

Managing stakeholder involvement in decision-making

A comparative analysis of six interactive processes in The Netherlands

Jurian Edelenbos

Erik-Hans Klijn

Abstract^a

Initiatives to encourage and stimulate the involvement of citizens but also various societal organisations in decision-making can be seen in a wide variety of European countries.

Citizens panels, citizens charters, new forms of participation and other forms are being used to increase the influence of citizens on decision making and to improve the relation between citizens and elected politicians.

In the Netherlands a lot of local governments have experimented with interactive decision-making that is enhancing the influence of citizens and interest groups on public policy making. Main motives to involve stakeholders in interactive decision making are diminishing the veto power of various societal actors by involving them in decision making, improving the quality of decision making by using information and solutions of various actors and bridging the perceived growing cleavage between citizens and elected politicians.

In this article six cases are being evaluated. The cases are compared on three dimensions:

^a This article is a revision of a paper written for the Conference on Governance and Performance: organizational status, management capacity and public service on 15-16 March 2004 in Birmingham (School of Public Policy University of Birmingham). The conference was part of the ESRC/EPSR Advanced Institute for Management Research (AIM) program. E.H. Klijn would like to thank the University of Birmingham for inviting him as AIM fellow. The authors would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers of JPART for their comments.

- the nature and organisation of participation
- the way the process is managed (process management)
- the relation with formal democratic institutions

These organizational features (both in terms of formal organization and in terms of actual performance) are being compared with the results of the decision-making processes in the six cases. The article shows that the high expectations of interactive decision-making are not always met. It also shows that managing the interactions- in network theory called process management- is very important for achieving satisfactory outcomes.

J. Edelenbos is assistant professor and **E.H. Klijn** is associate professor at the Center for Public Management, Department of Public Administration at Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

P.O. Box 1738; 3000 DR Rotterdam; The Netherlands

Edelenbos@fsw.eur.nl; Klijn@fsw.eur.nl

1. Introduction

All over the world, governments are exploring different types of decision-making that considers the increased interdependency of public actors on private, semi-private and other public actors. This also enhances the opportunity for citizen involvement in decision-making.

This trend – in which public actors increasingly use old and new types of citizen involvement in decision-making – can be seen in all western democracies. It occurs under labels such as citizen panels but also under labels such as community governance, open planning procedures and others (see, e.g., McLaverty, 2002; Van Deth et al., 2003; Lowndes, Pratchet and Stoker, 2001).

Interactive decision-making

In the past few years there has been substantial experimentation with interactive decision-making in the Netherlands. Interactive governance is described in this article as a way of conducting policies whereby a government involves its citizens, social organizations, enterprises and other stakeholders in the early stages of the policy-making process (Edelenbos, 1999). The difference with more traditional public policy procedures is that parties are truly involved in the development of policy proposals while in classic opportunities of public comment, citizen and interest group involvement only occurred once the policy proposal had been developed. Interactive decision-making is a policy practice. It is an experimental form of decision-making practices mainly at the local level but also in some cases at the central level (Edelenbos, 2000, Klijn, 2003). As such it is interesting to evaluate this new practice as is done in this article. We see interactive decision-making in this article as a new form of network governance, which we try to evaluate empirically.

Interactive decision-making is not without problems. Often, it does not fit the ‘normal’ decision-making procedures, so separate organisational provisions have to be developed in order to conform to these ‘new’ decision-making procedures. Evaluating the connection

of this new policy practice with existing decision-making and evaluating the guidance of this new practice (we call this process management in this article) thus seems important. In this paper we evaluate the outcomes and backgrounds of six interactive decision-making processes and their organisational arrangements in the Netherlands. The most important question we want to address in this paper is “What is the influence of organisational arrangements on the outcomes of interactive policy processes?”

Outline of this article

Before we discuss the outcomes of these six processes (section three), we first discuss some backgrounds of interactive decision-making. We also sketch briefly our theoretical framework, network theory, and also pay attention to the question of the tension between new governance forms (of which interactive decision-making is one) and existing democratic institutions, which can be found in the governance literature (section two). In sections four, five and six, we discuss and assess the impact of three factors that are considered to influence the outcomes of interactive decision-making: process design and management of the interactive decision-making process, the degree of participation, and the relation with existing political institutions. Finally, in section seven, we compare the cases to discover correlations between organisational arrangements and outcomes of interactive decision-making processes. We end this article in section eight with conclusions.

2. Interactive decision-making: an overview

For some time now, interactive decision has been used in the Netherlands as a new type of horizontal steering for solving problems (Radford, 1977; Mason/Mitroff, 1981; Edelenbos, 1999; Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004). Interactive decision-making is regarded as a way of increasing citizen involvement in government thereby decreasing the perceived cleavage between government and citizen (Tops et al., 1999; Nelissen et al. 1996) but also as a way to cope with interdependencies in complex processes

Network theory as theoretical framework

Governance and network theories have strongly focused on the changing nature in modern decision-making (see Hanf/Scharpf, 1978; Marsh/Rhodes, 1992; Kickert/Klijn/Koppenjan, 1997; Rhodes, 1997; Scharpf, 1997). They have stressed that many actors are involved in decision-making and that these actors do not only possess vital resources to realise policy goals and outcomes, but also have different perceptions on the problem definition and have different information and ideas on solutions. So stakeholders' interests often collide in complex decision-making; there is much danger that stakeholders block decision-making, because decisions are not in line with their interests. Achieving interesting outcomes often depends on finding attractive solutions, which encourage actors to activate their resources and knowledge for the problem and/or policy process at stake. So decision-making is also finding ways to manage the complexity of the process, combining necessary actors and decision-making arenas and creating interesting solutions.

A specific branch of the governance literature is network theory. Basically the network perspective on public policy sees policy as being formed in interactions between actors with their own perceptions and strategies. These actors are tied to each other by

dependency relations (Scharpf, 1978; Rhodes, 1997; Kickert/Klijn/Koppenjan, 1997; Mandell (ed.) 2001). So policy formation and outcomes are realised through complex interaction games between actors, which have to be managed to achieve interesting outcomes. These management activities are covered by the concept network management (Kickert/Klijn/Koppenjan, 1997; Meier/O'Toole, 2001; Koppenjan/Klijn, 2004). In the literature a wide variety of strategies is mentioned as well as the importance of a process design as starting point in complex interaction processes (De Bruijn/Ten Heuvelhof/In 't Veld, 1998). We take this network perspective as theoretical framework to direct our questions (the importance of process management and process design) and evaluate outcomes. Rather than dealing extensively with the whole theoretical framework of the network perspective (which has already been done elsewhere, for example Kickert et al, 1997) we elaborate some of the assumptions we derived from network theory in the sections to come.

Thus: we view interactive decision-making mainly as a network process, although we are aware that this process can also be positioned in literature on participation and democracy (Arnstein, 1971; Berry/Portney/Thomson, 1993; McLaverty, 2002; Hirst, 1997; Sorenson/Torring, 2003). We touch this literature when we come to speak about the relation between citizens and elected officials. However, we keep a more network perspective; we are interested in what roles elected officials play in complex interactive processes, in which citizens, societal groups and private companies also are actively involved. We do not question the effectiveness of representational democracy as such (see MacLaverty, 2002; Edelenbos, 2005). Moreover, we don't want to go into the institutional tensions between various traditions of democracy (see Klijn/Koppenjan, 2000; Edelenbos, 2000; Sorenson/Torring, 2002). We are mainly interested in the

growing complexity of policy processes, because of the growing number of actors and their interdependencies, and the functioning of the interactive network related to the more traditional representational form in terms of satisfactory outcomes and smooth-running processes.

The ideas on which this paper is build heavily rest upon earlier work (and empirical research) of the authors on governance and network theory. Before we present the empirical material we first discuss how interactive decision-making is supposed to be a solution for some of the problems observed in modern complex decision-making.

Interactive decision-making as real life solution

With interactive decision-making, public actors attempt an alternative way of decision-making that should provide a way out of perceived problems encountered in the usual type of decision-making. Problems that are perceived in policy practices are the fact that decision-making takes a long time due to resistance of various involved actors, that solutions are often not inventive enough, or that there is a large gap between politicians and civil servants and citizens.^a These problems have been discussed extensively in practical discussions and in the literature on governance (see for instance: Kingdon, 1984; Marin/Mayentz, 1991; Schön/Rein, 1994; Rhodes, 1997; Kickert/Klijn/Koppenjan, 1997).^b Interactive decision-making is different from more traditional decision-making procedures. The actual form which the process takes shape differs basically in the sense that it explicitly tries to involve a wide variety of actors. Interactive decision-making is an open decision procedure; it tries to incorporate values and wishes of various involved actors in the solutions that are developed during the interactive process.

