multilevel analyses stemming from the subsidiary principle of democratic public policies, democratic values of socio intercultural diversity and openness, the needs of local and regional inclusive communities. Conservation policies are characterized competing imperatives and conflicts between multilevel governance and local implementation. Shifting from one-dimension conservation practices toward more complex comprehensive approach may be more intrinsically linked to participatory forms of knowledge production with emphasis on the ethnicization and trust on conservation policies.

Multilevel polity in empowered subsidiarity within regional policy are attractive for participatory actions that influence development at the cross border contexts. Regional policy making in participatory governance should enhance regionalization and legitimacy of politics. The ability to influence decision and policy making can be curtailed from external and internal spheres of participatory governance spaces due to political pressures and intimidation to participants.

The implementation of a strategic agenda-setting on participatory deliberation policies designed from the bottom-up including citizenship at geographic territorial multilevel and happening at all socio-economic sectors. At multilevel implementation of institutional participatory governance framework created and adopted in different areas including the cultural policies to provide the foundations and guidelines for supporting and empowering either through top-down or bottom-up implementation of initiatives. Bottom-up and mixed cases of institutional participative governance addressing policy and political issues, officials of local governments are interested in creating new institutions.

The participatory initiatives transform local decision and policy making aimed to empower the marginalized. Empowerment of local government officials, citizens, and activists may become plausible to produce public policy outcomes to gain support. Local administration units hold consultation, deliberation, decision, and policy making open to the participation of all citizens. Local governments facilitate to citizens to make decisions and choices that have an impact on public policy outcomes, making necessary to modify the state's administrative structures.

National policies may include additional measures, relating to individual inclusion in participatory governance development methods more evident in the form of support for development programs. Institutional participatory governance practices are recognized in comparative analyses between nations and regions considered as imagination and creating the new structure of public policy and decision making in the specific contexts including cultural polycentric and pluralism, creative autonomy, participation, and cooperation (Primorac and Obuljen Koržinek, 2016: 4). Participation and cooperation increase the direct relationships aimed to achieve effective and tangible policy outcomes (Ansell and Gash, 2008:552).

To treat the issue of pluralism can be used in several approaches to solve pluralism policy connected to the community through inclusion in institutional participatory governance development, as a permanent dynamic processes.

Participation may be reflected through the prism of the myth considered by the imperative of evidence-based policy to justify investments in institutional and organizational governance where the participatory decision making must ensure the inclusion of those involved (Bevir and Rhodes, 2010 in Jancovich, 2017: 4). Independence and fragmentation between the institutional components of local urban government considering the proximity for participation an autonomy from regional and national governments that may hamper the local implementation of the policy of inclusion influencing or constraining the inclusive initiatives.

Participatory governance has positive effects on policy performance, which externally may vary depending on the transaction costs. Transaction costs are related to internal and external factors which have effects not always positive of participatory governance on policy performance (Rigg & O'Mahony, 2013; Robertson & Choi, 2012). The institutional participatory governance methods vary in the positive effect of participatory governance and limited by high-transaction-cost policy conditions.

In the situation of increasing transaction costs, it is needed that agencies and human resources have more interactions using participatory governance methods the effects on policy performance may be negative. Participatory governance interventions and programs have spillover effects on social dynamics and local institutions such as meeting the citizens 'demands for public deliberation and consultation getting involved and engaged in local decision and policy making, as the example of the open budget. However, there is little evidence that some forms of participatory governance can transform decision and policy making in local institutions.

Participatory governance is limited by higher transaction costs. In institutional participatory governance, transaction costs are more meaningful to policy conditions rather than political environments, but political environments are more significant in non-institutional participatory governance rather than transaction costs. No institutional participatory governance on policy performance even under low transaction costs is less positive that the institutional participatory governance.

Participatory governance and advisory committee spending have positive effects on policy performance, although uncertain behavioral and environmental conditions lead to high transaction costs and the interaction variables between advisory committee spending and transaction-cost-related policy conditions are negative. Citizens have the responsibility to identify themselves and participate in decision and policy making processes in all the environmental issues and concerns (Luger, 2004).

