Strengthening Participatory Approaches to Local Governance:
Learning the Lessons from Abroad

BY JOHN GAVENTA

Portions of this essay are adopted from a working paper prepared by John Gaventa for the Neighborhood Renewal Unit of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in the United Kingdom, on "Representation, Community Leadership, and Participation: Citizen Renewal in Neighborhood Renewal and Local Governance." The full version may be found at www.ids.ac.uk/logolink.

In Porto Alegre, Brazil, every year thousands of citizens gather in neighborhood meetings to debate and deliberate on local priorities, and to elect representatives to negotiate with other neighborhoods and local officials to approve the annual budget.

In Indonesia, following decades of authoritarian rule, hundreds of "forum wargas" (citizens' forums) have emerged as a new space where citizens, local officials, business, and other sectors can meet, discuss local issues openly, and identify solutions.

In the Philippines, local government legislation has created spaces for local community organizations and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) to sit at the same table with local elected officials to draw up development plans. Through a national coalition of NGOs, community groups and local officials are working together in new ways, and creating changes in how services are delivered.

In Uganda, villagers across the country are involved in participatory approaches to developing priorities for the national budget through a program involving the finance ministry, national NGOs, and district and local governments.

These are just several of thousands of innovations around the globe in which citizens and governments are coming together in new ways to participate, deliberate, and develop solutions to pressing social, economic, and community development issues.

> Citizens and governments are coming together in new ways to participate, deliberate, and develop solutions to pressing social, economic, and community development issues.

Although in recent years deliberative and participatory approaches to local governance have been gaining increased attention in the United States and in parts of Europe, much can be learned from poorer countries of the world, many of whom are in the process of creating new democracies after a long period of colonial or authoritarian rule.

In June 2004, members of LogoLink, an international consortium (largely based in "southern" or developing countries) dedicated to promoting learning about how to strengthen citizen participation in local governance, came together with members of the Deliberative Democracy Consortium, a network largely made up of representatives from "northern" or developed countries, to share their experiences. There were differences of history, language, and culture, but commonalities were quickly found.[1]

In this essay, I review the emergence of new forms of participatory governance in other countries, point to some innovative strategies and legal frameworks for strengthening citizen engagement, and suggest some lessons that can perhaps be applied to the growing field of deliberative and participatory governance in the United States, as well as other countries.

From Government to Governance: The Broadening Basis of Democratic Participation

In recent years, a number of studies, among them several articles in earlier issues of this journal, have pointed to the gap that exists in northern democracies between ordinary people and the institutions that affect their lives. Other studies point to similar trends in southern, developing countries, especially in relation to how poor people see government. For instance, the World Bank's *Voices of the Poor* study finds that many poor people around the globe perceive large institutions—especially those of the state—to be distant, unaccountable, and corrupt.[2] The *Voices of the Poor* study is not alone in its findings. Another study by the Commonwealth Foundation in more than forty countries also found a growing disillusionment of citizens with their governments; it is based on their concern with corruption, lack of responsiveness to the needs of the poor, and disconnection from the lives of ordinary citizens.[3]

Although the "democratic deficit" is now widely recognized, there has often been disagreement about how to respond. On the one hand, attention has been given to strengthening the processes of citizen *participation*: how ordinary citizens exercise voice through new forms of inclusion, consultation, and mobilization designed to inform and influence larger institutions and policies. On the other hand, growing attention has been paid to how to strengthen the accountability and responsiveness of these institutions and policies through changes in institutional design, and a focus on the enabling structures for good government.

> Although the "democratic deficit" is now widely recognized, there has often been disagreement about how to respond.

Increasingly, however, we are beginning to see the importance of working on both sides of the equation. As participatory approaches are scaled up from projects to policies, they inevitably enter the arenas of government and find that participation can become effective only as it engages with issues of institutional change. As concerns about government responsiveness grow, questions about how citizens engage and make demands on the state also come to the fore. In this debate, we have seen a shift in discussion from being about *government* to *governance,* focusing on broad forms of involvement among the state, civil society, and market.

In both South and North, there is growing consensus that the way forward is to focus on both a more active and engaged citizenry and a more responsive and effective state that can deliver needed public services. Within this debate, citizens move from being simply "users or choosers" of public services policies made by others to "makers and shapers" of policies themselves.[4] In this process, participation means more than consultation; it involves shared responsibilities for decision making in establishing policies and allocating resources.

