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Abstract

Abstract: This work focuses on the potential effects of participatory processes in the interaction between civil society and the state. Our aim is to offer a proposal for the analysis and the operationalization of such effects in the relation of local authorities with the society: do participatory processes produce any change as they promise from a normative point of view? Once specified the potential changes in these patterns of interaction, we consider two dimensions: the structural and the cultural level. After, we offer a proposal for its analysis and we develop several hypotheses (the coral reef effect, ) which illustrate the mechanisms and conditions by which participatory processes affect the patterns of interaction civil society/authorities. The work closes with a discussion of factors affecting (modulating, enhancing or inhibiting) the possibility that participatory processes trigger theses effects.
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1. Introduction.

Participatory processes are seen as institutional reforms that seek to expand the opportunities for citizens and especially those with less power to influence public decision making. However, our knowledge about the empirical effects of these institutions (if they occur) is limited. The objectives behind the introduction of participatory devices differ substantially. For analytical purposes, we can distinguish two types of justifications: while some justifications emphasize administrative efficiency and accountability, others prioritize the arguments of democratic deepening. In general, the first type of arguments consider participatory instruments as tools to achieve extrinsic goods such as social justice and redistribution (which would be achieved by changing the agenda and the policy orientations), efficiency and reducing corruption (due to greater transparency and accountability), and they also point to the reduction of conflict and greater legitimacy of decisions.

When arguments of deepening democracy are exposed, participatory processes appear not only as tools but as goals or goods in themselves (not only as a means to achieve other goals or outputs). Thus, without denying their possible contribution to results for more efficient and transparent policies, other arguments support the achievement of outcomes which may be called intrinsic, such as the strengthening of the democratic elements of civil society, the civic virtuosity of participants, the establishment of interactions with the state based on autonomy (compared, for example, to clientelism) or the democratic reorientation of management and the organizational culture of public administration.

At the risk of oversimplification, one could say that in the first orientation the major concern is the reform (or modernization) of the administration, facing increasingly diverse and complex social problems (Castells 1999, Font et al 2006, Blanco and Goma 2002). Meanwhile, in the second orientation, attention focuses, to a various degree, on the transformation of the political (and social) systems through democratic deepening.

In any case, while power (and its exercise) is relational, most studies agree that the success of participatory devices implies a transformation in the interaction between civil society and the state, between citizens and public authorities. However, the extent to which these participatory processes can contribute to generate the conditions for this transformation varies in different approaches. In general, the greater the emphasis on intrinsic goals (the arguments of democratization), the greater the transformative potential given to participatory reforms versus structural factors. Somehow, in these approaches, we can see the idea that institutions are, in a relevant degree, determinants of the politics (Hall 1986, Thelen and Steinmo 1992); adopting perhaps too optimistic approaches, participatory reforms are seen as an opportunity to change the power relations between actors and redistribute power among civil society.

2 We leave aside for the moment skeptical views that consider that participatory devices often respond to strategies, intentional or not, of mobilization of bias (Bachrach and Baratz, 1962) for the maintenance of the status quo. Skepticism has grown since the promoters of participatory processes often not accompanied by good practice (Warren 2009: 29). Some authors have shown this sort of political instrumentalisation behind the activation of participatory processes, as a means for demobilized opposing parties (Parkinson, 2004) or reinforcing clientelism. Other empirical studies have shown the mistrust of public administration towards lay people’s participation in the public management (Kathi and Cooper, 2005; Hartz-Karp, 2007) or the tendency to establish participatory frameworks inflexible, tailored to its own interests, goals and agenda (Eliasoph, 1998).

3 On the different views in the debate over democratic deepening, see Gaventa (2006).
In this paper, our focus is on those potential effects (democracy deepening) in the interaction between civil society and the state. As shown in Table 1 below, this decision involves leaving aside many other possible effects of participatory processes. Issues such as the efficiency of the decisions made in participatory processes and the generation of social justice policies are not addressed in this work. Our purpose is to identify and operationalize possible effects in the relation of social actors and public administration. We aim also to specify the mechanisms that connect them with participatory processes, the factors relating to the design of participatory processes themselves or the context that modulate or condition the effects. Our goal is to provide an analytical framework that guides our exploration of the democratizing effects of participatory processes.

The literature review is aimed at identifying potential democratizing effects. This is not a narrative strategy that involves taking an optimistic or naive vision of participatory processes. In fact, we believe that our research can contribute decisively to know to what extent participatory processes actually represent a democratization of political systems. Our emphasis on the changing nature of state-civil society interactions places our research in the perspective of institutionalized power structures (Pateman 2012); we do not assume a harmonious vision of political processes associated with the implementation of participatory processes. Actually, the greater the disruption of power structures is, the greater the chances of conflict and resistance dynamics. Finally, whether or not the conflict appears, our analytical framework should be open to detect and understand negative or unintended consequences.

In the next sections, we develop the definition of our object of study: the effects of participatory processes in the civil society and state interaction. When identifying the effects of participatory processes in the interactions we consider that the influence of institutions on dynamics is twofold: structural and cultural. After defining the effects, in the third section we offer a proposal for its analysis. We also propose (some) explanatory mechanisms that connect effects with participatory processes. The work ends up with a discussion of the results obtained in a brief period of exploratory fieldwork conducted to qualify our operationalization tools, analytical framework and hypothesis.

---

4 Table in progress: Rather than establishing a comprehensive map of possible effects identified in the specialized literature, it aims at delimiting effects of interest in our research, based on a non-exhaustive review of the literature that has addressed this issue.