Lobby, hearings, issue salience, and investigations are transaction-cost-related policy conditions and the political environment variables are executive-legislative unified government, conflict, and a liberalism. Political environments spend less than the advisory committees which tends to be institutional in policy communities. Agencies consider their political environments regarding the management of public meetings and related to

transaction cost policy conditions. Public meetings are ineffective non institutional participatory governance method under low transaction costs policy conditions.

The effect of participatory governance decreases as transaction cost increases in lobbying, hearings, issue salience and investigations. The positive effect of public meetings on policy performance tends to decrease as the transaction costs increases. Depending on transaction-cost-related policy conditions, public meetings and advisory committees have positive effects on policy performance.

Participatory governance accentuates the effects of interactions to gain better understanding of environments and improve policy performance (Paletta, 2012; Neshkova & Guo 2012; Nicholson-Crotty & O'Toole, 2004). Participatory governance influences policy performance shaped by internal and external factors related to transaction costs. If the transaction costs are uncertain, the effect is less positive (Lee, 2016).

However, other studies have concluded that participatory governance does not necessarily improve policy performance (Doberstein, 2016; Gerlak, Heikkila, & Lubell, 2012; Choi, 2014) and its effect may vary depending on the methods used (Frieling, Lindenberg, & Stokman., 2014; Robertson & Choi,2012). This imply that participatory governance is not always related to policy performance (Marcus, Geffen, & Sexton, 2002) and vary in the relationship between internal and external factors and the transaction costs incurred in the transactions.

Creation, development, and growth of new models of institutional participatory governance, and innovative policies in institutions and organizations require an adjustment of existing legal frameworks aimed to ensure the design and implementation of more hybrid democratic policies. The design and implementation of new forms and types of institutional participatory governance, requires of more research, knowledge and experiences in policy experiments based on the existing research and recommendations.

The new models of institutional participatory governance develop evolutionary steps in policy development and responses to enhance the values of democracy in society, decentralization, and local development. New models of participatory governance can be experimented based on expert advisory committees formed by volunteer residents, professional and experts aimed to develop policy proposals on sustainable issues and other actions. Experimenting with a new model of participative governance based on the work of advisory committees composed of volunteer residents, professional and experts committed to develop policy and project proposals with respect to concerns, actions, and issues such as the participatory budgeting model.

Implications in designing and implementing strategies

A strategy aimed to ensure institutional participatory governance sustainability is the law codifications despite the disjunction between the formal law and the governing practices. The strategic objectives of the participatory governance imply the notions of citizenship participation and engagement, involvement in decision making and authority and governance

devolution. In participatory practices and initiatives, the actors bear interests and values oriented towards common goods and strategies of urban space exploitation and economic growth such as the associations, social movements, committees, individuals, and so forth are included in priorities.

Strategies of inclusive practices and initiatives have different meanings and natures in various forms of participation and governance into the inclusion of a governing process analyzed by the social and political sciences. Give voice and facilitate participation to different identities and conflicting interests is a strategy pursued by explicit politics and policy of inclusion through complementary and coordinated political practices of participatory governance. Participation and voice of citizens translate into specific governance outcomes which may fall into overlapping policy categories, such as education, health environment, transportation, and mobility, etc.

The relationships between inclusions initiatives and strategies promote practices that may be in opposition or on intermediate positions in the continuum. There is empirical evidence of inclusive practices, strategies and policies based on governance and participation shared in the participatory governance framework.

Issues of politics life have a broad impact leading to loss of institutional trust on established practices in government regulations, and to experiment with new participatory strategies to regain trust through participation. Ethos and pathos as strategic rhetoric in classical Greek play a relevant role in participatory governance. Participation in the politics of life is an elaborated theoretical framework to be used against the background of social change processes and the emergence of strategies of new governance. The new governance arrangements as the act of governing, are designed with non-state actors or individuals not being elected as representatives and individuals in civil service, participates in policy analysis or policy making processes.