With this new form interactive decision-making tries to provide a solution for a number of existing problems in complex decision-making processes, which are:

- *The use of veto power*: There is substantial veto power in decision-making processes because of the involvement of many actors who typically have the means to influence the outcome of decision-making. By involving these actors at an early stage, it is hoped that the use of veto power by the involved actors will decrease and support for decisions will increase. This would accelerate decision-making processes. At any rate, the extra (time) investment necessary for interactive decision-making can be 'profitable' because it will avert lengthy legal procedures.
- *Constantly changing problem formulations*. Since problems are constructions of actors, they have a tendency to change over the course of time as a result of new information, interactions between actors and external developments. Complex problems are characterised by lengthy decision-making. Fixation on a problem formulation early on might mean that a solution is pursued for a problem that appears to be something quite different at the end of the process. By involving more actors in the decision-making process, more and various aspects of the problem can be included in the search for solutions, and problem formulation becomes more flexible. The same argument applies for a premature fixation on solutions.
- *Creating 'poor solutions'*. Go alone strategies and hierarchical policy processes often lead to poor and one-dimensional solutions, because one rationality or perception dominates in the formulation of the solution, other perceptions are excluded (Klijn and Koppenjan, 2004). Since with interactive decision-making not only different perspectives on and ideas about problems and solutions are brought in the process, but also multiple types of knowledge, information, skill and experience are employed,

a better analysis of the problem area is possible and better solutions can be created.

Thus the overall quality of the final policy is enhanced. Interactive decision-making offers the potential to utilise the creativity and experience expertise of those involved in order to address issues on a broader, and possibly innovative, way (Edelenbos, 2000:87).

- *Lack of democratic legitimacy.* When the citizen cannot identify with the policy products of government, the expectation is that they will turn away from government and politics. A number of problems confronting society, such as indifference to rule enforcement, abuse of collective service, overriding norms, and political non-participation are ascribed to this gap (Klijn and Koppenjan, 2000). By involving more actors (and certainly citizens), decision-making acquires a less closed character and more democratic legitimacy.

In time, interactive decision-making is expected to result in richer policy proposals that can be implemented more efficiently and thus raise the democratic legitimacy of the decisions.

Interactive decision-making as organisational arrangement

Interactive decision-making has to be given organisational shape in practice. The form it takes is greatly dependent on the specific situation and context in which these interactive processes are initiated. In this paper, we evaluate the influence of some of these organisational arrangements for interactive policy processes. In this paper, we reflect on the following arrangements for interactive processes:

- The degree of formalisation of the interactive process through process design and process management;
- Stakeholder participation, especially how the ‘depth’ and ‘width’ is organisationally shaped;
- The shaping of the relation between the interactive process and the formal position of the municipal council.

One could argue however that not only the arrangements of interactive decision-making matters, but also the substance of the process, particularly the degree of value conflict on the substance. Effective interactive decision-making depends on how different values and interests are discounted in decisions. We didn’t neglect this feature but took it implicitly into account through the aspects process design and management (the way the process manager responded to changing situations) and stakeholder participation (the degree in which the variety of conflicting values and interests are assimilated in a good manner in the selection process).

The cases: six times interactive decision-making

While interactive processes are organised for decisions at the national level (Edelenbos & Monnikhof, 2001; Klijn 2003), most of the cases can be found at the local level. In this paper, we analyse six local interactive policy processes that all concern planning and zoning decisions. Hence, they occur in more or less the same sectoral regimes. All these cases were studied extensively (sometimes on different occasions and in different research projects) with emphasis on rich description. This article is an attempt to generalise findings of these cases by focusing on a limited number of variables.

The number of inhabitants varies per city/municipality. The six cases are exemplary for other Dutch interactive processes. Table 1 provides an overview of the cases that were studied for this paper.

Please insert table 1

As mentioned each of these cases was studied extensively. We closely monitored the behavior and opinions of all participants in the interactive processes. We held semi-structured interviews with major stakeholders, civil servants, politicians, and process managers at the start and end of the interactive decision making process. In these interviews we reconstructed the perceptions of the stakeholders on the interactive process, their view on the outcomes and how they tried to influence the process. All the way through the interactive process, we also held additional 'update' interviews with key persons, such as process managers and civil servants, and examined the course of the process through observation and document analysis. Next we reconstructed the decision-making process and the main issues. All relevant documents in the process (on the organisation as well as documents that presented ideas, solutions or plans) were studied. Subsequently we reconstructed the ideas that were being brought in the process. The data were collected qualitatively.

We first made a reconstruction of the phases of the interactive decision-making process and the important issues and events in the process. Then we made an in-depth analysis of these issues and events and their outcomes on the interactive process. Because we analyse six cases it is difficult to present very detailed case information. It would take simply too

much space in this paper^c. We therefore present the case information at a certain aggregation level in various tables.

We use the following five-point scale to score the six cases on the three independent variables, i.e. the organisational arrangements:

1. -- (double minus): very low;
2. - (minus): low;
3. +/- (plus minus): average;
4. + (plus): high;
5. ++ (double plus): very high.

This five-point scale is used for all the indicators designed for the three independent variables. Next we translated the scoring on the different indicators per variable in a ranking (1 to 6). The various indicators for the three independent variables will be presented in the subsequent sections 4, 5 and 6. In the next section we score the six cases on their outcomes.^d

3. The outcomes of interactive decision-making: an evaluation

Evaluating the effects of interactive decision-making processes is not easy. Network theory stresses first that many actors are involved so the first question that arises is “whose objectives will be taken as starting points for the evaluation?”. This means that a classic goal evaluation, working with the objectives of a single actor, is not sufficient. Second, it involves dynamic processes where learning processes occur and objectives

change as a consequence of interaction and exchange of information (see, e.g., Klijn and Koppenjan, 2000; Edelenbos, 2000). At the very least, an evaluation should attempt to provide an understanding of these dynamics.

Hence, it is more useful to evaluate the six cases in such a manner that adequately considers the multi-actor nature of the process and the dynamics of the interactive policy processes. Thus we include the following elements in our evaluation:

- *Actor Contentment*. This criterion concerns whether the parties involved are content with the results of the processes. The advantage is that it involves a weighing of outcomes among different actors and that it takes the dynamics into account. After all, actors judge whether the outcome meets the objectives developed during the process (Teisman, 1992; Klijn and Teisman, 1997). The degree to which the outcome of interactive processes is regarded as positive then depends on how satisfied the actors are.^e
- *Enrichment*. This criterion explicitly concerns the substance of the process. When we accept the starting point of network theory (Kickert, Klijn and Koppenjan, 1997; Mandell (ed.), 2001; Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004), i.e. that information for achieving good policy proposals and policy products is dispersed across many actors and that good policy products are characterised by helping to solve the perceived problems of various actors, the enrichment of variety is an important criterion for the substantive enrichment of the solution (see also: Teisman, 1997; Edelenbos and Monnikhof, 2001). In addition to this variety criterion, we also examine whether the variety of ideas actually emerges in the outcomes (decisions, plans, intentions, etc.). We call this the ‘impact’ criterion (Edelenbos, 2000; Edelenbos and Monnikhof, 2001).

We speak of ‘good outcomes’ when actors are satisfied and when there is an enrichment of ideas. To assess the last criterion, enrichment, we first looked at the actual outcome. We then traced ideas, solutions and proposals that had come up in the process and compared them with the initial ideas that were present (mainly formulated in starting documents). The enrichment was large if many different ideas were generated which were not available at the start (variety of ideas) and if we could find many of these proposals in the outcomes of the process (mostly an end document or explicitly formulated statements and decisions at the end). Actor satisfaction was simply measured by looking at how many of the actors were satisfied at the end of the interactive process. Table 2 contains the most important conclusions about the outcomes of interactive decision-making in the six cases. More detailed information on the coding and scoring can be found in Appendix A. On the basis of individual scores, the cases have been ranked in the last column according to their degree of effectiveness. Looking at this table, a few things are striking:

- There are few cases where the outcomes are unambiguously positive. Apparently, it is not easy to transform theoretically defined advantages of interactive decision-making into real and achieved advantages.
- Leerdam and Doetinchem emerge as the most positive. However, Leerdam is the case where the scope of the interactive process was the smallest. It appears that tight conditions and modest ambitions sooner lead to satisfactory outcomes but also to less substantive innovation and enrichment. This is related to the first conclusion. There is hardly a case where we find a high variety of ideas and a high degree of influence. The Doetinchem case comes closest.

- Most problems are in the impact criterion. This is negative in two cases and average in two others.

Now we have described the outcome of the six interactive decision-making processes, it is time to consider the organisational arrangement, i.e. process design and management, stakeholder participation, and the relations with democratic institutions in the following three sections.

Please insert table 2

4. Process design and management

Introduction

In this section we address the role of the process design and process management in the arrangement of local interactive policy processes. Interactive processes are not ‘self-executive’; a separate person (or group of people) is usually assigned to manage the interactive process. It is emphasised in the network literature that such complex processes can only lead to good and satisfying outcomes, when they are intensively supported by process management (Klijn and Koppenjan, 2000; Mandell, 2001). This should also be based on well-designed organisational arrangements (a process design) for interactions (De Bruijn/Ten Heuvelhof/In ‘t Veld, 1998; Edelenbos, 1999). In the Netherlands there

are no laws that prescribe certain a priori rules and norms before conducting interactive decision-making processes.