> There is growing consensus that the way forward is to focus on both a more active and engaged citizenry and a more responsive and effective state that can deliver needed public services.

In response to this agenda, a number of initiatives around the world have sought to find new forms of governance, which link citizens and states in new ways and seek to rebuild the relationships between citizens and their governments. Several common characteristics underlie these various initiatives:

- Concern with more active and participatory forms of citizenship. Such views go well beyond the notion of the citizen as consumer, as articulated during the 1980s and early 1990s, to the citizen who engages in policies and in delivery of services. They also profess to go beyond consul-

tation to deeper, more empowered forms of involvement.

- Concern with inclusion, especially of poor people, racial and ethnic minorities, youths, older people, and others seen as previously excluded or marginalized.
- Simultaneous concern with involvement of multiple stakeholders in new forms of partnership, which in turn enable wider "ownership" of decisions and projects.
- Concern with the quality and methods of deliberation, including use of knowledge and dialogue to support and legitimate policy decisions.
- Emphasis on broader forms of accountability, which enable multiple partners to hold institutions and policy makers to account, and which involve social accountability as well as legal, fiscal, and political forms.

Through this approach, the hope is that participation will not only contribute to overcoming the democratic deficit through better governance and a more engaged citizenry but also meet developmental goals of improved communities and service delivery.

Emerging Strategies

The extent to which these goals are being realized in new participatory initiatives is now widely debated around the globe. What has become clear, however, is that a rich range of innovations and methods are being used for strengthening participation in the areas of policy and governance.

In earlier work, Anne-Marie Goetz and I reviewed a number of these mechanisms. We argue that the various approaches may be seen along a continuum, ranging from ways of strengthening voice at one end to ways of strengthening receptivity to voice on the part of government institutions at the other. The "voice" end of the spectrum, we argue, must begin with examining or creating the preconditions for voice, through awareness raising and building the capacity to mobilize; that is, the possibility for engagement cannot be taken as a given, even if mechanisms are created.[5]

As citizens who are outside of governance processes begin to engage with government, there are a series of strategies through which their voices may be amplified, ranging from advocacy to citizen lobbying for policy change and citizen monitoring of performance. Then, as we move along the spectrum of engagement, there are the more formalized arenas in which civil society works with the state in jointly managing and implementing public services (through various forms of partnership), as well as in joint planning and deliberation.

Just as there are a number of mechanisms for amplifying voice, the paper argues, so they must also be strengthened by initiatives that improve receptivity to voice within the state. These include government-mandated forms of citizen consultation, standards through which citizens may hold government accountable, various incentives to encourage officials to be responsive to citizen voice, changes in organizational culture, and legal provisions that in various ways make participation in governance a legal right.

Toward Participation as a Right of Citizenship

Regardless of the methods or strategies used, participatory approaches are more likely to have the greatest potential for influence if they can be strengthened by claims to participation as a legal right. The right to participation is potentially a more empowered form of engagement than participation by invitation from governments, donors, or higher authorities. It also supplements and extends other important democratic rights, such as the right to free and fair elections, and to assembly and freedom of expression.

> Participatory approaches are more likely to have the greatest potential for influence if they can be strengthened by claims to participation as a legal right.

One area in which new rights to participation are being embodied into law is that of local governance.

In 2003, LogoLink carried out research in nineteen countries on legal frameworks that have the potential to enable and strengthen citizen participation.[6] The legal frameworks are not sufficient by themselves, but they constitute an enabling factor to more empowered forms of participation. A number of approaches have been developed.

Joint Approaches to Planning
In the Philippines, for instance, the 1991 Local Government Code (LGC) requires citizen participation at all levels of local government through local development councils. Participation is mandated in the areas of development planning, education, health, bids and contracts, and policing. In theory, the LGC also permits direct representation of civil society and voluntary organizations on local government bodies, though this has been implemented unevenly. Legislation also mandates funds for training citizen representatives so they can participate effectively.

Perhaps the largest experiment in the joint approach is found in Brazil, where the new Constitution of 1988, termed at the time the "Citizens Constitution," affirmed public participation in delivery of local services as a democratic right. This has resulted in creation across the country of municipal-level councils that link elected officials, neighborhood representatives, and service providers in almost every sector, notably health, education, and youth. The scale of these initiatives is enormous. In the case of health, for instance, more than five thousand health councils were created by the 1988 Constitution, mandated to bring together representatives of neighborhoods, social movements, and civil society organizations with service providers and government representatives to govern health policy at the local level.