Participation contributes to solve the contentious problems of governance through policies concerned the dimensions of the politics of life under human control and limited to socio-political control. These dimension of the politics of life are connected to normative, value and moral factors, such as responsibility towards non-human nature, ozone in future generations. In these dimensions, the traditional mechanisms of governance may hamper policymaking in institutional experimentation.

The new forms of direct democracy tend to limit the power of political and party elites to increase the participation of excluded groups and allow them to get involved in deliberative and policymaking ongoing processes. The discourse and practice of deliberative democracy centered around the meaningful public participation needs and issues, are valued for the potential and have influence to facilitate government decision and policy making.

The emerging new forms of participatory governance and development are promising new democratic solutions but bringing many challenges, that may be not overcome with new policy statements from above, but the strategic design of institutional change, behavioral change, and capacity building. New forms of institutional participation in policy making

approached from a conventional perspective may fit the model of participation in the forms of citizen surveys and referendums.

Participatory governance in institutional designs is the practice of involving and consulting public members in the agenda setting, decision-making and policy design activities of organizations and institutions that are responsible for policy analysis and development. (Rowe & Frewer 2004). Government institutions and agencies must design and implement the best strategy to reduce or absorb uncertainty in domains of life politics based on policies precautionary principle, considering that may be broader to include uncertainty about regulation and governance of benefits and risks of using the novel technology.

Participatory governance arrangements are context-specific terms and features in learning, trust development, modes of governance, individual and collective responsibility, strategies, and concerns to cope with uncertainty, complexity, risk, value conflict, etc., as some of the most relevant issues of the effective and legitimate politics of life. Citizens take collective decision and policy making in more inclusive, democratic, and participative processes to be delegated to the community. The legitimation process of participatory governance extends to inclusive initiatives and practices within the various policy domains and issues. The implementation of participatory governance requires the strategic design of institutional change, behavioral change, and capacity building.

Public participation in institutional participatory governance is a strategy designed and implemented by policy makers in the face of crisis and uncertainty events aimed to build public support for regulatory means and measures. More open and flexible public participation leading to participatory governance combine a variety of approaches to give support to activities and practices strategically used in spontaneous and informal forums and participation to more formal participation among a variety of stakeholders and actors. A broad use of participatory approaches involving citizens and beneficiaries of projects and policies concerning decision and policy making process in programming, implementation, and evaluation.

Interconnections between participatory governance and cultural heritage as a strategic resource for sustainability through structured dialogue, social dimension and synergy coordination among the actors and stakeholders involved in the procedures of heritage valorization of the interests.

Multiple lanes for citizen engagement link community development, social organizations and movements, and political parties with local governance strategies, using a variety of participatory methods. Participatory methods and approaches have entered in the government spheres to confront issues of policy and institutional changes. Citizens use different participatory strategies aimed to engage in local governance and create engagement spaces for direct civil society participation in decentralized powers of local governments.

Local governments can improve the public participation in policy-making by advancing social and political awareness of the meaning, methods, and tools (Montin and Granberg, 2013). Local government must be committed to develop and increase the opportunities for the public participation of citizens in influencing the decision and policy making processes

and adding elements of deliberative and representative democracy, leading to a functioning representative democracy, and adapted to participatory governance (Trägårdh, 2011).

The engagement of citizens with government but outside of participatory governance, require of strategic actions to be implemented to amplify their voices through advocacy, lobbying for policy change, monitoring and performance. Poor participants engage in behaviors associated with strategies implemented by higher income citizens in a more dynamic participatory institutions and contentious civil society.

Local community articulations of sociopolitical values based on heritage is strategic in local development underlining the need for sustainable development models of participative governance and management about the preservation and management of infrastructure and species. Institutional participatory governance is linked to local political environment programs designed to facilitate citizens the reshaping right of local policy outcomes. Local governments can pressure the central normative government to implement inclusive methods in strategic planning, consultation procedures and others. An institutional and formal process of negotiating and adapting strategies between local government officials and citizens is necessary to secure the outcomes.