5 As can be seen in Table 1, we also limit our attention to effects as they empirically show at the meso level of analysis, that is in the field of organizational configuration of society and its interactions with the state, leaving, hence, out of our focus, effects observable at macro (or aggregate) and micro-individual levels.

6 For instance, comparing participatory budgeting in Cordoba, Paris and Porto Alegre, Ganzuza et al. (2012) have argued that instruments encompassing processes of change in power relationships generate resistance among those who see their status quo threatened.

7 This object of study has received little attention. While participatory processes have been studied, extensively and comparatively, in terms of their organizational designs and structures (Smith, 2011) or the type of practices that engender (Font et al., in preparation), as well as from the perspective of transformations that provoke among participants (Talpin, 2011), effects in the interactions between citizens and civil society and the authorities are, in relative terms more incipient (Fung 2004, Blanco y Ballester 2011; Baiocchi et al, 2011).

Often, the alleged effects of participatory processes are part of theoretical assumptions and justifications formulated in normative terms; they depend on different approaches to the "participatory governance". For analytical purposes, two types of approaches can be drawn: the quest for a modern (effective) management, on the one hand, and the search for the democratization of the political system and the society, on the other. In the first approach, participatory processes tend to be conceived as instruments contributing to the effectiveness of public action. At the risk of simplifying an heterogeneous field research, it is possible to consider that in the first approach extrinsic goals tend to be emphasized, such as the efficient use of resources, policies conductive to social justice, access to public services, objectives of sustainable development, greater legitimacy of decisions (coupling with conflict). From this standpoint, it is considered that "the opening to the social participation of the State’s nuclear activities is one of the most effective ways to improve the monitoring of the actions" (Ackerman, 2003: 448). The instrumental value of participation also emphasizes the necessity of turning the state (and agencies) action to the demands of citizens (responsiveness), improving social services, social welfare, reducing inequality, while improving the vertical control (accountability). In the second type of approach, the implementation tends to be an objective and a good in itself. We focus on this second type of approaches.

**Participatory governance as democratic radicalization (or a good in itself)**

A second orientation when justifying the introduction of participatory processes comes from the theory of democracy (Fung and Wright, 2003; Barber 1984, Pateman 1970, Cohen and Arato 1992, Fishkin 1995; Dryzek, 2000). Here, the starting point is the reflection on the profound democratic deficits of representative democracies: the introduction of participatory mechanisms is understood as part of a broader process of democratic deepening, conceiving them as complementary to or revitalisers of the existing representative channels (Wampler 2012, Warren 2009). Thus, these devices are not only implemented for the achievement of instrumental objectives (the extrinsic ones), but they are also envisioned as contributing to intrinsic goals such as changes in the organizational configuration, values and attitudes that guide the action of the various actors, the interaction between civil society and the state. In these approaches, the idea of empowerment and democratic deepening in the interactions between people and authorities becomes central (Fung and Wright 1993, 2006; Baiocchi et al. 2011; Abers 2003)

Factors that in other approaches tend to be considered as pre-conditions or constraints to the success of participatory processes become now the objectives of reform. This is, the conditions (for example, the network of social actors or their relation to public authorities) are to be modified by the implementation of participatory processes. Thus, a "strong" civil society (the density of organizations and their interconnections or orientation toward public good) can be important as by-products of participatory governance. From this orientation, the change in the relationships state-civil society, the power structures and the form of power exercise becomes central.

---

8 Empowerment is expressed in the extension of a set of attitudes and practices associated with the civic culture (Pateman 2012; Verba et al., 1995; Talpin, 2011; Funes et al., 2013).

9 Thus as Fagotto y Fung (2009: 15) point out, "those who build institutions and practices of public engagement frequently work at two levels. Not only do they address urgently felt needs in their
More or less explicitly, most of the previous approaches agree in the search of changes in the interaction between civil society and the state, an interaction to be directed towards positive relationships (mutually reinforcing). For example, Evans (1996), based on various studies of economic development initiatives in third world countries, highlighted as a success factor the synergies which were created, mutually reinforcing between civil society and the state. In particular, it is noted as the most remarkable cases those in which the relationships between social groups and public authorities were configured in networks that permeated the public-private divide (embeddedness), based on relationships of trust and collaboration. The same conclusion can be seen in the study of Abers (1998) on participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre. The change in the patterns from patronage to a kind of democratic association appears as a key factor of success.10

Along with the idea of synergy, Evans (1996) took the idea of “constructiveness” of social capital11: this author finds sufficient evidence to highlight the role of the state as promoter of the organizational base of civil society, transforming or creating organizational resources that serve as the bases for civil society (through the mobilization of existing social ties, articulating relational resources, etc.). Applied to the literature of participatory governance, institutional reform could play this role of “enhancer” of interactions, strengthen civil society, both in its organizational base and the nature of their relationships with authorities, transforming the client (consumer) modes of interaction into new modes based on the autonomy of social groups (Baiocchi et al. 2011).