Process management and design

In practice, interactive processes often evolve according to agreements about substance, participation and rules of the game for the interactive process. These are known as the process design in network theory. Since the process design supports the interaction of the parties, it is of great importance that the participants accept it. Hence, there is no standard design or blueprint for an interactive process. The actual design of the interactive process depends on specific situational features in which the interactive process has to be carried out. Moreover, the process design is not 'self-executive'. It must be developed during the interaction process, applied, and, if necessary, corrected. Together with other activities, this is part of process management (De Bruijn, Ten Heuvelhof and In 't Veld, 1998; Edelenbos, 2000). In other words, there is constant interplay between process design and process management. All the more so since the environment in which the process unfolds is continuously in flux. Hence, the design is not fixed, but it evolves with the process (Koppenjan, 2001). Process management fulfils a crucial role in this. On the basis of theoretical insights, we may expect that interactive processes will yield the best results when the design is well organised (hence: a number of rules of the game for time organisation, conflict management, responsibility, roles, etc.) and when there is active process management during which the process design is flexibly used and focussed on the specific interaction situation.

In order to get an idea of the meaning of process design and process management for the outcome of interactive processes, we examine two elements:

1. Formalisation of the interactive process: is the interactive process fixed in a formal document (process design)? What is regulated in it, including: time phases of the process, determination of budget, role allocation, manner of conflict resolution, accountability, substantive frameworks, auxiliary conditions, etc.? When the process is fixed in a formal document and many different aspects are regulated in that we speak of very high formalisation.
2. Process management: did the process manager accompany the interactive process strictly according to the agreements and rules of the game in the process design or did he adapt these when necessary to secure a smooth unfolding of the process? How active was the process manager?

Comparing the interactive processes

In Table 3, we compare the six interactive processes with regard to the elements of process design and process management. More detailed information on the coding and scoring can be found in Appendix B.

Please insert table 3

Example of blueprint process management: In the case of De Bilt the process starts with a very detailed process design of the interactive process made by the external process manager. The process design contains elements as time phasing, role description of the participants in the process, policy conditions, participation methods, rules to handle conflict, et cetera. The process design has a very detailed character. In the execution of the process the process manager wants to hold firmly to this design. He does not tolerate

any deviations. A striking illustration of this rigid attitude is the reluctance of the Mayor to performing a referendum in order to determine how far the people of De Bilt support the outcomes of the interactive process. The determination of both the process manager and the Mayor results in a political fight, which has negative impact on the course of the interactive process. This process is delayed for several months.

Example of improvised process management: In the case of the Bijlmer the process starts with the creation of a project group in the middle of 1995. Project leaders are two people from the project bureau of the central city, which have experience with this kind of project. In a way given the fact that the decision to install the project group was made by the sub-municipal county these are outsiders. Apart from the official decision to start and redefining the content of the process (which was derived from earlier documents on the Bijlmer as a whole) only some ideas on how to involve tenants were formulated (especially the ones who are normally absent in these processes like the many immigrants who inhabit the Bijlmer and the neighborhood of the case the K-neighbourhood in particular). For this element a participation plan was drafted at the beginning (explicitly accepted by the council at the end of 1995). The sub-municipal council is identified as the organisation that assigns and controls the project leader. But apart from a formal decision to start and the participation plan no other aspects of a process design are agreed upon and no documents exists in which these aspects are regulated. This clearly makes this case in terms of formalisations a low formalisation (only official starting decision and rough decisions on project leaders and an participation plan but no decisions on all the other aspects).

This comparison demonstrates that in all six cases, there is a formalisation of the interactive process through a process design, and only the degree of formalisation varies greatly. The interactive process in De Bilt operated on a very detailed process design where many issues were formally fixed, such as role allocation, final responsibility, time phases, work forms, process organisation, rules of interaction, etc. On the other hand, the interactive processes in Enschede, Leimuiden and Bijlmer worked with a rudimentary

process design that only regulated issues at a very general level. The Leerdam and Doetinchem cases occupy the middle ground.

We see variation in the implementation of the process design. Although all the process managers in the cases are very active, which seems logical given the experimental nature of the decision-making processes, the way they operate is not the same. Thus, in the case of De Bilt, the process manager rigidly holds on to the process design, even when circumstances in the interactive process call for an adaptation of it. This style can be characterised as ‘blueprint process management’. In the cases of Enschede and Bijlmer, we see that a rudimentary process design is ‘compensated’ with a more flexible and active implementation, resulting in a style we call ‘improvising process management’ since deviations from the design often occurred during implementation because of intermediate developments in the interactive process. Leimuiden, like Enschede and Bijlmer, had a rudimentary process design, but also an active process manager rigidly holding on to the main outlines of the design (time phasing, role allocation, etc.).

We qualify adaptive process management (cases Leerdam and Doetinchem) as good management, because there is a reasonably detailed process design that evolves with the developments in the interactive process. Improvised process management (cases Enschede and Bijlmer) is qualified as reasonable process management; although there is a rudimental process design before the start of the interactive process, this is compensated through adequate and creative actions from the process manager. We qualify blueprint process management as moderate; there is a thought-out process design, but the process manager follows this design too rigid during the execution of the interaction process. The process manager ignores meaningful new development in the interactive process, which

has negative impacts on the course of the interactive process (see text box below table 3 for illustration). Process management on main outlines (case Leimuïden) is qualified as bad process management; both process design is rudimental and process management style is inflexible.

5. Stakeholder participation

Introduction

In this section, we discuss stakeholder participation in the interactive process.

Stakeholders include societal organisations, private parties and organised and non-organised citizens.

The depth and width of participation

In order to assess whether the participation structure of an interactive policy process results in more meaningful participation, we consider two dimensions of participation. Inspired by Dahl's 'preconditions for a polyarchy' Berry, et al. (1993:55) formulated two dimensions of participation that are important for a system of *strong participation*. These are *width* and *depth* of participation, which together determine the *strength* of participation in the policy process (see also Wille, 2001). The *width* of participation is the degree to which each member of a community is offered the chance to participate in each phase of the interactive process. The *depth* of participation is determined by the degree to which citizens have the opportunity to determine the final outcome of the interactive process. In the analysis of width and depth of participation, it is important to distinguish

the process on the one hand and the final outcomes of that process on the other. In this section, we only consider the process itself.

Citizens usually become active when invited to participate: hence it is largely mobilised behaviour. This is also the starting point of various types of interactive policy development. In the analysis of width of participation, we consider how municipalities have shaped this 'invitation' policy. In short: what opportunities for participation have been made available? Did citizens frequently receive information about how they could participate? Was participation accessible to all?

An evaluation of the width of participation during the interactive process is focussed on the articulation of interests. The analysis of the depth of participation in the outcome is focussed on the degree and type of influence citizens have had in shaping opinions and the realisation of outcomes.

In order to map the influence of participation, participation ladders are frequently used (e.g., Amstein, 1971:71-78). To determine the depth of participation, participation ladder outline below is used (Edelenbos, 2000:43-44).

1. *Informing*: to a large degree, politics and administration determine the agenda for decision-making and inform those involved. They will not use the opportunity to invite interested actors to provide input in policy development;
2. *Consulting*: to a large degree, politics and administration determine the agenda, but regard those involved as a useful discussion partner in the development of policy. Politics does not, however, commit to the results of these discussions;
3. *Advising*: in principle politics and administration determine the agenda but give those involved the opportunity to raise problems and formulate solutions. These involved actors play a full-fledged role in the development of policy. Politics is

committed to the results in principle but may deviate (if argued) from them in the final decision-making;

4. *Co-producing*: together politics, administration and those involved determine a problem agenda in which they search for solutions together. Politics is committed to these solutions with regard to the final decision-making, after having tested this outcome in terms of a priori conditions;
5. *Co-deciding*: politics and administration leave the development and decision-making of policy to those involved and the civil service provides an advising role. Politics simply accepts the outcomes. Results of the process have an immediate binding force.

These levels are organised in such a way that when the input and involvement of citizens increases, the influence and role of government decreases. At lower levels (consulting and advising), the citizen is regarded as a supplier of ideas, mobilised by local government who wants ideas about specific policies. A higher degree of interaction occurs when citizens help determine the agenda in a particular policy area and co-operate in producing problem definitions and solutions while the final decision rests with local government (co-production). Finally, together with the government, citizens can decide about plans made in co-operation (co-deciding). The different modes of participation in width and depth leads to different types of interorganizational structures (see Mandell & Steelman, 2003).

Reasoned from the motives for interactive decision-making, such as discussed in section two, it is expected that more intensive involvement of participants, both in terms of width as well as depth, must lead to substantively richer policy proposals. Logically, these are

linked to a larger degree of satisfaction among actors with the outcomes. Probably the width of participation is strongly linked to the variety of the outcomes while the depth of participation is more linked to the satisfaction of the outcomes and (logically) to the influence.

Comparing the interactive processes

In Table 4, the six interactive policy processes are compared with regard to stakeholder participation. More detailed information on the coding and scoring can be found in Appendix C.