Economic globalization processes have an impact on urban areas in different forms leading to their reactions by policy making and strategies with different orientations (Savitch & Kantor, 2002; Jessop, 2002; Brenner & Theodore, 2002; d'Albergo & Lefèvre, 2007). Cities worldwide framed by information and communication technologies to be considered as smart city strategies oriented by active people engaged in co-creative innovation in urban services (Castri, Veiga Simão, Granato, 2020).

The so called government technologies have been developed to overcome the capacity deficit resulting from the imperfect information flows emerging from the policy target groups and the public policy actors (Mayntz & Scharpf 1975; cf. Mayntz 1980). The technology assessments have limited impacts due to the participatory practices which are more democratic oriented and practical like the policy practices towards the social basis for decision making on science and technology and improvement of the technological design and other attempts of classification.

The mobilization strategy of the participatory governance of public services delivery model engages government service providers with demand side. Critiques of the government policies based on evidence of unequal and unfair tariffs for public services in which government is responsible for financing and implementing them, may resonate and find support with social and environmental movements. In such situations should be mutual respect between the two actors involved based on the political functions of egalitarian and inclusive nature of participants with consideration of observations and opinions in the deliberation, decision and policy making processes and absence of coercion (Carson & Hartz-Karp 2005).

With a new strategy for institutional development, the regional and local participatory governance may remain elaborated and rated on the scale of urban planning and development areas based on priorities. Government officials and actors prefer to appear as pure or affected

publics to engage publics in some specific policy areas. To build participatory governance are required to formulate and implement strategies considering the functioning of the states, regional and local conflicts and ethnic violence, dysfunctionalities in civil societies and communities with weak engagements. Any disease that affects humans strongly disrupts the institutional organization affecting the policy areas of public health, and other fields organized in isolations from one another. Development of strategies for civil society engagement in economic arenas is a challenge.

The configuration analysis of the state must be able to assess the impact of state policies favoring and engaging citizens, more likely in post-conflict poor regions than in other environments where a well-functioning state have developed greater capacities to implement public policies with greater expectations for achievements. The effectiveness of the state is related to local governments that are likely to adopt public policies enhancing participatory institutions to meet the needs of citizens.

However, if the states are becoming less effective, the participatory institutions should address the emerging policy problems. Strategies of participatory governance can be implemented at regional level but has less influence at local and community levels. The participatory approach of dual power is implemented through strategies of partnership and cooperation between local governments and grassroots communities to contribute to public decision and policy making.

The performative dimension refers to the strategic efforts to control interactions in the directions of desired outcomes and to a structuralist interpretation to hold personal participations (Burke 1969) self-activated being involved in an occurrence and less involuntary made-to-be part of and self-motion (Sartori 1987).

Analysis of the assessment of public institutional participatory governance overlooking the political manifestation and participation in collaborative policy making should be under scrutiny (Connick & Innes 2003:178). Assessing the institutional architecture of participatory governance to evaluate the inputs-outputs, policymaking should be interested in strategic participatory institutions to set the goals with strong or weak states and strong and weak societies. Policymakers, strategies, practitioners, and scholars learn from the adoption of participatory governance institutions. Policymakers, strategists, and scholars can develop evidence of participatory institutions that produce benefits related to the nature of participation, structural context, rules, forms, designs, and modalities of adoption.

Conclusions

According to the objective of this study and after a careful policy analysis based on the assumption leading to the effects of policies and strategies, it is concluded that the design and implementation are critical to develop and institutional participatory governance framework.

The trend of institutional participatory governance is a movement toward the decentralization of governmental structures and allowing the involvement of citizens in public affairs,

decision making and policy making. Policy scholarly agendas can help to understand the potential of institutions of participatory governance to transform the economic, social, and sustainable environment in which they are embedded. The rules governing the participatory processes must match the policy issues adapting the rules to reflect community and local needs and demands.

Participatory initiatives contribute to policy change and inform policy making of the realities and priorities of local people in making decisions. Also, participatory initiatives contribute to cultural, structural, and procedural change in large institutions. Participation strengthens the voice of engaged citizens as participants in the policy making processes through the generation of knowledge and perspectives to policy makers. Scaling up participatory approaches have an influence in policy institutions while maintaining and improving the quality and genuine local involvement.