By the Constitution, the federal government is also required to transfer decision-making authority over resources to the municipal level as well. In this case, the laws mandating new participation are closely linked with laws relating to decentralization and to integrated planning across local, state, and federal levels. Participation is also linked to Municipal Organic Laws, through which each municipality specifies procedures of public consultation and public hearings and the process of delegation of municipal powers to sectoral councils or committees and to neighborhood committees. However, despite the general orientation of the national constitution toward participation, how local laws for participation are actually implemented may vary a great deal across states and municipalities.

Also in Brazil, such local-level participatory planning is often accompanied by a process of participatory budgeting, made famous now by the example of Porto Alegre. In the case of participatory budgeting, priorities for government funding are established at the neighborhood level through large-scale public forums. The neighborhood assemblies also choose community representatives, who then take the neighborhood priorities to the higher tiers made up of themselves and elected representatives. In a standard representative democracy, the task would be left to civil servants and merely ratified by the local elected bodies.

Changing Forms of Accountability
Further innovations have not only emphasized citizen involvement with local governments in planning but also empowered citizen representatives to hold government to account for properly carrying out the functions of government.

In Bolivia, the Law of Popular Participation of 1994 mandated broad-based participatory processes, starting at the neighborhood level, as part of local government decentralization. It also recognized the importance of social organizations that already existed (including indigenous communities, with their own practices and customs). About fifteen thousand such territorial base organizations are registered to participate in the planning process. In addition, the particular innovation of the Bolivia

law was legally to create citizens' oversight or vigilance committees in each municipality, which are empowered to freeze municipal budgets if actual expenditures vary too far from the planning processes. Again, actual implementation of these laws varies greatly, thanks to differences in understanding, power relations, citizens' awareness, and so on, in differing localities.

> In Porto Alegre, Brazil, some 10 percent of the population has attended a participatory budgeting meeting at least once in the last fourteen years.

Empowered Forms of Local Direct Participation

Although many approaches are looking for new forms of a joint relationship between citizens and elected representatives, others are creating forms of direct citizen participation that complement representative forms of governance with more empowered, direct involvement of citizens at the local level. In Brazil, large-scale neighborhood meetings may be used as part of the process of participatory planning or budgeting. (In Porto Alegre, estimates are that more than one hundred thousand people, representing some 10 percent of the population, have attended a participatory budgeting meeting at least once over the fourteen years of the initiative.) In India, the seventy-third and seventy-fourth Constitutional Amendments gave local governments (the *panchayati raj* system) the task of planning for economic development and social justice. In theory, this process begins at the village level, or the *gram sabha,* though this varies in practice across states. In the State of Madhya Pradesh, a new law was passed in 2001 virtually transferring all powers concerning local development to the village assemblies, including powers related to village development, budgeting, levying taxes, agriculture, natural resource management, village security, infrastructure, education, and social justice. In Kerala, as part of the People's Planning Campaign, local governments received 40 percent of the state budget allocation for local services.

Grassroots planning processes were carried out in thousands of villages that were then approved by direct vote in popular village assemblies.

Strengthening Inclusive Representation of Locally Elected Bodies

Another strategy employed in certain countries has been to try to make local councils more inclusive of traditionally excluded populations. For instance, the same two Constitutional Amendments in India as just mentioned mandated that one-third of the seats should be reserved for women, as well as one-third of the offices of the chairperson. Similar reservations have been made for those of the lower castes and tribes. Making local councils more inclusive, the Constitution also gave them a great deal more power for planning for "economic development and social justice" in twenty-nine separate areas of local development, among them forests, education, and irrigation. Implementation of these new representation processes has been uneven, and the local councils are not always granted adequate financing from central government, but inclusion of new members in the political processes has been vast. About one million women and about 600,000 lower-caste or tribal members have now been elected to local government office.

> Constitutional Amendments in India mandated that one-third of local council seats should be reserved for women, and similar reservations have been made for those of the lower castes and tribes.