Please insert table 4

Example: In the case of Leerdam a small working group is formed in which in total 14 representatives of organised interest groups participate (entrepreneurs, ngo's, et cetera). Although this is a rather small participation, it makes it possible to realise a reasonably 'deep participation'. Civil servants and participants work in co-production towards alternatives for the realisation of the renovation of the city square. Ideas for the renovation are developed in extensive and time-consuming design teams and working sessions.

Example: In the case of De Bilt there is a very wide participation. Every citizen has a opportunity to join the interactive process. Through open invitations and direct mailing stakeholders are mobilised. Over 200 participants participate actively in several interactive methods like workshops. Their participation is although not deep. They have the opportunity to raise ideas, but the selection of these ideas is mainly done by civil servants and communicated to Mayor and Aldermen and not to the stakeholders.

When the cases are compared, we see that there is generally fairly broad participation. Only in the Leerdam case is there limited participation. As far as depth of participation is concerned, most cases involve lighter types of participation. Advising and consulting dominate (four cases), while in only two cases do we see a somewhat heavier form (co-production). In characterising the strength of participation (Berry et al., 1993), we see that only the Doetinchem case experienced this. Weak participation was characteristic for the De Bilt, Enschede, Leimuïden and Bijlmer cases. The Leerdam case is difficult to characterise since there was reasonably influential participation, but from few participants.

6. Relation with the municipal council

In this section, we discuss the relation between the interactive processes and the existing democratic institutions at local level, more particularly analysing the relation of the cases to the municipal council.

Co-ordination of interactive process with the political environment

The relation between interactive processes and the existing political-administrative policy world is not without problems. There is a risk that the interactive processes become uncoupled from the ‘normal’ decision-making procedures as is clear from various reflections about interactive decision-making (Edelenbos, 2000; Koppenjan, 2001). The lack of commitment of political officeholders in the normal policy arenas may lead to the emergence of parallel policy making trajectories: the interactive and the traditional

process. Thus, the first question is whether political officeholders have been informed and consulted about the initiative of starting an interactive process? Have they played a role in confirming the process design for the interactive process? These two formal indicators for political involvement are the first to be compared in the cases. We label them with the terms 'initiation' (who initiated the interactive process?) and 'confirmation' (is the initiative for an interactive process solidified in a formal decision by the municipal council?).

Next, organising the feedback moments to the municipal council is important. Lacking co-ordination and feedback between interactive process and the normal policy and decision-making arenas may result in 'hard linkages' at the end of the interactive process: traditional decision-making processes and interactive processes bump into each other. Decision-makers in the 'traditional' decision-making arenas are unaware of or uninvolved in the interactive process. They are surprised by the outcomes and experience these as bothersome. Since they lack commitment to the interactive process, they do not take it into account. Political officeholders ought to be 'taken along' in the interactive policy making learning process and become familiar with the arguments and ideas. This may result in 'soft linkages': although political officeholders make their own assessments, they can use the insights from the interactive process. This requires constant feedback between the interactive process and the governing bodies involved. Here, we call this feedback and examine whether during the interactive process, formal (through regular procedures) and informal (ad hoc through the interactive process) feedback to the municipal council occurred.

Roles of politicians: true participation of the council

Interactive decision-making is a type of direct democracy, which is applied in the game of representative democracy (Lowndes, Pratchett and Stoker. 2001; McLaverty, 2002; Klijn and Koppenjan, 2000). This involves a role conflict for political and administrative officeholders because decisions taken by the direct participation possess a legitimacy of its own which may challenge the legitimacy of the representational decision making channel. As a result, they are sometimes disinclined to participate in interactive processes because they do not want their hands to be tied at the end of the process and thereby be prevented from living up to the mandate given by the electorate. On the other hand, early involvement of these actors may 'kill' the process: there must be something that other parties can bring forward. Keeping political officeholders out of the interactive process raises the chances of a hard linkage at the end. One must search for a co-ordination between political officeholders and interactive process that gives proper consideration to the position of both (Klijn and Koppenjan, 2000). To assess this, we look at the frequency with which council members participate in the interactive process. The idea is that the more they participate in interactive sessions, the better able they are to assess the outcomes of the interaction. We use a threefold division in determining the participation of council members: always to often present, present now and then and once to never present.

Next, we consider the role that council members played if they participated in the interactive process. We distinguish between three types of roles going from passive to active participation: passive auditing/information collection, questioning participants/providing information, active participation.

On the one end of the spectrum is the role of auditor. During the interactive process, council members do not actively engage in discussion and negotiation with each other or

with other participants, but they observe these processes. They do not participate in the discussion and in designing policy, even when participants explicitly request their opinion or perspective.

In the middle of the spectrum is the role of information provider, which includes both passive and active aspects. The passive element concerns, for instance, that prior to the process council members and civil servants provide information in the form of auxiliary conditions, data from reports, memos and results from research. The active part involves providing information during the process, either through presentations and/or brief answers to (informative) questions from participants.

At the other end of the spectrum, we find the role of participant, the most active role. Council members participate in the process in order to provide substantive input from their own perspective, interest, and value. They actively engage with other participants in the interactive policy process through discussion and negotiation in order to arrive at opinion formation about problems and solutions.

Comparing the interactive processes

In Table 5, the six interactive policy processes are compared with regard to the relation between interactive process and city council. More detailed information on the coding and scoring can be found in Appendix D.

Please insert table 5

Example: In the Doetinchem case, the relation between the city council and the interactive process is very tight. Councillors are actively involved in the start of the interactive process and in the determination of their role during the process. During the process they are kept up to date extensively, formally in the meetings of the council and informally through attendance of the interactive workshop sessions. The councillors also take the role of debater in the interactive process; they do not only listen carefully to the debates between citizens but are not afraid to join the debate. This attitude leads to a very active council involvement in the interactive process.

Example: In the case of De Bilt the councillors are not informed at the beginning of the interactive process. The process is not even politically approved by the council. The involvement of the council is also very limited during the interactive process. Councillors sporadically join the interactive process and when they do, they take a very passive role as auditor and information collector.

In comparing these six interactive processes on this aspect, it becomes clear that one case jumps out positively: only the interactive process in the municipality of Doetinchem had both formal (initiation and confirmation) as well as actual (feedback and council member participation) close involvement of municipal council in the interactive process. The Bijlmer case shows a situation where the (neighbourhood) council was formally involved, but hardly at all in practical terms. The other four cases display limited to very limited involvement of the municipal council with the interactive process. In the cases of De Bilt and Leerdam, the limited involvement of the municipal council is, of course, striking. After all, they did involve experiments that explicitly aimed at strengthening the relation between citizens and politics.

7. Organisational arrangements and outcomes

Table 6 presents a comparison of the analyses of the previous sections to each other. We sum up the scores for the three organisational characteristics, process management, stakeholder participation, and relation to municipal council. This also holds for the score of the outcomes of the six cases. The last score in each column also provides the ranking of the six cases. When two cases have (almost) the same score, they have, in principle, been given the same ranking.

In some cases, the large difference between cases is also taken into account. Thus, for all cases there has been a medium to weak involvement of the council. The only exception is the Doetinchem case and this is expressed by giving it the ranking 1, and giving the two following cases, which have a much lower score, a ranking 3. In the ranking for stakeholder participation, equal scores for the cases resulted in emphasis upon depth of participation to determine the ranking.

Please insert table 6

Process management and outcomes: adaptive process management enhances good outcomes

Looking at Table 6, we can see a clear link between a positive score for the process management aspect and the score for outcome. The two cases where process management was assessed positively, and where it was earlier labelled as adaptive process

management (Doetinchem and Leerdam) also score the best when outcomes are compared. Interestingly, the distance between the cases of Doetinchem and Leerdam on the one the hand and the other cases on the other is large when considering process management, and this is reflected in the outcomes. In other words: cases with adaptive process management have good outcomes, while the other cases display a weak or even a negative score for both process management and outcomes. Adaptive process management leads to outcomes that are supported and enriched by stakeholders. Hence, there is a strong correlation between the scores for process management and for outcomes. This is probably the most interesting finding of this research on the six cases.

Interactive decision-making and stakeholder participation

The good position of Doetinchem is again striking when looking at the relation between stakeholder participation and outcomes. Also striking is that De Bilt occupies a relatively high position while in terms of outcomes it is much lower. This is because the variety of ideas had limited influence on the end results. In the case of broad stakeholder participation (Doetinchem, De Bilt, and Bijlmer), there was substantial variety if brought into the interactive process. The assumption in the literature that an increase in participation results in more variety and, in principle, in richer plans, appears to be supported. Crucial, however, is that this variety is also assimilated in a good manner in the selection process. Thus, the variety in Leerdam was not so great, but an outcome that was good for all parties was achieved since the ideas put forward also influenced decision-making and end results. This requires adaptive process management. It appears that broad stakeholder participation is an important but not necessary condition for a good

outcome. The depth of participation is more important for a positive assessment about the outcome of interactive decision-making.