In contrast, other studies identify processes of co-optation, instrumentalization and de-mobilization of social actors and their collective action. Diverse studies have identified this type of “mobilization of bias” practices. Navarro (2000) in his analysis of diverse case studies of participatory experiences in Spanish municipalities, identified instrumentalization practices, through the selection of participants according to electoral affinities with the incumbent political party. Similarly Parkinson (2004) shows how, in a process of reform of the health policy, participatory spaces were opened to exclude critical and challenging stakeholders. Overall, authorities tends to show distrust to external social groups (Kathi and Cooper 2005, Hartz - Karp 2007), their working schedule and the definition of topics can tightly constrain the frame of participatory processes (Eliasoph 1998). In addition, as noted by Baiocchi et al. (2011) in his comparative study of participatory budgeting, relational configurations between social actors and the authorities (from autonomy to co-optation) depend on the prior empowerment

10 In this sense, see Wampler (2012) which compares such effects caused by participatory budgeting implementation across different districts of Belo Horizonte. Even in empirical researches in which preexisting autonomous and organized actors are analyzed as condition for success, participatory processes are also seen, as reinforcing organizations and as opportunities for politically relevant forms of interaction based on trust and collaboration. See also the work of Baiocchi (2011) on participatory budgeting in Brazil or Abers (2007) on the establishment of watershed councils also in Brazil.

11 Contrary to Putnam’s perspective that considers the allocation of social capital in a given society as a component strongly rooted in structural factors and consequently difficult to change in the short term (see Putnam 1993).
of civil society and the characteristics of the participatory design. In any case, we cannot ignore the dimension of the conflict and its effects (Blanco and Gomà 2003).

In short, participatory processes can be considered as political opportunities for the development of processes of collective action and of interaction with the state (and not just as tools that improve decisions), but can also respond to the logic of mobilization of bias and legitimation of the status quo. By introducing them, authorities are not only more responsive to citizen demands; there are other by-products related to the relationship among actors.

In this paper, we focus on the identification of the effects of participatory processes in the civil society-State/Administration interactions. We do not care if the decisions generate more efficient or more socially fair policies but to what extent, how and under what circumstances, participatory devices transform the nature of the interactions between the state and civil society. These effects might also involve changes in the stakeholders world views, attitudes and practices within the field of civil society. These changes of patterns will be evident in both the structural and the cultural facets of these interactions.

3. Specifying structural and cultural effects on civil society-state interaction and potential explanations.

The implementation of participatory processes may involve changes in the rules and the dynamics of the policy arenas. As follows from the above discussion, such institutional reforms may have potential impacts on many facets, related to both process and results, whose empirical manifestations can be traced at different levels: macro -meso -micro. Without being exhaustive, Table 1 shows the changes most frequently mentioned in the literature, distinguishing the level of analysis at which they reveal observable12. We are interested in changes in civil society-state interactions that take place at a meso level, both concerning the organizational and cultural configurations as practices that are evident at this level13. Here, we can distinguish three types of effects: a) civil society empowerment/dismantlement/weakening/dislodging, b) greater democratic adaptability of the administration (or reinforcement of traditional styles) and c) generation of patterns interaction between social and administration actors. In this section, we define the first and third of these effects in operational terms and propose, as illustrative examples, some possible explanatory mechanisms.

Participatory experiences define not only who take part in decision-making about a given problem, but also shape participants profiles, influence the range and definition of topics covered (the agenda ), the ideas and values that frame discussions and decisions, as well as the opinions and attitudes (worldviews and representations ) of participants. In our (preliminary) operationalization proposal, we consider both aspects of these changes: the structural (changes in organization and practices) and cultural (changes in values and attitudes).

**Participatory processes as affecting and as strengthening civil society?**

12 Still, based on a non-exhaustive process of literature review..  
13 Hence, effects related to the consequences of the processes in policy outcomes (linked to extrinsic goals of participatory reforms) are beyond the scope of our research. Similarly, effects on the organizational life of the civil society and on collective action processes are analyzed from a "meso" angle.
To the extent that participatory processes pursue the strengthening of civil society, a departing point for the analysis consists of observing what features are connected to the strength of civil society. We can consider that civil society is composed of two interrelated elements: groups (beyond family ties and with different degrees of formalization) and their networks of interaction (the structural or organizational element) pursuing a variety of aims, on the basis of patterns of cooperation and feelings of mutual trust (or ideational cultural bases) (Cohen and Arato 1992).

From a political angle, we can consider that civil society accomplish two functions (Hadenius and Ugglia, 1996: 1622-1623): the promotion of pluralism as well as democratic practices and values. First, the existence of numerous, diverse, autonomous, and densely-networked actors is seen as a token of democratic quality to the extent that articulates and organizes social interests. The democratic role of civil society depends on its autonomous capacity for self-expression and will shape the mode of interaction with the authorities (Baiocchi et al. 2011). The pluralist function of civil society appears then, inextricably associated with the degree of autonomy, diversity, strength (resource availability) and the multiplicity of networks of groups (i.e. the structural component). In other words, the greater the presence of groups connected through a varied array of networks (more or less formalized), the greater their autonomy from the state and its sensitivity to interest / popular needs. Table 2 presents a summary of indicators to assess this structural aspect of empowerment, based on the properties of groups, the modes of interactions among groups as well as with their bases and citizens at large.