Even though none of these approaches offers a panacea, they have created through legislation new roles for community leadership in relationship to local governance. However, the extent to which the legislation itself opens new spaces for participation varies a great deal, according to both the characteristics of the legal frameworks themselves and the broader contextual situation in which they are a part.

Key Lessons and Ways Forward

None of these examples can be given as a blueprint for the way forward in all contexts. What may emerge as a solution in one context may not be appropriate in another, and many of the processes described earlier in other countries are only now being studied and evaluated in detail. Nevertheless, the experiences presented here, as well as others found internationally, do suggest several lessons for how to build more effective forms of participatory local governance.

> Although much of the important work on deliberative democracy in the United States focuses on the quality of "public talk" and dialogue, in many other countries the emphasis has been on inclusion.

Who Participates? A Concern for Inclusion and Social Justice

Although much of the important work on deliberative democracy that has emerged in the United States focuses on the quality of "public talk" and dialogue, in many other countries the emphasis has been first and foremost on inclusion—that is, in seeing participation as a way of addressing critical issues of poverty and social justice by enhancing the voices of those who are directly affected by public policies but who are often excluded from the process of making them. Put more simply, approaches to strengthening citizen participation have often emphasized who gets to the decision-making table, while approaches to deliberation often focus on the quality of conversation that occurs around the table. In fact, both approaches are important; it is not enough to increase participation unless the quality of the decision-making processes also improves. Conversely, better deliberation without broader engagement of the poor and powerless may simply strengthen existing inequities in the status quo.

Working on Both Sides of the Equation

As argued earlier, building new forms of participatory local governance also means working on both sides of the equation. On the one hand, attention must be given to strengthening the capacity of local citizens to exercise voice; at the same time, voice without responsiveness simply builds frustration. There is also the need to build and support the capacity of local governments and representatives to be responsive to community participation, and to learn how to change their roles, attitudes, and behaviors in the new environment.

On the community voice and participation side of the equation, as citizens become "representatives" in deliberations with local bodies, attention may need to be paid to developing certain leadership capacities:

- Knowledge of legal rights, procedures, roles, and responsibilities in the new environment
- Skills in negotiation and conflict resolution
- Skills in representation (how to listen to one's own community; how to report back and be held accountable by them)
- How to practice democratic and collaborative models of leadership

Beyond the level of individual skills and knowledge, attention and support may also need to be given to building:

- Strong, democratic community organizations that know how to select and support community leaders, and to hold them accountable
- Broad-based community knowledge and awareness of the roles and functions of local bodies, the opportunities and processes for community engagement, and the rights and responsibilities of participatory citizenship
- Processes of information sharing and communication that can enable and support a culture of accountability and transparency

On the responsiveness side of the equation, one cannot assume that elected leaders and the staff of government agencies have the skills or support systems to operate effectively in a new environment of participatory local governance. For many decades, gov-

ernment staff and elected officials have been trained to act for the community. Changing to act with the community requires new attitudes and behaviors. As on the community side, support may be needed for elected officials and government staff to learn new knowledge and skills for:

- Understanding the roles and philosophy of participatory and deliberative approaches to governance
- Listening to and engaging with local communities
- Communication, negotiation, and conflict resolution

At the same time, elected officials and staff of government agencies cannot sustain individual learning and change without alteration of bureaucratic cul-

tures and organizations as well. Such changes include the development of:

- Incentive and performance systems that reward responsiveness to community participation
- Built-in systems for consultation and joint planning with communities
- More flexible procedures in areas such as accounting, expenditure flows, and planning, which can respond to changing community needs and priorities
- Clear and accessible processes for transparency and information sharing
- Organizational learning processes and environments that enable elected officials and government agencies to reflect on their own