Interactive decision-making and the municipal council: a problematic item

What is most striking about Table 6 is the involvement of the municipal council in interactive processes in almost all of the cases. This indicator is only strong in the Doetinchem case where, from the start, there was substantial attention by the process manager for involving council members in the interactive process. There was also a positive attitude among most council members about involvement in the interactive process. However, it also makes it more difficult to draw clear conclusions about the relation between outcomes and the degree to which interactive decision-making is embedded in the normal political decision-making. The low score of Leerdam (last) is striking while the score for outcomes was good. Apparently, it is possible to compensate a limited relationship with the municipal council with good process management. We also need to take into account the fact that the council in the one municipality is more prominently and forcefully involved in local politics than in another municipality. Good organisational structuring of the relation between interactive process and municipal council is important when the council has a strong influence upon municipal affairs. When the council is less strong (it can be that the Mayor and Alderman overrule the council) organisational structuring may be less important. In the short run, not involving the council in interactive processes may have limited consequence since an alderman can carry the outcomes of the interactive process through the council. In the longer run, however, there is potential danger. The council may become irritated and may decide to block outcomes of the interactive process that once appeared set in stone. Nonetheless,

striking is the conclusion that the relation to the council is less important than previously thought and this conclusion also contradicts findings about interactive processes at the national level. One explanation could be that the relation between politics and the interactive process is of greater importance at the national level, in The Netherlands, since national political officeholders can develop more counterweight to administrators than their counterparts can at local level.

Another explanation can be that one indicator is more relevant than the other. When we look at the indicators (see table 5) we can see that the indicator 'feedback' scores positively on the cases Doetinchem and Leerdam. These are exactly the cases that show good outcomes. This finding corresponds with earlier research on this topic (Edelenbos, 2005), but still needs further attention in future research.

Compound lenses: the importance of process management

When we consider all the three dimensions of the organisational arrangement of interactive decision-making, process management comes across as the most important condition. This score is most similar to that of scores for outcomes. Furthermore, there are no deviations (such as high scores for process management and low scores for outcomes or vice versa) that sometimes occur with other organisational characteristics of interactive processes. In short: low performance on one of the other organisational features can be compensated (as, for instance, in the Leerdam case) but a low score for process management cannot be compensated. This confirms the opinion often stated in network literature that process management is of paramount importance to complex interactions.

8. Conclusion: the importance of good process management in interactive decision-making

In this paper we considered the organisational arrangements of interactive decision-making processes. We focussed on three characteristics: the formal organisation of process management and the practical use of it, the degree of involvement of societal actors and the relation of the process to normal political decision-making (i.e., the relation to the municipal council).

The most important conclusions are:

- Greater input of variety of parties generates a variety of ideas and potentially enriches process substance.
- Greater input does not guarantee good outcomes. The Leerdam case demonstrates that good outcomes can be realised with less variety, and the Bijlmer and De Bilt cases demonstrate that large variety does not guarantee good outcomes. In Leerdam, the variety was not great but this was compensated with good influence and process management.
- Process management emerges as the most important condition for good and satisfactory outcomes. There was a high correlation in the six cases between good process management and good outcomes.
- It is difficult to find a link between outcomes and the degree to which the municipal council was involved in the interactive process since in most cases that involvement was not substantial. The Leerdam case, which combines low council involvement with good outcome, leads us to conclude that council involvement is not unimportant

and can, in fact, be an obstacle (see Klijn and Koppenjan, 2000; Edelenbos, 2000), but it is not a decisive factor for a negative outcome.

Placed in the discussion on participation and governance these findings make an interesting contribution. First the outcomes seem to stress that participation is strongly appreciated by stakeholders if they see real outcomes of this participation. On the basis of our material we are even inclined to say that you can better organize no participation at all than bad participation which is not well managed and in which voiced preferences are neglected. This is maybe reason to draw the research even more than already is the case out of the normative discussion that participation is good in itself and focus on the way this is achieved in a really satisfactory and efficient way. The relation between these new forms of decision-making and the elected officials in city councils still remains ambiguous and is certainly something that requires more research. Our findings on these six case studies do, however, provide a good impression of the importance of good process management for the success of interactive processes. Management matters in the successful evolution of interactive decision-making processes. This is in general also stressed in the literature on governance and network management (Gage/Mandell, 1990; O'Toole, 1988; Agranov/Mcguire, 2001; 2003; Mandell, 2001). Our addition to the existing literature on network management is that we have distinguished *different styles of network management*, and assessed which styles are more appropriate for using in the guidance of complex interactive decision-making processes. Initiators of interactive decision-making processes must adopt an adaptive style of network management in order to be successful in the end. If initiators of these forms of governance lack the organisational slack and creativity to manage these and there are no other actors who are

prepared and willing to fulfil the role maybe one should simply refrain from action (see also Koppenjan/Klijn, 2004: 252). This is of course a controversial statement, because what should you do if there is an urgent problem that needs solving? We think that realism is still needed and in such a case you should work on preconditions before acting. In the long run bad managed projects and disappointed stakeholders are worse than rhetorical actions.

Appendices

Appendix A. Outcomes

Below we describe the outcomes that were realised at the end of the interactive process and the actors who were satisfied and dissatisfied with the outcomes in table 'satisfaction of actors'. We present the enrichment of the outcomes in the next two tables. We conceptualised enrichment as variety of ideas and influence of ideas. We used the two indicators variety of ideas on problems and variety of ideas on solutions as indicators. In order to determine the influence of ideas on decision-making we used the indicators influence during the development of the plans and influence recognisable in the final documents of the interactive process. The two variables actor satisfaction and enrichment determine the quality of the outcome. We speak of 'good outcomes' when actors are satisfied and when there is an enrichment of ideas.

Table: Satisfaction of actors

	Outcomes realised	Actors satisfied	Actors not satisfied	Qualification
De Bilt	Abstract final document; '33 decision point' document, no actual implementation of the outcomes	Civil servants and Mayor and Aldermen were satisfied with the outcomes. Also the councillors were pleased with the outcome (+)	Most of the participants (citizens, ngo's, farmers, etc.) were not satisfied with the outcomes, because of the abstract character of the final document (-)	+/- reasonable actor satisfaction
Enschede	Abstract policy framework for restructuring the inner city; document was sent for approval to city council	Civil servants and Mayor and Aldermen were satisfied with the outcomes. Also a few participants were content with the results of the process (+)	Some citizens living around the square were not satisfied; they held the opinion that the municipality took the interests of the shopkeepers more seriously (-)	+/- reasonable actor satisfaction
Leerdam	Reasonably detailed restructure plan for the city square which was implemented in practice	All stakeholders (civil servants, citizens, shopkeepers) supported the structure plan (++)	No opposition to the structure plan (++)	++ very high actor satisfaction
Leimuiden	An abstract 'vision document' for the future for restructuring the inner city	The participants of the interactive process (civil servants and citizens) were satisfied with the outcome (+)	Non-participants showed some hesitation. Some Aldermen were opposed. Councillors blocked the plan because of the vagueness of it (-)	+/- reasonable actor satisfaction
Doetinchem	Structure plan (main lines) for the realisation of new residential area; input for the next phase in the process	Most participants (civil servants and future citizens) were very satisfied with the structure plan. The plan was also approved by the city council (++)	Some residents and farmers in the planned residential area were opposed to the building plans because they felt constrained in their living space (-)	+ high actor satisfaction
Bijlmer	Proposal to restructure neighbourhood including indication of dwellings to be demolished and restructuring surrounding environment	Reasonably satisfied: housing association, municipal authority (civil servants and alderman), some groups of unorganised tenants (possibility to acquire new dwelling) (+)	Group of tenants who lived in the Bijlmer for long time (opposed to demolishing) Other tenants satisfied or indifferent (-)	+/- reasonable actor satisfaction

Table: variety of ideas

	Variety of ideas on problems	Variety of ideas on solutions	Qualification
De Bilt	Much attention paid to creation of diversity of problem definitions in workshop meetings attended by many stakeholders. Many aspects were developed (+)	Much room for participants to bring up solutions in several workshop meetings attended by many stakeholders. Many solutions were created, some innovative (+)	Large variety on problem definition and solutions (+)
Enschede	All stakeholders had the opportunity to broaden the scope of problem definition. Many aspects were developed (+)	Especially shopkeepers and retailers got the opportunity to create ideas with civil servants for solutions, because they had to co-finance the outcome. Other stakeholders (residents) did not have the opportunity to bring on ideas (-)	Reasonable variety on problem definition and solutions (+/-)
Leerdam	Stakeholders brought on problem aspects in workshop meetings. These aspects did not differ much from analyses from civil servants performed earlier on (+/-)	In workshop meetings, stakeholders (especially shopkeepers and retailers) got the opportunity to develop ideas on the square. These were mainly alterations of existing ideas developed by civil servants (+/-)	Reasonable variety on problem definition and solutions (+/-)
Leimuïden	The exploration of the problems at hand was done by stakeholders in workshop meetings, but was also dominated by civil servants (-)	Civil servants did the search for solutions for the inner city. Stakeholders could mainly react on these ideas (-)	No variety on problem definition and solutions (-)
Doetinchem	Stakeholders got the opportunity to give their views on the problems in the area. They could add their problem definitions to the ones out of reports and analyses of consultancies (+)	Stakeholders developed many ideas on how to create a durable residential area. Many innovative ideas were created stimulated by a creative designer (+)	Large variety on problem definition and solutions (+)
Bijlmer	Exploring problem by joint sessions with tenants, professionals and civil servants. Main conclusion: safety problems and resulting lack of attraction of dwellings one of the central issues of the area (+)	Considering various options to safety and letting problems from more intensive maintenance to demolishing and rebuilding, generating many options. Process includes comparing and discussion solutions (+)	Large variety on problem definition and solutions (+)