[Table 2 here]

Secondly, civil society plays an educational role: through participation in collective forms of organization, citizens acquire cognitive skills and pro-participation attitudes (are schools of political socialization), add civic elements into their political culture (generalized or mutual trust, public interest orientation), and propitiate the emergence of feelings of attachments to the territory or sense of community membership). We can think of similar effects in the field of organizations and groups (at the meso level of analysis). The empowering effects of participatory processes would be reflected in the development of democratic cultures (both in their internal functioning and in the modes of interaction in net and among groups) and of identity processes (collective identities and relationships of trust and mutual cooperation). Specifically, as stated in Table 2, we believe that empowering effects, expressed at the ideational level, are reflected in the orientation of the groups from more particularistic toward broader general interest standpoints, promotion of alternative policy views (based on alternative/local non-institutionalized forms of knowledge) or the development of feelings of community attachment (Kinney, 2012). Participatory reforms would also favour internal democratic culture, sensitiveness to the problems of communities, networking attitudes, on the bases of mutual trust and solidarity (vs. organizational competence), establishing collective identities and encouraging feelings of political efficacy.

**Generating synergies between social actors (stakeholders) and the administration, or tools of mobilization of bias?**

Participatory processes imply the creation of new arenas in the process of decision making, in which social actors, authorities and administration staff interact, configuring new policy networks (or modifying existing ones) and pursuing shared goals. The synergistic nature of these relations, and in contrast to those based on competition, clientelism or co-optation, is manifested in the network properties as in the objectives and practices that shape the
interaction. The configuration of this type of patterns does not assume the absence of conflict but distinct modes for its political managing.

[Table 3 here]

Regarding their structure, these networks tend to greater openness and permeability, producing frequent and politically relevant contacts, through both formal and informal channels - apart from those anticipated in the design of participatory mechanisms, through which resources exchange take place. This sort of network structures, imply the existence (and extension) of positive perceptions of their performance, both in the evaluation of its efficiency and achievements as in its democratic dimension (perceived autonomy ); it also entails redefinitions of mutual perceptions among actors, attitudes of recognition, feelings of identification and trust.

Concerning practices and contents of interactions, participatory processes involve a tendency towards adopting deliberative and consensual arrangements, and towards processes of continuous redefinition (framing) of the purposes of collective action. These may result in (formal or informal) practices of redefinitions or rotations of roles played by the different actors, as well as techniques to regulate competition between different views, forms of knowledge, the distribution of spaces, and processes for the assessment of evaluation and improvement. In its cultural manifestations, actors tend to have favourable perceptions of consensual practices, developing collaborative attitudes, greater sensitivity towards alternative positions, acceptance of alternative knowledge, and commitment with the common goals and processes.

4. Explanations for the production of effects. Some preliminary hypotheses.

If the literature’s treatment of effects lacks detailing and systematic-empirical approaches, the absence of explanations regarding explicative mechanisms is even more frequent. Below, we identify some general hypotheses that may help theorize the causal mechanisms associated with the production of the aforementioned effects.

**The hypothesis of the coral reef**

We may think, regarding the empowering effects on civil society (blooming of democratic networks and politicised social actors), that participatory processes act as coral reefs by facilitating confluence and interaction among social participants that would be otherwise difficult. As participatory processes shape policy arenas where social actors merge, they may also facilitate certain structural properties or shape the organizational structure of civil society.

As an example, we may identify causal mechanisms in three of the structural effects listed on table 2.

**Reducing the costs of collective action**

The creation of new groups – if shared aims are established and/or expectations of political influence are generated – reduces the initial cost of coordination and/or increases the potential benefit of collective action (Abers 1998, 2007). Once the initial problem of coordination is solved, the collective action’s chances of maintenance over time are increased allowing its

---

14 The metaphor of the coral reef has been taken from the work of Tarrow (2001:5) on the formation of transnational networks of social actors around international institutions.
crystallization in networks and somewhat formalised groups, even more if outcomes meet the collective action’s expectations.

This effect may also refer to the creation of inter-group networks. The participatory processes would activate a brokerage mechanism between groups that would not occur otherwise\textsuperscript{15}. This brokerage promotes confluence and cooperation among social actors, establishes the when and where for their gatherings, and encourages the coordination of efforts.

Political legitimacy of the groups is one of the resources that is potentially favoured thanks to the activation of certification mechanisms (McAdam et al. 2001: 145-146) by which the authorities recognize these groups as spokespersons/intermediaries.

The hypothesis of interational effects

The changes associated to participatory processes would also be empirically expressed in the ideational-cultural field. We may think that, in the context of its implementation, these processes imply broadening, intensifying, and even creating interactions amongst actors. Moreover, they encourage, on the one hand, revision processes of mutual and self-identifying perceptions; and, on the other hand, learning and revision of attitudes towards content and procedural (including self-perception) elements. Cognitive mechanisms such as the political self-identification and the commitment towards the participatory process may take place.

For example, feelings of collective identification – among the network of actors on which the participatory process lies – would be generated as long as the continuous interaction creates a commitment towards the correct development of the process and the attainment of goals. Networking supports the creation of common ground based in the recognition of shared aims, tasks etc. This is one of the assumptions of neo-institutionalist approaches which consider that institutions do not only influence the strategies of actors, but also their preferences\textsuperscript{16}. Changes in mutual perceptions (respect, trust, open-mindedness) would be by-products of commitment. Continuous confrontation and commitment amongst participants of deliberative processes force permanent exchange of opinions and experiences causing empathic relations (Pincock 2012).

The hypothesis of failed hybridization

Encounters between authorities and social actors, beyond participatory process, may be of conflictive nature and may even create a contentious negative feedback. The creation and memory of conflicted relations may occur when participatory devices are characterized by a strong control on the framework and agenda by the authorities that define even what is politics, and which contents are submitted to deliberation (Eliasoph, 1998; Levine and Nierras, 2001).