Table 1. Enabling and Constraining Characteristics of Legal Frameworks for Citizen Participation	
Enabling Characteristics	Constraining Characteristics
Promulgated in response to demands from below and with citizen inputs	Imposed from above without groundswell of popular demand, and overly inspired by prevalent international discourses and tendencies to neglect home-grown discourses and in-country or regional aspirations and sources of inspiration
Seeks to strengthen and improve institutions of representative democracy by better representation of those with least voice, better quality of representation and performance, and through complementing mechanisms of participatory democracy	Seeks only to make the institutions of representative democracy work better, not to challenge them or extend governance relationships beyond them
Recognizes people and civil society organizations as citizens with rights, including the right to participate in governance and auxiliary rights	Treats people and civil society organizations as relatively passive subjects, to be engaged only in nonbinding consultations at a relatively late stage of decision making
Builds in accountability measures that ensure representatives can be recalled and government actors held to account for poor performance	No accountability measures, or measures that are impracticable in real-life situations
Provides for or contemplates in the future a significant degree of fiscal decentralization and citizen participation in fiscal processes, as both an incentive to citizens to participate in local governance and assurance that local government can allocate resources to participatory processes	Centralized power retained over fiscal matters—revenue-raising and allocation—or no participation envisaged in them, contradicting spirit of decentralization and citizen participation and reducing incentives for involvement in local governance
Law(s) accompanied by set of operational guidelines, policies, or capacity-strengthening measures to ensure that the relevant actors are enabled to apply them	Excessive reliance on laws and on a legalistic approach, to the neglect of operational guidelines or provision of practical support and capacity building for implementation

Source: Reprinted by permission from R. McGee with N. Bazaara, J. Gaventa, R. Nierras, M. Rai, J. Rocamora, N. Saule, E. Williams, S. Zermeno, "Legal Framework for Citizen Participation" LogoLink Research Report, Brighton, England: Institute of Development Studies, 2003, pp. 62–63.

performance and that invite monitoring and review by local communities

A great deal of work is now being done in the international development context on organizational learning and changes that support and enable participation. Other pilot work has been done on new training programs for government staff, as well as training for local communities to participate effectively.

Developing and Promulgating Clear "Rules and Roles of Engagement"
As discussed in earlier sections, new forms of participatory governance create uncertainty about roles and new ways of doing things. For participatory governance to work, old rules of engagement need to be replaced by new ones that outline clearly the processes for inclusion and decision making, and the new roles, rights, and responsibilities of the various parties. Otherwise, old procedures are likely to kick in, even if the process looks more inclusive and participatory. These new rules and roles need to be mutually agreed and openly negotiated.[7] In the famous Porto Alegre case, though budget priorities are now decided in a new, far more participatory process than was used a decade ago, this has not been in the absence of clear procedures. A participatory budgeting manual has been developed that clearly outlines the process, the timeline for meetings and decisions, and the rights and responsibilities of the citizenry (as well as the leaders). These handbooks are widely disseminated in popular format.

Who Speaks for Whom? The Challenge of Representation
Debate about democracy has often contrasted "representative" forms of governance, in which leaders are elected by their constituents to represent them, and more direct or participatory forms of governance, in which citizens participate in many ways beyond electing and holding elected leaders to account. Yet even these participatory processes also include processes of representation, through which some speak for others as intermediaries in policy discussion, often through claims to legitimacy other than election. For instance, citizen representatives can claim legitimacy through their experience, identity with a certain group, leadership in neighborhood associations, and so on.

> Though leaders are elected from "the community," who counts as that community?

Increasingly, as governance processes are opened to diverse forms of engagement, questions are raised about who speaks for whom and on what basis. Though leaders are elected from "the community," who counts as that community? If representatives come from key organizations, how are those organizations chosen and credentialed, and how are the leaders accountable to their members? If they are chosen to represent particular "identities," who participates in the process, and which identities are represented in broader public processes? Far more work needs to be done to understand the forms of representation and legitimacy that are emerging in these participatory governance processes, and how they interact with more traditional electoral processes.[8]

> Engaging in participatory governance takes time. These processes are often messy and difficult, and they can lead to burnout.

Improving Incentives for Engagement and Quality Representation
Engaging in participatory governance takes time. These processes are often messy and difficult, and they can lead to burnout. For communities and local officials to invest the time and effort for high-quality participation and deliberation, there must be some incentives; they must be able to see some results or some evidence that their participation

matters. Fung and Wright argue that it is most possible to gain "broad and deep participation" in participatory governance approaches that offer a "real prospect of exercising state power"[9]—that is, where some genuine decisions are *really* on the table.