Table influence of ideas

	Development of the plans	Recognisable influence	Qualification
De Bilt	Civil servants and advisors already developed a lot of ideas before the start of the interactive process. New ideas were hardly developed in the interactive process; if so, mainly on details. End document did not differ much from the starting document (- -)	End text dominated by civil servants and experts. Variety of ideas of other actors only now and then visible and recognisable for stakeholders in end documents. Text rather abstract, while the solutions offered by the stakeholders were sometime very detailed (- -)	No influence of the ideas of stakeholders (--)
Enschede	Civil servants and retailers mainly developed the plan for the inner city, outside the interactive process in the working group of citizens. Citizens could only react on these ideas (+/-)	Stakeholders could hardly recognise their input, because of the abstract character of the end document (a policy framework). Some stakeholders called this 'an escape in abstraction' (-)	Little influence of the ideas of stakeholders (-)
Leerdam	There was hardly any information gathered at the beginning of the interactive process. All the ideas from citizens, retailers, and civil servants were developed in the interactive process (+)	Stakeholders did recognise their input on a very detailed level in the final document of the interactive process. Council accepted the plan entirely (+)	Much influence of the ideas of stakeholders (+)
Leimuiden	The intention was to give stakeholders much opportunity to develop ideas on the plan for the inner city. During the process, civil servants gave much input in the developments of the plan, citizens mainly followed their ideas (-)	Although the council reacted positive on the outcome of the interactive process, Mayor and Aldermen disqualified the plan, because of lack of depth. They stated that further research was needed (-)	Little influence of the ideas of stakeholders (-)
Doetinchem	The interactive process offered much room for stakeholders to develop new ideas. Although civil servants had also their say in the development, participants corrected their input if not in accordance with their ideas (++)	The input of the stakeholders was very much recognisable in the end document of the interactive process. Many of the concrete ideas were incorporated in the structure plan for the area (++)	Very much influence of the ideas of stakeholders (++)
Bijlmer	End documents contain a lot of ideas which were already in overview documents of Bijlmer as a whole, some new ideas (on safety, on combining high rise with single	Some of the solutions been developed a bit outside interactions with other actors (especially on demolishing dwellings) and not been discussed. But a reasonable amount of ideas	Reasonable influence of the ideas of stakeholders

	family dwellings (+/-)	included in end document (+/-)	(+/-)
--	------------------------	--------------------------------	-------

Appendix B. Process management

The table ‘formalisation of the process design’ indicates the presence of a process design and the detail level of this design. These two indicators determine the formalisation level of the process design.

The table ‘actions/style process management’ indicates the dominance of the process manager in the interactive process through his activities, and the flexibility of the process manager in executing the process according the process design. These variables determine the style of process management in the six cases. In this last case these indicators are used to create typology of management (active very rigid (--), passive rigid (-), passive flexible (0), active flexible (+), active very flexible (++)]. The degree of flexibility thus determines the positive or negative nature of the score (compare De Bilt (very rigid and active process management a score of -- , which is composed of active (++) and hardly any flexibility (--). The scores of the two tables together determine the characterisation in table 3 in the main text.

Table: formalisation of the process design

	Process design available?	Detailed organisational arrangement?	Qualification
De Bilt	Yes (+)	Very detailed; process design pays attention to roles for participants, time phasing, auxiliary conditions, conflict resolution, participation methods (++)	Very high (++)
Enschede	Yes (+)	Very rudimental document with attention to time phasing, moments of involvement of stakeholders (-)	Low (-)
Leerdam	Yes (+)	Reasonably detailed; process design pays attention to time phasing, role allocation and way of involving stakeholders (+)	Reasonably high (+)

Leimuiden	Yes (+)	Very rudimental document with attention to time phasing, moments of involvement of stakeholders (-)	Low (-)
Doetinchem	Yes (+)	Reasonably detailed; process design pays attention to time phasing, role allocation and way of involving stakeholders (+)	Reasonably high (+)
Bijlmer	Yes (+) *	Only rough sketch, tells which groups should be included and gives outline of ways to achieve this (like contacting religious groups to enhance participation of immigrants. No attention for other aspects (-)	Low (-)

*Although the process design only concerned the participation aspect of the process

Table: actions/style of process management

	Dominance and activities of process manager	Flexibility	Qualification
De Bilt	The process manager dominated the process enormously; he determined everything what was going to happen in the interactive process (++)	The process design was the 'holy bible' for him; everything had to be done according this design; no deviations were tolerated (- -)	Very rigid and active process management (- -)
Enschede	The process manager displayed a lot of activities in the process, organized meetings, consulted with civil servants and key participants in the process (+)	The process manager distinguished different degrees of participation, because retailers feel that they as co-investors need to be heard first (+)	Flexible and active process management (+)
Leerdam	Very active process manager who was on top of things, was much around and stayed in touch with participants, civil servants and administrators (+)	The process manager deviated from the original process design in giving entrepreneurs more opportunities (for example consultation with civil servants and administrators (+)	Flexible and active process management (+)
Leimuiden	Reasonably active process manager; reacted promptly on developments in the process and tried to steer the developments in wanted directions (+)	Although the process managers reacts to developments in the process, he stayed strongly committed to the original process design (-)	Rigid and active process management (-)
Doetinchem	The process manager displayed a lot of activities in the process, organized meetings, consulted with civil servants and key participants in the process (+)	The process manager organized more meetings than planned with participants, because the development of ideas went to slowly (+)	Flexible and active process management (+)
Bijlmer	Much time invested and many different	Moderate-high (many new initiatives that	Flexible and

	initiatives of the project leaders (two for full time of the period), which strongly dominated the process. They initiated search for new solutions, coordinated interactions between actors, set temporary organisational provisions for interactions. (+)	were not foreseen (prize elections for best ideas, using scale models of area). Many ad hoc organisation and managing activities to cope with new situations. Sort of activities structured by habits of urban renewal and accepted practices. (+/-; +)	active process management (+)
--	---	---	-------------------------------

Appendix C. Stakeholder participation

The table ‘width of participation’ states who are invited to participate, and what the actual participation was in the interactive processes. These two indicators determine the width of participation. The table ‘depth of participation’ indicates who sets the agenda, brings in ideas during the process, and who makes the final decision. (Notice: this is not the same as influence of ideas (see indicators for outcomes) but one would expect a relation although with lot of conflicting actors who all can set the agenda etc the influence still can be minor) These three indicators determine the depth of participation in the six cases.

Table: width of participation

	Invitation policy	Actual participation	Qualification
De Bilt	Process accessible to all interested people, mobilisation through ‘open invitations’ and direct approach to certain stakeholders, no barriers for participation (++)	Over 200 participants through several interactive workshops; very diverse participation: citizens, entrepreneurs, ngo’s, etc. (++)	Very wide (++)
Enschede	Process mainly accessible to organized interest groups. Unorganized actors (like citizens) got less opportunity to participate, but were not excluded (+)	Around 7 organized interest groups (like entrepreneurs, ngo’s, etc.) got opportunity to participate during the whole process; unorganized actors (around 12) only on occasion (-)	Medium (+/-)
Leerdam	Only the people living or working nearby the square were invited to participate (-)	In total 14 actors participated, who represented 7 organisations (-)	Small (-)

Leimuiden	Process accessible to all who wanted to participate. But no invitation policy; coincidental approach of actors (-)	23 actors joined the interactive process, of whom 5 represented an organization (+)	Medium (+/-)
Doetinchem	Process accessible to all interested people. Mobilisation through purposefully mobilisation of actors (actors living or working nearby the area) (+)	Around 50 people participated actively in the interactive process. Around 40 wanted to be kept informed (+)	Wide (+)
Bijlmer	Process accessible to wide variety of groups (invited tenants to react on scale models, meeting with various church communities), in wide variety of activities (information meetings, discussion on proposed solutions, surveys, invitation for ideas to all tenants etc) (++)	Large number and diverse (tenants, shopkeepers , religious organisations, police, housing associations etc) total number difficult to estimate but certainly more than 100-150 different persons (although especially on information sessions still less tenants from immigrant groups) (++)	Very wide (++)