Given the complexity of these issues, participatory governance development is a topic that requires more research based on cultural policy that needs to be transferred into practice. Institutional participatory governance protects the cultural diversity of all-inclusive expressions and affirming and developing democratization processes. A hybrid institutional governance based on the principles of participation policy faces great challenges when it comes to providing support initiatives and establishing cooperation with non-institutional actors and agents.

The internal organizational and administrative processes must be required to be reengineered to provide the information that policy experts, all participant and ordinary citizens need to know to make decisions. Disinterested citizens may follow some idealized rules of discourse based on an engineered participation through different forms of participation in emerging regulatory policies.

The establishment of the institutional participatory governance based on resources and strategic direction of development require shaping the organizational structure considering that there are interests and the needs of citizens to incorporate new forms. Formal public consultation based on a strategic agenda should be implemented when less risky and costly approaches of participatory governance are no feasible and likely to fail. The inclusion of non-political actors in inclusive participatory governance must consider some subjective factors, goals, and strategies.

The new governing arrangements supported by government officials require policy and political incentives and limited authority to promote investments for scarce resources. However, in participatory governance and public participation there is not any preferred approach across many policy domains. The institutional governance arrangements support the structure of territorial governments and the political leadership as relevant factors of city-wide governing based on authority and institutional resources needed for the implementation of the inclusion policy by the institutional local government. The territorial cooperation processes of participatory governance need to be developed by a facilitator with legal instruments in accordance with the political tools aimed to elaborate public policies at the different levels of government.

Ethics in participatory governance supports the ethical and moral arguments and the ethicization of policy debates in specific issue areas of governance and the actions of participants. Institutions that made a policy decision regarding the use of a participatory approach, it may not mean necessarily that is using it in a responsive, flexible, and dynamic manner.

References

- Adams, B. (2004). Public meetings and the democratic process. *Public Administration Review*, 64(1): 43-54.
- Alexander, J. C. (2006). *The Civil Sphere*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Alfaro, D. (2010, April 19). *Montreal's borough system*. Retrieved from <http://meslin.wordpress.com/2010/04/19/boroughs/>
- Ansell, C. K. (2011). *Pragmatist democracy: Evolutionary learning as public philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ansell, C. and Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4).543-571.
- Baltà Portolés, J. (2017) Towards more collaborative cultural governance. In: *Reshaping Cultural Policies. Advancing creativity for development*. Paris: UNESCO. pp. 35-53. Available online at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0026/002605/260592e.pdf> (2/2/2018).
- Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (2010). *The State as Cultural Practice*. OUP Oxford.
- Bonet, L. and Négrier, E. (2018) The participative turn in cultural policy: Paradigms, models, contexts. In: *Poetics*, Volume 66, February 2018. pp. 64-73.
- Brenner, N., Theodore, N., (2002). Cities and the Geographies of Actually Existing Neoliberalism, in Brenner, N., Theodore, N. (eds.), *Spaces of neoliberalism. Urban restructuring in North America and Western Europe*, Blackwell, Oxford. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8330.00246
- Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives*. University of California Press.
- Busenberg, G. J. (2001) Learning in Organizations and Public Policy. *Journal of Public Policy*, 21 (2), pp.173-189.
- Carson L, Hartz-Karp J. (2005). Adapting and combining deliberative designs: juries, polls, and forums. In: Gastil J, Levine P, editors. *The deliberative democracy handbook: strategies for effective civic engagement in the twenty-first century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2005. p. 120–38.
- Castri, F. C. R., Veiga Simão, J., Granato, P. (2020). Co-creating app-based policy measures for mobility behavior change: A trigger for novel governance practices at the urban level, *Sustainable Cities and Society*, Volume 53, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101911>.
- Choi, T. (2014). Revisiting the Relevance of collaborative governance to Korean public administration. *Korean Journal of Policy Studies*, 29(2): 21-41.
- Connick, S. & J. Innes (2003) Outcomes of Collaborative Water Policy Making: Applying Complexity Thinking to Evaluation. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 46 (2). pp.177-197.