One area that is found to make a difference in sustained, quality participation is fiscal processes of local governance. Where resources can be seen to be generated or reallocated through community participation and deliberation, then such engagement is more likely to be seen as making a difference. In Porto Alegre, for instance, popular participation and engagement in the budgeting process continues to expand year by year. In part, this is because people could see outcomes of their engagement: reduction in corruption and malpractice, improvement in the political behavior of elected and bureaucratic local officials, and most significant a redistribution of resources through higher taxes on the middle class and wealth sectors along with a change of spending toward the priorities of the deprived and poor.[10]

Garnering Support from Nongovernmental Allies
A further lesson from successful experiments in participatory governance is that they often happen with the support not only of local and central government but also of significant other civil society allies, such as political parties and social movements. In his study of participatory governance initiatives in South Africa, India (Kerala), and Brazil, for instance, Heller finds that "civil society and social movements are critical to any sustainable process of democratic decentralization."[11] Similarly, Wainwright argues that "the feasibility and legitimacy of the participatory process is enormously enhanced by the existence and electoral success of a party that believes in it." There are trade-offs, but "the end result is that the organs of representative government lose some power to the new participatory sphere. But the new system of managing public resources through a combination

of electoral and participative democracy involves an overall gain in democratic legitimacy and as a result, potentially, in power."[12] The broader point is that the pressure for increased deliberative and participatory innovation cannot come from government alone.

Naming and Addressing Power Relationships
To be meaningful, participatory processes must engage with and change power relationships. Simply creating new openings and spaces for community leaders to participate does not by itself change power; even if new actors enter the new participatory spaces, their interactions may simply replicate and reproduce preexisting power relationships.[13] Or, even though providing openings for some to participate more, new spaces for participation may also be surrounded by forms of power that shape who enters the space in the first place, on what issues, and with what effect. Similarly, internalized forms of powerlessness (for example, long-established forms of deference based on class, gender, education, or other hierarchy) may affect the ability of community leaders to exercise their voice effectively even when they do enter new participatory spaces.

Naming power relationships and helping community leaders learn to map how they affect participatory processes constitute the first step in beginning to confront them. In some situations, strategies for dealing with power may involve strengthening the capacity of participants to alter the micropolitics of engagement in a given deliberative space; in other cases, they may involve recognizing the power barriers that keep potential leaders from entering such a space in the first place.[14]

The positive exercise of power in participatory processes requires the existence of certain preconditions, among them basic awareness of rights (including the right to participate), an ability to mobilize and act collectively, and the ability to communicate

with others perceived as having more power. In the absence of such preconditions, simply opening up a deliberative space means only that it is likely to be filled by more powerful actors and thus reinforce the status quo. Further work, time, and resources are needed in such a case to develop the preconditions necessary for effective participation and leadership to occur.

The Importance of Context

Strategies and forms for participatory governance that work in one context may not work in another. Much depends on local or regional context, even within a given country. Within each of the countries mentioned in the previous section of this essay, implementation of the laws varied enormously, in interaction with other factors such as the existing level of trust between government and citizens at the local level, the strength and experience of the civil society, the support of political parties or other social actors who also saw community participation as important, and the level of openness and transparency within local government. The variations that exist across contexts suggest the need for:

- Mapping tools that can help to assess the "preparedness" of communities and local governments for participatory approaches, as well as their own understanding of patterns and sources of existing leadership.
- Recognition that some localities may need more support in early stages to help to build the preconditions for participation. In other localities, with existing experiences of working together, more rapid progress may be made.

Taking Time and Going Slow

Developing new forms of community leadership and political representation takes time. As pointed out earlier, the moves to participatory governance at the local level in many countries run counter to decades—sometimes centuries—of a totally different

kind of political culture. New attitudes, new forms of trust and collaboration, new skills and capacities, new models of leadership and power sharing—all take time to develop and to grow.

> The moves to participatory governance at the local level in many countries run counter to decades—sometimes centuries—of a totally different kind of political culture.

Given this, a key lesson from international experience is not to rush to scale too quickly, and to think carefully about strategies for spreading and mainstreaming good practice. The temptation is to attempt to scale up from above, rapidly, and through sweeping changes in government procedures or approaches. Previous points have argued for the importance of enabling legislative and strong coordination from the center, but equally important for instilling good practice is development of local ownership and supporting horizontal forms of spread. In this approach, the scaling up occurs more slowly, through supporting local precedents that can become models of new relationships between community leaders and elected representatives, and then encouraging the spread of such models through peer-to-peer exchanges and learning, not only at the community level but also among elected officials and government leaders, and highlighting and rewarding positive changes.[15]