\textsuperscript{15} In the case of the water councils in Brazil Abers (2007: 1454) applies the idea of catchment area of Brannstrom (2004) to refer to this effect in the case of the creations of the river basin committees in Brazil. Jiménez (2005) showed how the creation of the national advisory board of the environment in the mid-nineties contributed to the organizational consolidation of the movement network at the state-level and favored its connections with other type of social organizations.

\textsuperscript{16} En la literatura de los movimientos sociales la participación institucional de las organizaciones de los movimientos ha sido asOCIada a este proceso de asimilación a las prácticas y valores de los actores institucionalizados. Frente a las visiones que asocian estas tendencias a procesos de cooptación (y desmovilización) (e.g. Kriesi et al., 1995) otros las perciben como procesos de influencia de la sociedad civil (Jiménez, 2005). Del mismo modo, en la literatura de la gobernanza, junto a las visiones más escépticas o negativas, algunos autores los conciben como oportunidades para incorporar las dinámicas democráticas de la sociedad civil en la esfera institucional de los procesos decisionales.
2007). Nonetheless, conflicts over the contents or the frame may be interpreted as another way to project political demands by social actors (Blanco and Goma 2003).

Phenomena such as bias mobilization (Navarro 2000), co-optation (Baiocchi et al. 2011) and instrumentalisation (Parkinson 2004) reduce the capacity of participatory devices to broaden the network of relationships between administration and the society, by appointing only those actors that answer to the predefined interests of the authority. The selective logic of the social actors called, either formally or informally, may create confrontation dynamics between excluded actors and the authorities, and even between participant/non-participant social actors.

Nonetheless, the reproduction of conflict may occur as a consequence of the frustration induced by the participatory experience when the initial expectations of social actors are not met, as was shown in the perceptions of individual participants (Talpin 2011). In any case, the impact, considered as conflict with social actors, will depend on the design and aims of the participatory mechanism and on the pre-existing setting of relationships (autonomy vs. dependence) (Biaocchi et al. 2011).

5. Some evidence from an exploratory field.

To test how our analytical framework worked, we decided to do a first exploratory pre-fieldwork. The aim of this phase of our research was to see how the different dimensions were developed in different contexts of participatory instruments, how the codebook travelled to a questions’ guide to capture data, and how we could define hypothesis before starting in depth fieldwork through case-studies. With this purpose, we decided to conduct interviews to academic experts in the field of participatory governance in three regions of Spain and focus-groups with practitioners. Finally, we conducted eight interviews with academic experts (in Catalonia, Andalusia and Madrid) and two nominal groups (VVAA 2009) with 7-8 practitioners each (one in Andalusia and the other in Catalonia). The groups were formed by civil servants practitioners (public administrations workers) and auxiliary practitioners from private organizations. Nominal groups are similar to focus-groups with experts and they had a dynamic that goes from individual discourses to collective discussions. For interviews, we used a guide with questions which reflected the different dimensions of effects; in nominal groups we used a similar sketch. In both cases, we went from general effects to concrete ones. After conducting this pre-field, we analysed the texts through thematic analysis manually and with Atlas-ti, identifying the main dimensions, codes and indicators, paying attention to emerging discourses and hypothesis over the effects of participatory instruments.

This exploratory pre-fieldwork has helped us to be more confident on the codebook we designed and about the hypothesis. Interviews to experts showed, first, that effects on civil society and their relations to local governments have been broadly unexplored in a comparative way, apart from particular cases. Interviews also showed the necessity of doing a hard work in the task of translating our indicators/codes (for example, concrete indicators on internal changes in organizations or about the relationships among actors) into explicit questions. We were putting question on very subtle and non-previously assessed shifts on interactions, so questions had to be clear, explicit and complemented with illustrative examples so that people can reflect. Furthermore, interviews with experts were really rich in the task of defining design and context factors motivating change and, consequently, hypotheses. The two nominal-groups gave us a more nuances and detailed data. In contrast to experts’ interviews which were more focused on general dynamics, practitioners gave us more
detailed data from their direct field experience. The result has been a general insight on the potential effects which participatory processes can produce on civil society and state relations, and a set of hypothesis which we will try to follow in case studies. Now, we will expose some of these potential effects and hypothesis collected in pre-fieldwork. They have been summarized in Table 4.
(Table 4 here)
5.1 On internal effects on groups.

If one of the effects associated to participatory processes is the emergence of new social organizations, our experts were sceptical towards this possibility. Thinking of concrete participatory instruments, experts do not clearly identify the birth of new entities. But they point to a large cycle tendency: when municipalities assumed the management of social services and they bootstrapped participatory councils related to social welfare, an important number of new entities on social issues (health, migrations, women, disabilities, and youth) consolidated. This was not a direct consequence of participatory councils, but an effect of the decentralization of social services where participatory councils had a relevant role. Subsidies and grants were incentives which acted as the motor-force for the emergence of new social welfare organizations. A second wave for the emergence of new social actors would be happening at the current moment, and it is associated to the failure of participatory politics. As one of the interviews said, “They have been replaced by non-institutional processes”. New actors self-organized ignoring institutional participatory processes which are not recognized as opportunity-windows to impulse their demands. Thus, institutional participatory processes are not represented as a motor-force for the formation of new social groups and entities at the current moment, being the context the main explanation.