- d'Albergo, E., Lefèvre, Ch., (2007), Why cities are looking abroad and how they go about it, *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, vol. 25, n° 3. DOI: 10.1068/c2503ed
- Doberstein, C. (2016). Designing collaborative governance decision-making in search of a collaborative advantage. *Public Management Review*, 18(6): 819-841.
- Freeman, J. (1997). Collaborative governance in the administrative state. *UCLA Law Review*, 1(1): 1-98.
- Frieling, M. A., Lindenberg, S. M., & Stokman, F. N. (2014). Collaborative Communities through coproduction: Two case studies. *American Review of Public Administration*, 44 (1): 35-58.
- Gerlak, A. K., Heikkila, T., & Lubell, M. (2012). The promise and performance of collaborative governance. In S. Kamieniecki and M. E. Kraft (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of U.S. environmental policy* (pp. 413-434). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gunningham, N. (2009). The new collaborative environmental governance: The localization of regulation. *Journal of Law and Society*, 36(1): 145-166.
- Harmon, M. M. (1995). *Responsibility as paradox: A critique of rational discourse on government*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hajer, M. A. and Wagenaar, H. (eds) (2003) *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society* (Theories 238 — 239
- Harter, P. (1982). Negotiating regulations: A cure for the malaise. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 71(1): 1-118.
- Held, D. (2006) *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hertting, N. and Klijn, E.H. (2018). Institutionalization of Local Participatory Governance in France, the Netherlands, and Sweden: Three Arguments Reconsidered. N. Hertting and C. Kugelberg (Eds.) *Local Participatory Governance and Representative Democracy*. New York and London, Routledge.
- Innes, J. & D. Booher (2000) *Public Participation in Planning. New Strategies for the 21st Century*. Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Urban and Regional Development.
- Jancovich, L. (2017) The participation myth. In: *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23 (1). pp. 107 – 121.
- Jancovich, L. (2015) Breaking Down the Fourth Wall in Arts Management: The Implication of Engaging Users in Decision-Making. In: *International Journal of Arts Management*. Special Issue. Cultural Audiences and Populations: New Challenges for Creation and Appropriation, Vol. 18., No. 1., Fall 2015. pp. 14 – 28.
- Jancovich, L. (2011) Great art for everyone? Engagement and participation policy in the arts. In: *Cultural Trends*, 20, 3 – 4. pp. 272 – 279.
- Jennings, B (1987) Interpretation and the practice of policy analysis. In: F. Fischer & J. Forester (eds.) *Confronting values and policy analysis: The politics of criteria*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Jessop, B., (2002) Liberalism, Neoliberalism and Urban Governance: A State-Theoretical Perspective, in Brenner N., Theodore N. (eds.), *Spaces of neoliberalism. Urban restructuring in North America and Western Europe*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8330.00250
- Kelly, T. (2004). Unlocking the iron cage: Public administration in the deliberative democratic theory of Jürgen Habermas. *Administration and Society*, 36(1): 38-61.