Table: depth of participation

	Setting of the agenda	Development of ideas	Making decisions	Qualification
De Bilt	Agenda set by the process manager and the municipal project leader (-)	Participants have the opportunity to develop their ideas and thoughts on problems and solutions in several interactive workshop meetings (+)	No participation in selection and decision phases; selection done by civil servants without feedback to participants (-)	Advising (+/-)
Enschede	Agenda set by the municipal project leader and the external process manager (-)	Participants, mainly the retailers, have the opportunity to develop ideas on problems and solutions (+)	Only a small group of retailers with civil servants had a say in the results of the process (+/-)	Advising (+/-)
Leerdam	Agenda set by the process manager in consultation with participants (+)	The group of participants had the opportunity to raise problems and mention solutions (+)	Council members committed themselves to the outcome; plan made by citizens and participants (++)	Co-production (+)

Leimuiden	Agenda set by municipal projectleaders and process manager (-)	Participants have the opportunity to develop their ideas on problems and solutions in several interactive workshop meetings (+)	Selection of ideas done by civil servants; participants got the opportunity to give feedback on the final document (+/-)	Advising (+/-)
Doetinchem	Agenda set by civil servants and process manager (-)	Participants have the opportunity to develop their ideas on problems and solutions in several interactive workshop meetings (+)	Participants made the plans for the new residential area, which were modified by civil servants and approved by the participants (++)	Co-production (+)
Bijlmer	Set by project leaders and sub-municipal council (-)	Inventarisation of ideas (with tenants). Spatial solutions developed partly outside tenant meetings, initiated by project managers (afterwards discussed with tenants) (+/-)	Selection of ideas done by civil servants; no involvement of tenants or other actors (-)	Consultation (-)

Appendix D. Relation with municipal council

In table ‘relation between interactive process and municipal council’ we used five indicators (1) who initiated the interactive process (2) was the process confirmed by the council before it started (3) was the council kept up to date of the progress of the process and (4) did the council members participate in the interactive process. Together these variables determine the way the council was related to the interactive process.

Table: relation between interactive process and council

	Initiation	Confirmation	Feedback	Participation council members	Qualification

De Bilt	Civil servant initiated the process without involvement of the council (- -)	Mayor and aldermen approved the process; there was no involvement of the council (- -)	During the process some informal moments of feedback by inviting council members to come to the interactive process (+/-)	Some council members took the invitation to join the process in their prescribed role of auditor, information collector (-)	Both formally as in actuality a very limited council involvement (--)
Enschede	Alderman initiated the process, council is informed directly after (-)	Municipal council approved the idea of stakeholder involvement (++)	During the process some informal moments of feedback were explicitly organized (+/-)	On occasion some council member participated in the role of auditor, information collector (-)	Both formally as in actuality a rather limited council involvement (+/-)
Leerdam	Process was initiated by the municipal clerk; there was no involvement of the council (--)	Municipal council approved the idea of the interactive process but after the process had already started; no real meaning, more ritual (-)	Some formal and informal feedback during process by civil servants and Aldermen (+)	No participation (--)	Both formally as in actuality a very limited council involvement (--)
Leimuïden	Alderman initiated the interactive process. Council was informed directly after (-)	Municipal council approved the start of the interactive process (++)	No formal or informal feedback to council was organized (- -)	No participation (--)	Both formally as in actuality a limited council involvement (-)
Doetinchem	Civil servant initiated the idea of the interactive process, council was informed (-)	Municipal council approved the start of the interactive process (++)	Both formal and informal moments of feedback, through civil servants and moments in the interactive process (++)	Mostly or always present in the role of participant; council members went in debate with other participants (++)	Both formally as in actuality a very active council involvement (++)
Bijlmer	Neighbourhood council initiated the idea of the interactive process (+)	Neighbourhood council approved the idea of stakeholder involvement (++)	Some formal moments of feedback in council meetings, no informal feedback during the process (-)	No participation (--)	Formally closely involved, but in actuality hardly involved (+/-)

References

- Agranov, R., M. McGuire, (2001), Big questions in public network management research, *Journal of Public administration research and Theory*, vol 11 (2001), no. 3: 295-326
- Agranov, R, M. McGuire (2003) *Collaborative Public Management; new strategies for local governments*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press
- Arnstein, S.R. (1971) Eight rungs on the ladder of citizen participation, in: Edgar S.C. en B.A. Passett (red.), *Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change*, Praeger Publishers, New York, 69-91.
- Berry, J.M., K.E. Portney & K. Thomson (1993) *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy*, The Brookings Institution, Washington DC.
- Bruijn, J.A. de, E.F. ten Heuvelhof and R.J. in 't Veld (1998) *Procesmanagement. Over procesontwerp en besluitvorming*, Academic Service, Schoonhoven.
- Coglianese, G. (1997) Assessing Consensus. The Promise and Performance of Negotiated Rulemaking, *Duke Law Review*, 46(6), 1255-1349.
- Denters, B, O. van Heffen, J. Huisman, P-J Klok (eds) (2003), *The rise of interactive governance and quasi-markets*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press
- Edelenbos, J. (1999) Design and management of participatory public policy making, *Public Management Review*, 1, 4, 569-578.
- Edelenbos, J. (2000). *Process in Shape*. Lemma, Utrecht (PhD thesis, in Dutch).
- Edelenbos, J. and R. Monnikhof (eds.) (2001). *Local interactive policy development*. Lemma, Utrecht (in Dutch).
- Edelenbos, J. (2005) Institutional Implications of Interactive Governance: Insights from Dutch Practice, *Governance*, 18(1), pp.111-134.

- Gage, R.W., M.P. Mandell (eds.), (1990), *Strategies for managing intergovernmental policies and networks*, New York/London: Praeger
- Hanf, K.I. and F.W. Scharpf (eds.) (1978), *Interorganizational Policy Making: Limits to Coordination and Central Control*, Sage, London.
- Hirst, P., (1997), *From statism to pluralism; democracy, civil society and global politics*, London: UCL Press
- Kickert, W.J.M., E.H. Klijn and J.F.M. Koppenjan (eds.) (1997) *Managing Complex Networks. Strategies for the Public Sector*, Sage, Londen.
- Klijn, E.H. (1998), *Ruimte voor beslissen [space for decision]*, Delft: Eburon
- Klijn, E. and J. Koppenjan (2000) Politicians and interactive decision-making: institutional spoilsport or playmakers, *Public Administration*, 78, 2, 365-387.
- Klijn, E.H., G.R. Teisman (1997), *Strategies and games in networks* in: Kickert/Klijn/Koppenjan pp. 98-118
- Klijn, E.H. (2003), *Does interactive policy making work? Expanding Rotterdam Port*, in: Denters et al (2003), 15-42
- Klijn, E.H., J.F.M. Koppenjan (2002), *Rediscovering the citizen: new roles for Politicians in interactive decision-making*, in: McLaverty(2002): 141-164
- Koppenjan, J. (2001) *Design and management of local interactive processes*, in: Edelenbos, J. and R. Monnikhof (eds.) (2001). *Local interactive policy development*. Lemma, Utrecht (in Dutch), 143-174.
- Koppenjan, J.F.M. , E.H. Klijn (2004), *Managing uncertainties in networks; a network approach to problem solving and decision making*, London: Routledge
- Lowndes, V, L. Pratchet, G. Stoker (2001), *Trends in public participation: part 1 local government perspectives*, *Public Administration*, 76 (2): 205-222

- Mandell, M. (ed.) (2001), *Getting results through collaboration; networks and network structures for public policy and management*, Westport: Quorum Books
- Mandell, M.P. (ed.) (2001), *Getting results through collaboration; networks and network structures for public policy and management*, Westport: Quorum Books
- Mandell M.P. & T.A. Steelman (2003), *Understanding what can be accomplished through interorganizational innovations. The importance of typologies, context and management strategies*, *Public Management Review*, 5(2): 197-224.
- Marin, B., and R. Mayntz (eds.) (1991), *Policy Networks: Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Considerations*, Westview Press, Colorado.
- Marsh, D. and R.A.W. Rhodes (eds.) (1992), *Policy Networks in British Government*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- McLaverty, P. (ed.) (2002) *Public Participation and Innovations in Community Governance*, Ashgate: Aldershot.
- MacPherson, C.B. (1979), *The life and times of liberal democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Meier, O'Toole (2001) 'Managerial strategies and behaviour in networks: a model with evidence from U.S. public education', in: *Journal of Public Administration and Theory* (11) 3: 271-293.
- Nelissen, N.J.M., A.J.A. Godfroij en P.J.M. de Goede (1996) *Vernieuwing van bestuur: inspirerende visies*, Coutinho, Bussum.
- Newman, J. (2003), *New Labour and the politics of Governance* in: A. Salminen (with J.W. van der Donk and E.H. Klijn) (eds.) (2003), *Governance in networks*, Amsterdam: IOS Press

- O'Toole, L.J., (1988), Strategies for intergovernmental management: implementing programs in interorganisational networks, *Journal of Public Administration*, 25 (1), pp. 43-57.
- Pollitt, C. (2003), Joined-Up Government: a survey, *Political Studies Review*, 1: 34-49
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997) *Understanding Governance*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Scharpf, F.W. (1997) Games real actors play. Actor-centered institutionalism in policy research, Westview Press, Boulder.
- Schön, D.A., M. Rein (1994), Frame reflection: toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies, New York: Basic Books
- Sorenson, E, J. Torfing (2003), Network politics, political capital and democracy, *International Journal of Public Administration*, vol 26, no 6: 609-634
- Süsskind, L. and J. Cruikshank (1987) Breaking the impasse. Consensual Approaches to Resolving Public Disputes, BasicBooks.
- Süsskind, L, S. MacKearnan & J. Thomas-Larmer (eds.) (1999) *The Consensus Building Handbook: A Comprehensive Guide to Reaching Agreement*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Teisman, G.R. (1997) *Sturen via Creatieve Concurrentie. Een innovatie-planologisch perspectief op ruimtelijke investeringsprojecten*, Nijmegen.
- Teisman, G.R. (1992) *Complexe besluitvorming*, Den Haag: Vuga
- Tops, P.W., M. Boogers, F. Hendriks en R. Weterings (1999) *Omtrent Interactieve Besluitvorming Een inventariserend onderzoek naar nieuwe vormen van politieke participatie in de 'alledaagse democratie'*, voorstudie t.b.v. de Staatscommissie Dualisme en lokale democratie.