Changes in the agenda and the improvement of the resources of social groups are two interrelated dimensions. For experts, the 80-90’s participatory policies based on advisory councils and subsidies to associations had the result of patronage practices, institutionalization and professionalization. First, social agendas suffered a transformation towards more integral perspectives, for example, as an expert explained, Neighborhood Plans in Southern Madrid promoted a shift consisting on “From investing in stone to investing in people, this is, investing in culture, welfare, social services, education etc.” Strategic plans in the South Madrid made that the vindications of organizations were more sensitive to cultural, social and economic objectives, not only traditional public works. On the other hand, social movements, anti-globalisation organizations, ecologists and new social movements put the emphasis in “the loss in mobilizations and protests”. This is, changes in the agenda and the incorporation of public resources and objectives were seen as a risk of demobilization, loss of contentious and independent character.

Regarding resources, participatory councils promoted “empowerment in terms of resources acquisition, in terms of decision-making power … less potential.” A better knowledge of administrative and institutional processes, facilities for social organizations, economic resources for projects and participatory skills were expanded. But, the other side of this process was a culture of clientelism and a loss in the reivindicative character of social organizations: “While the civil society of the Transition was committed, Public Administration became a thirsty customer claiming for their subsidies”. New participatory instruments came with new lines of subsidies to organizations, projects and facilities, and this was identified also with a clientelistic mentality inside organizations.

Regarding new visions and knowledge, participatory processes promoted deeper knowledge on the complexities and structures of public administration, how the technical criteria worked and new participatory methodologies supported by facilitators. As one of the experts explained, participatory devices transmitted a new vision of democracy where participation of organizations and citizens was central. A “new epistemic community” and the debate over the subject of democracy broke through. Among these ideational internal changes, a key transformation was the feeling of external efficacy, this is, the perception of influence and
trust over local governments. Here, one expert said that trust and receptivity towards institutions could be an important effect, but most experts made emphasis on frustration, fatigue and demotivation. Specifically, frustration happens when participatory processes as councils do not produce collective decisions. This also happens when decisions are taken but not implemented by public administration. Thus, the main ideational transformation can be frustration as far as most of participatory mechanisms have a weak link to the implementation of proposals.

All these transformations seem to be restricted to a small ring of participants of organizations: “I see just 8, 12, 15 representatives of civil society. I could not ensure they have capacity to move the rest of their communities or the rest of civil society”. Another expert made emphasis on the generational aspect (adults and seniors which are more integrated in traditional Neighbor Associations). This is, only a small ring inside organizations seemed to be impregnated by these effects.

5.2 The channels of groups with citizens.

The relationship of social organizations with citizens is a less central topic in our interviews and groups, and it rarely appeared spontaneously in conversations; actually, experts are sceptical towards the idea that participatory devices opened new channels of communication between organizations and non-organized citizens. Effects in the channels of communication with citizens seem not to be strong. However, regarding advisory councils, one of the experts explained how the institutional recognition (certification processes) made some neighbor and social organizations a reference for their communities, favoring the interaction with the rest of neighbors as opportunity-windows. Nevertheless, the refractory relation of entities with lay citizens can be evident in participatory devices which are open to all residents (participatory budgets, for example). Our experts explained how organizations can preserve a conflicted memory on the participation of all residents: who is legitimated to participate? Who is more representative, individuals or interest groups? One expert who organized participatory budgets in Andalusia explained that “the arguments for opposing individual participation are not banal at all; they are related to the individualization of the society and the destruction of collective action and associations”. Therefore, open-to-everyone participatory mechanisms are not normally seen as an opportunity to build new bridges with non-organized people; they can be seen as individual competitors over decision-making. They can also be seen as another way to the dissolution of solidarity bonds through which organizations are formed.

Not all organization are so refractory to non-organized citizens and, as one of the experts put on the table, mechanisms as participatory budgeting produce effects in organizations which were engaged previously in self-transformation. This is, those organizations which are opened to revise their internal working were more apt to learn from participatory mechanisms. But, this was rare, “organizations which had already begun the process because they had few people, they were in crisis and they were poorly connected with the general public, and had already begun a process of change, changing the structures, rotating the posts, being more horizontal ... ” This is, organizations changed when they have previously started the effort; in that situation, participatory processes can transmit democratic methodologies and make organizations more open to include non-organized citizens.

In the case of participatory mechanisms which include lay citizens as the participatory budget of Getafe (Madrid), there was a break of the monopoly of neighborhood organizations in the
relationship with institutions (a new certificatory process). Thus, processes of decision in social organizations tended to incorporate external lay citizens making proposals more open to non-associated citizens. This was part of a weak trend to responsiveness and accountability which remained after participatory processes. Thus, in the case of advisory councils in a small-size town of Madrid, institutional recognition of some entities obliged them to be more responsive to the demands of neighbors; they became a sort of intermediaries with the municipality. These entities which had public facilities and subsidies were also asked to make their organizational structures explicit, to show their budgets and economic reports to authorities, making them available and more transparent to citizens too.

From these accounts, it seems crucial that changes in the interaction of social organizations with non-organized citizens happen depending on the design of participatory processes and previous contexts. Specifically, it depends on the strategy of mobilization of the participatory mechanisms. Thus, participatory budget confronted organizations with their neighbors and obliged organizations to make open proposals justify their representative role and, in sum, present themselves to the rest of citizens. For the case of advisory councils, it seems that changes come with the “certification etiquettes”, this is, authority giving publicity and legitimacy to some organizations which became another participatory window for citizens. From the context, previous processes of reflection and democratic change in organizations were the key to understand how they were affected by participatory institutions.