- Lee, J. (2016) Designed to Succeed: Participatory Governance, Transaction Cost, and Policy Performance. *Korean Journal of Policy Studies*, Vol.31 No.2 pp. 1-22
- Lubell M (2000) Cognitive conflict and consensus building in the national estuary program. *American Behavioral Scientist* 44(4): 629–648.
- Luger, M. (2004). Engineer, Ninham Shand; Author of Skuifraam Dam EIA. Interview on 18 May.
- Marcus, A. A., Geffen, D. A., & K. Sexton. (2002). *Reinventing environmental regulation: Lessons from Project XL*. Washington DC: RFF Press
- Mayntz, R., ed. (1980), *Implementation politischer Programme*, Koningstein: Athenäum.
- Mayntz, R., Scharpf, F. (1975), *Policy Making in the German Federal Bureaucracy*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Mee, S. (1997). Negotiated rulemaking and combined sewer overflows (CSOs): Consensus saves ossification? *Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review*, 25(1):213-245.
- Montin, S. and Granberg, M. (2013). *Moderna Kommuner*. Stockholm: Liber.
- Nagy, S. (2015) *Integration Through Culture? Participatory Governanace in the European Capitals of Culture Programme*. Budapest: Central European University.
- Neshkova, M. I., & Guo, H. (2012). Public participation and organizational performance: Evidence from state agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(2): 267-288.
- Nicholson-Crotty, S., & O’Toole, L. J. (2004). Public management and organizational performance: The case of law enforcement agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 14(1): 1-18.
- Paletta, A. (2012). Public governance and school performance. *Public Management Review*, 14(8): 1125-1151.
- Papadopoulos, Y., Warin, P., (2007), Are innovative, participatory, and deliberative procedures in policy making democratic and effective? *European Journal of Political Research* , vol. 46. DOI: [10.1111/j.1475-6765.2007.00696.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2007.00696.x)
- Primorac, J. and Obuljen Koržinek, N. (2016) *Compendium Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe. Country profile: Croatia*. Last profile update: July 2016. Council of Europe/ERICarts. Available online at: <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/countries-profiles-download.php> (2/2/2018).
- Rigg, C., & O’Mahony, N. (2013). Frustrations in collaborative working. *Public Management Review*, 15(1): 83-108.
- Roberts, N. C. (2002). Keeping public officials accountable through dialogue: Resolving the accountability paradox. *Public Administration Review*, 62(6): 658-669.
- Robertson, P. J., & Choi, T. (2012). Deliberation, consensus, and stakeholder satisfaction. *Public Management Review*, 14(1): 83-103.
- Rowe G, Frewer LJ. (2004). Evaluating Public-Participation Exercises: A Research Agenda. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*. 29(4):512-556. doi:[10.1177/0162243903259197](https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243903259197)
- Sartori, G. (1987) *The Theory of Democracy Revisited*. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House.
- Savitch, H., Kantor, P., (2002), *Cities in the international marketplace: the political economy of urban development in North America and in Western Europe*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Sclove, R. (1995) *Democracy and Technology*. London: The Guilford Press.

- Speer, (2012). Participatory Governance Reform: A Good Strategy for Increasing Government Responsiveness and Improving Public Services? *World Development* 40 (12), 2379–2398.
- Sternfeld, N. (2013) *Playing by the Rules of the Game*. Helsinki: Department of Art, Aalto University. Available online at: https://cummastudies.files.wordpress.com/2013/08/cummapapers1_sternfeld1.pdf (5/2/2018).
- Singleton, S. (2002). Collaborative environmental planning in the American West: The good, the bad and the ugly. *Environmental Politics*, 11(3): 54-75.
- Sørensen, A. S., Kortbek, H.B. and Thobo-Carlson, M. (eds) (2016) *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift*. Vol. 19. No. 1. Available online at: <https://www.idunn.no/nkt/2016/01> (8/3/2018).
- Sveriges Kommuner och Landsting, SKL (2009) *Civilsamhället som utvecklingskraft. Positionspapper*. Stockholm: SKL.
- Trägårdh, L. (2011) Rethinking the Position of Civil Society in the Nordic Social Contract: Social Trust and Radical Individualism, in Wijkström, F. & Zimmer, A. (eds) *Nordic Civil Society at a Cross-Roads*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Trägårdh, L. och Vamstad, J. (2009) *Att ge eller beskattas. Avdragsrätt för gåvor till ideella organisationer i Sverige och andra länder*. Stockholm: Sektor 3. p. 239
- Venter, D. (2006). *Chair, Berg Water Project Environmental Monitoring Committee*. Interview on 17 August.
- Wampler, B. and Avritzer, L. (2004). Participatory Publics: Civil Society and New Institutions in Democratic Brazil. *Comparative Politics* 36 (3): 291-312
- Wang, X., & Wart, M. W. (2007). When public participation in administration leads to trust: An empirical assessment of managers' perceptions. *Public Administration Review*, 67(2): 265-278.
- Wondolleck, J. M., & S. L. Yaffee. (2000). *Making collaboration work: Lessons from innovation in natural resource management*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