- Wille, A., Political participation and representativity in the interactive process, in:
Edelenbos, J. and R. Monnikhof (eds.) (2001). *Local interactive policy development*.
Lemma, Utrecht (in Dutch), 87-116.

Tables

Table 1 *Characteristics of the six cases*

Case	Number of inhabitants	Subject of the process	Actors involved	Time period
De Bilt	43.000	Developing a spatial structure vision for the municipality	Municipality, inhabitants, companies, action groups, store owners, retail association, employers associations	April 1997 - August 1998
Enschede	152.000	Renovating the city centre. Increasing the attractiveness of the centre area and expanding services	Municipality, inhabitants, store owners, environmental groups, cyclists association, restaurant and café owners	July 1997 - October 1998
Leerdam	21.000	Restructuring the city centre from the 1970s in the West Neighbourhood	Municipality, inhabitants of the city square, people living near the city centre	September 1997 - March 1998
Leimuiden	3.000	Developing a future vision for the centre including a city zoning plan	Municipality (alderman), municipal services, citizens	October 2001 - October 2002
Doetinchem	49.000	Developing a zoning plan for the future residential area, called "Wijnbergen"	People living around the Wijnbergen neighbourhood, environmental organisations, municipality, architects, planning experts	May 1998 - May 1999
Bijlmer	17.000	Restructuring a high-rise area. Objective: destruction and new construction, creating a more	Sub-municipal Council, inhabitants, municipal services, housing association, other actors	December 1995 - February 1997

		attractive living area, ensuring safety, stimulating economic development	(police, store owners etc.)	
--	--	--	-----------------------------	--

Table 2 *Outcomes of the six cases*

Case	Actor Satisfaction	Enrichment		Overall judgement	
		<i>Variety of ideas</i>	<i>Influence of ideas</i>		<i>Ranking</i>
De Bilt	+/-; contentment and discontent among participants, contentment among non-participants doubtful	+; many different ideas brought forward	--; final document rather vague with open-ended formulation; input thus not recognised by participants	Variety of solutions; problems and input minimally visible in the end results; mixed image about contentment among those involved (-, +/-)	5
Enschede	+/- reasonable contentment among participants and non-participants	+/-; many new suggestions for structure, but also narrowing of the number of themes the structure focuses on	-; dominance of civil service; participants in consultation block participation of individual citizens. Escape in abstraction	reasonable variety; influence of ideas limited to specific input, mixed image of contentment among those involved (+/-, -)	4
Leerdam	++ very large; sufficient support among participants and non-participants for the new structure	+/-; limited opportunity for variation (especially with regard to details)	+; the plan is accepted by the municipal council without changes	example of strongly formulated conditions within which influence is possible (+)	2

Leimuiden	+/- reasonable contentment among most actors involved	-, not much input of ideas by participants, especially from civil servants, not many new options	-; despite positive response from council, mayor and aldermen and civil servants wish to review and adapt the proposals	mixed image about contentment among participants; limited variety, and influence in the end uncertain (-)	6
Doetinchem	+ substantial support among involved participants with an end result despite some tensions during the process. Non-participants are also content	+ reasonable but within the variants and variety partially created outside the process (by civil service)	++ Quite substantial number of ideas incorporated from the process in the final plan; mayor and aldermen adapted plan to participants	reasonably large variety and decent influence resulting in substantial degree of support (+; ++)	1
Bijlmer	+/-; reasonable contentment among most actors, some parties (organised inhabitants) are discontent but other non-participant parties appear reasonably content	+ reasonably large variety, visibility could have been better	+/-, various ideas included, but also ideas brought in at the last moment that had not been discussed during the interactive process	variety good, contentment and influence reasonable (+/-)	3

Table 3 *Overview of process design and management in the six cases*

Cases	Formalisation	Process management	Characterisation
De Bilt	Very high (++)	Very rigid and active (--)	Blueprint process management

Enschede	Low (-)	Flexible and active (+)	Improvised process management
Leerdam	Reasonably high (+)	Flexible and active (+)	Adaptive process management
Leimuiden	Low (-)	Rigid and active (-)	Process management on main outlines
Doetinchem	Reasonably high (+)	Flexible and active (+)	Adaptive process management
Bijlmer	Low (-)	Flexible and active (+)	Improvised process management

Table 4 *Overview stakeholder participation in the 6 cases*

Cases	Width of participation	Depth of participation	Characterisation
De Bilt	Very wide (++)	Advising (+/-)	Very wide participation, but with little influence
Enschede	Medium (+/-)	Advising (+/-)	Medium wide participation but with little influence
Leerdam	Small (-)	Co-production (+)	Small participation but with reasonable influence
Leimuiden	Medium (+/-)	Advising (+/-)	Average participation with little influence
Doetinchem	Wide (+)	Co-production (+)	Wide participation with reasonable influence
Bijlmer	Wide (+)	Consultation (-)	Wide participation with very little influence

Table 5 *Overview of the relation between interactive process and council in the six cases*

Case	Role before the start of the process	Role during the process	Characterisation

De Bilt	No involvement of the council at the start of the process (--)	Sporadic involvement of the council during the process (-)	Very limited council involvement (--)
Enschede	Council confirmed the start of the interactive process (+/-)	On occasion informal involvement of the council (+/-)	Rather limited council involvement (+/-)
Leerdam	Council was not involvement at the start of the process; she ritually approved it, after it already started (--)	Sporadic involvement of the council during the process (-)	Very limited council involvement (--)
Leimuiden	Council was informed after the idea of starting an interactive process, and approved the idea (+)	No involvement during the process (--)	Limited council involvement (-)
Doetinchem	Council was informed after the idea of starting an interactive process, and approved the idea (+)	Active involvement of councilors during the process through feedback and in their role as debaters (++)	Very active council involvement (++)
Bijlmer	Council initiated the idea of the interactive process (++)	No involvement during the process (--)	Rather limited council involvement (+/-)

Table 6 *Comparison of the arrangements in relation to the outcomes of the six cases*

Cases	Process management	Stakeholder participation	Relation municipal council	Outcomes
De Bilt	+/- (ranking 5)	+ (ranking 2)	-- (ranking 6)	- (ranking 5)
Enschede	+/- (ranking 3)	+/- (ranking 4)	+/- (ranking 3)	+/-, - (ranking 4)
Leerdam	+ (ranking 1)	+/- (ranking 3)	-- (ranking 6)	+ (ranking 2)
Leimuiden	- (ranking 6)	+/- (ranking 5)	- (ranking 5)	-- (ranking 6)
Doetinchem	+ (ranking 1)	+ (ranking 1)	++ (ranking 1)	++ (ranking 1)
Bijlmer	+/- (ranking 3)	+/- (ranking 6)	+/- (ranking 3)	+/- (ranking 3)

Notes

^a Just as many other countries the voter turnout has a tendency to decline especially in local elections.

^b Just as in other countries in The Netherlands there is a relative intensive interaction between the practice of public policy and public administration as a science. This leads to the situation that in official reports one can find arguments that also appear in scientific discussions. So there is no strict separation between the discourse in the policy field and in administration science.

^c The results are being elaborated elsewhere (Edelenbos, 1999; Edelenbos/Monninkhof, 2001; Klijn, 1998; Klijn/Koppenjan, 2002) in more detail.

^d Of course translating essentially qualitative data in more quantitative data is not unproblematic. We tried to use relative simple and clear indicators of the various independent variables (like the existence of a formal document see the section on process management) or tried to connect indicators to the view of the interviewed stakeholder (see actor satisfaction as indicator for the outcomes). By translating the five-point scale in a ranking of the cases we also checked our scorings again by making them a relative score and not an absolute score. This was sufficient for our purpose: drawing conclusions on the influence of certain organisational factors (and difference between the cases in these) on outcomes and performance of these experimental decision-making projects.

^e This was explicitly asked in the interviews.