5.3 Effects in the relations between groups.

One of the highest moments in interviews and groups is the discussion on the actors’ web of relations. If participatory devices seem to produce any relevant effect this is to impulse the meeting, recognition and the contact between social actors over time. However this is limited. For example, in the case of a participatory budget in a big city, facilitators designed a “sociogram” to see the horizontal interactions and they were quite precarious. In this case, participatory budget made neighbourhood organizations meet to criticize that process, but horizontal contacts did not increment substantially after that. In the case of Catalunya, another expert explained how autonomous coordination between different types of organizations did not follow the participatory wave. Thus, as autonomous and self-administered coordination between different types of organizations is so difficult, participatory mechanisms can be a relevant starting point: the role of brokerage we cited above.

Departing from this scenario of non-autonomous and horizontal coordination, one of the experts described how advisory councils in a small city of Madrid served for introducing organizations to each other, and their leaders. It was also useful to put in common the work that they were doing in different parts of the city. In a very sound case, the water councils in Catalunya, our expert reported:

“The most important and permanent in time is the fact of having known each other. In that process, which lasted four years, we have known and mutually recognized, despite the divergence, they are more able to work than before. One participant said she thought that environmentalists were brainless hippies, but they have spent many hours together and although she has not changed their basic position, she now recognizes environmentalist arguments”
Thus, frequently unknown or opposed actors met in these spaces and outlined their perceptions on the other. However, these encounters in participatory devices did not mean, automatically, happy collaborations. Actually, participatory devices, their designs, contexts and resources are relevant to understand the dynamics of inclusion (new relations among social actors), competition and cooperation between them. Experts brought here an important debate. For example, an expert brought the experience of Strategic Planning in some municipalities in Madrid as a relevant space to meet different associations—from neighbors, to owners, businessmen, trade unions, welfare NGO’s, etc., thus, generating dynamics of punctual collaboration for concrete projects. Here, contact is enough to produce love...

But this does not seem so simple. Other experts pointed to Strategic Plans for Urban Regeneration in Madrid and how they promoted competitiveness for economic resources and subsidies. Advisory councils associated to this plans helped the mobilization of bias of local governments. There could be a selection of winners by the local governments. On the contrary, in the 90’s, the Movement Dignidad Sur in Madrid—as a social movement formed by neighborhood organizations and new social movements- pushed for the implementation of a participatory process quite similar to participatory budgets. This implied, according to an expert, the confluence of traditional and new associations: “These two cultures started to live together. Neighborhood associations were contaminated by other social movements such as the environmental movement or the squatters”. This institutional participatory process started, previously, with a broad social movement in Southern Madrid. So, cooperation between different organizations and subcultures crystallized thanks to a virtuous institutional process; but it was also the effect of a previous impulse by the civil society itself.

In summary, what we can say regarding effects in the interactions between social actors is that participatory mechanisms seem to enhance contact or make it more frequent afterwards. The institutional design can become a space for organizations to meet, the incentive to recognize each other, exchange information and maintain a basic contact (even if this is just a telephone number!) beyond the institution. Apart from basic mutual knowledge, long-term competitiveness or cooperation depends a lot on the design of the participatory process: which social actors are invited, what type of product and public policy (decisions over a local development plan, information and advice), how many proposals will be admitted and their prioritization, and the process of allocation of resources. The products and incentives say a lot about the cooperation or competition between organizations. But it also depends on the previous relationship of these actors which, do not remember, have a previous history and memories.

5.4 Effects in the Policy Network.

Participatory processes can transform the network of actors around a concrete policy, this network including authorities and social actors. Participatory processes can give place to new stable networks as it was in the case of an advisory council in a small city in Madrid. This town had a conflict over the inclusion of immigrants and this was managed by a participatory council with different social entities. Thus, a new stable policy network remained over time. As an expert explained, advisory councils in the 80’s-90’s made that “social organizations were in the cusp of decision making and they were the valid partners chosen by political parties”. Disruptions in policy networks appeared when participatory process mobilized individual citizens as in participatory budgets. In many cases, social organizations felt displaced—in comparison with the “cusp” role they had as a consequence of “advisory councils”. Distrust flourished when they saw their privileged role in decision-making in danger.
There are other two ways, according to our experts, how participatory processes had an effect in the policy networks. First, mechanisms which are based on TIC’s and individual participation can “affect” previous networks and displace, again, social organizations from participatory channels. Second, participatory institutions which are related to subsidies to organizations “without asking for any objective or product” can also be a way to mobilize the bias and close the policy network, selecting those organizations which are not critical to authorities.

According to experts, the diverse participatory policies developed after the 80’s have not changed radically the interaction between public administration and social actors. Actually, experts made a negative assessment of participatory institutional mechanisms. From this point of view, participatory processes can be seen as an excuse to avoid transparency in the allocation of funds and in decision-making, to promote the co-optation of social leaders, public administration satisfying the egoistic self-interests of some selected groups. Advisory participation seemed to be more prone to this type of clientelistic policy networks. Once again, this pattern contrasts with participatory processes which depart from previous strong empowerment of social organizations, like the case of some Brazilian participatory budgets (Baiocchi el al. 2011). There, previous mobilizations, protests and social empowerment raised “creative trust”, opening the local government and preserving the proactive character of social organizations.