This lesson about taking time for relationships to change and new practices to grow is particularly important in how performance is measured. Expecting too much too quickly can lead to superficial change; not expecting enough, or not expecting an appropriate level of change, can send the signal that these areas of participation and deliberation are not important. Similarly, one-size-fits all indicators of performance may not be appropriate because, as was discussed earlier, certain communities may have

more preconditions in place than others for achieving better relationships between community leaders and government representatives. Participatory development of the indicators themselves has often been found to be a vehicle for strengthening communication among diverse stakeholders, and enabling them to better understand their synergies and differences.[16]

Conclusion

Around the world, a number of initiatives are seeking to develop and institutionalize new forms of participatory governance and link them to the solution of pressing community-level social and economic problems. The core assumption of these approaches is this: greater citizen engagement is not only a means of addressing issues of poverty and social justice; it is also a means of tackling the growing democratic deficit that is now widely discussed in both "mature" and "emerging" democracies.

In the process of innovation, deeper forms of democracy are being created from which public officials, citizens, and researchers in the United States have much to learn, and much to offer from their own experience as well. At the workshop in Washington in June 2004 in which members of the overseas-based LogoLink network and the USA-based Deliberative Democracy Consortium shared their experience, there was a great deal of enthusiasm for fostering new ways in which such international dialogue can continue to grow. At a time when much of the national debate is couched in the language of fear and homeland security, expanded international conversation and learning on civic engagement and deepening democracy might offer more hopeful possibilities for the future.

ENDNOTES

1. Further information about LogoLink may be found at www.ids.ac.uk/logolink. Information about the Deliberative Democracy Consortium is at www.deliberative-democracy.net. Special thanks to the Hewlett Foundation for making this workshop possible.

2. Narayan, D., Chambers, R., Shah, M. K., and Petesch, P. *Voices of the Poor: Crying Out for Change.* Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 2000.

3. Commonwealth Foundation. *Citizens and Governance: Civil Society in the New Millennium.* London: Commonwealth Foundation, 1999.

4. Cornwall, A., and Gaventa, J. "From Users and Choosers to Makers and Shapers: Repositioning Participation in Social Policy." *IDS Bulletin,* 2000, *31*(4), 50–62.

5. Goetz, A. M., and Gaventa, J. "From Consultation to Influence: Bringing Citizen Voice and Client Focus into Service Delivery." IDS Working Paper no. 138. Brighton, England: Institute of Development Studies, 2001.

6. McGee, R., and others. "Legal Frameworks for Citizen Participation." LogoLink Research Report. Brighton, England: Institute of Development Studies, 2003.

7. Wainwright, H. *Reclaim the State: Experiments in Popular Democracy.* London: Verso, 2003.

8. For further elaboration of these issues, see Cornwall, A., and Coelho, V. *New Democratic Spaces.* IDS Bulletin, 2004, *35*(2).

9. Fung, A., and Wright, E. O. "Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance." *Politics and Society,* 2001, *29*(1), 27. See also Fung, A., and Wright, E. O. *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance.* London: Verso, 2003.

10. Navarro, Z. "Participation, Democratizing Practices and the Formation of a Modern Polity: The Case of 'Participatory Budgeting' in Porto Alegre, Brazil (1989–1998)." *Development,* 1998, *41*(3), 68–71.

11. Heller, P. "Moving the State: The Politics of Democratic Decentralisation in Kerala, South Africa, and Porto Alegre." *Politics and Society,* 2001, *29*(1), 134.

12. Wainwright (2003), p. 190.

13. Cornwall, A. "Making Spaces, Changing Places: Situating Participation in Development." IDS Working Paper no. 170. Brighton, England: Institute of Development Studies, 2002.

14 . VeneKlasen, L., and Miller, V. *A New Weave of People, Power and Politics: The Action Guide for Advocacy and*

Citizen Participation. Oklahoma City, Okla.: World Neighbors, 2002.

15. Blackburn, J., Chambers, R., and Gaventa, J. "Mainstreaming Participation in Development." In N. Hanna and R. Picciotto (eds.), *Making Development Work.* London: Transaction, 2002.

16. Estrella, M., and others. *Learning from Change: Issues and Experiences in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.* London: IT Publications, 2000.

John Gaventa is a professor at the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, where he coordinates the Participation Group and the LogoLink program.

For bulk reprints of this article, please call (201) 748-8789.