The way deliberations and decision-making happens inside participatory mechanisms may also alter how the policy network remains. In this sense, an expert pointed at “participatory dialogue” based on empathy, sharing resources and power, common objectives and compromise, versus the typical political bargaining with social organizations while authorities make the allocation of resources and formal decision-making by themselves. The way participatory instruments imply deliberations and decision-making will condition future relations in the policy network. This is also relevant to understand future practices of clienteles, mobilization of bias, institutionalization and co-optation.

6. Some final comments...

Groups and interviews were fairly rich at identifying the potential factors which promote changes in civil society and their relations to public administrations. They also offered us an enrichment of our previous hypothesis, giving concrete details about the mechanisms which trigger effects. In the table 4, we can see the potential effects and the factors and mechanisms which may explain them. Obviously, case-studies will be able to reconstruct these processes of change while interviews and groups gave us further insight on the general hypotheses.

As we can see in interviews and groups, one of the properties of participatory mechanisms is that they can make, actually, the effect of coral reef articulating, promoting and modulating interactions and structures between social organizations, their members and authorities. These interactions and structures can remain, formally or informally, after the participatory process. Thus, participatory processes can produce structural transformations by putting different actors in touch and giving incentives to the contact. In our exploratory field, some structural changes seem to be relevant. For example, after participatory processes, organizations acquire new democratic skills, methodologies and more horizontal structures when they had a previous process of reflection. Social organizations get in touch, being unknown before, and these relationships remain informally and give raise to policy networks over time, which are cooperative or competitive according to the selection bias, the type of incentives, the
objectives and the procedure to distribute resources. This is, the design of a participatory process tells a lot about future contact among associations and the dynamics between them. For example, a parallel policy of scarce subsidies or the prioritization of proposals can leave a competitiveness chip between entities.

The second hypothesis was the reduction of costs in the collective action. In this sense, we can say that participatory processes which mobilize social organizations directly or indirectly, and which put them together in a physical space can produce this type of effect in the future. As one expert said, the participatory process is a big incentive to join when there was no previous relationship. This happens to organizations with different objectives, territories or areas, political backgrounds and social compositions, which had not meet spontaneously. This is the brokerage role of participatory processes. However, experts are not so confident about the capacity of participatory instruments to promote new groups to take advantage of the opportunity-window. The emergence of new groups depended more on subsidies, economic resources, facilities and decentralization of tasks to local governments (social welfare), than to the development of participatory processes. Nevertheless, in one of our cases, the official recognition of neighbourhood and social associations made that the community recognized these organizations a referent to channel their demands, the participatory process giving publicity and legitimacy, playing the role of certificatory agency. Thus, participatory processes could reduce the costs of collective action in between organizations and in the relationship of organizations with their communities by brokerage roles or by certifying the legitimacy of some actors.

Regarding cultural effects on the perceptions between organizations, organizations with citizens, and in the policy-networks, they are abundant though their research is hard. As we can see in interviews and groups, these effects are mostly unintended so their identification need a hard work of analysis. For organizations, feelings of frustration and negative memories of participatory processes seem to be relevant; this happens potentially when proposals are not implemented by local governments or when organizations feel displaced from the policy-network by the introduction of open-to-all citizens’ processes, as participatory budget. Other cultural changes appear when participatory mechanisms put in touch very different organizations (for example, ecologists with business) towards a strategic plan, a regeneration urban plan or water uses management. In these cases, the result is a common concrete policy and processes are long, so different actors potentially re-define the views on the other. They could also reinforce previous visions. The identification of the other actors as competitors or allies also depends on the previous relationship and the allocation of incentives and resources in the participatory process, for example, if organizations have to compete to enhance their individual projects. In the end, from our exploratory field, it seems that participatory processes produce cultural shifts among actors in terms of mutual knowledge, prejudices redefinition, building of new etiquettes towards the other, and sometimes we can see the shift to a positive evaluation of the other facilitating agreements on concrete policies. In other cases, participatory processes amplified frustration towards the institutions and a reinforcement of the previous views of actors. These changes depend a lot on the previous relationships, the objectives and the type of policy result (and its implementation), and the deliberations in long-term processes.

Finally, the last hypothesis was that participatory processes, under a strict control of the agenda and the mobilization tools by authorities, could serve to reproduce the status quo and reinforce existing unequal and close policy arenas. In our interviews and groups, subsidies,
personnel hiring and the management of projects, whose allocation depends finally on authorities, are connected to clientelism and instrumentalization. Actually, the participatory policy developed in the 80 and 90’s based on advisory councils and the articulation of resources to traditional organizations is connected with the clientelist paradigm. From the other side, organizations can act, eventually, as the client, basing their practices in exclusive self-interest and losing their reivindicative political objectives. A different frame for interactions does not seem to have emerged after the participatory wave; but some cases point to factors of change such as a) the previous empowerment of civic society (Baiocchi et al. 2011), b) a design based on deliberation to reach common objectives (vs. advisory-bargaining-informational structures), and c) an effort to demobilize the bias (this is, a sincere effort to pluralize the access of social organizations and mobilizing tools open to the major number of interests). If the contexts seem to be central to understand the impacts of participatory processes on the local civil society, the participatory design can leave important effects. New relational structures between organizations, new policy networks over time, internal debates on democracy or a reinforcement of frustration towards authorities, the recognition of social organizations as “certificated” agents to channel demands... Participatory mechanisms may have not shaken how social organizations and authorities relate in general, but they left structural and cultural effects which, once more developed, could contribute to a better democratic life.
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**Table 1:** (under construction) Effects related to extrinsic and intrinsic goals as levels of analysis (micro-meso-macro). Coloured Box: where the effects of participatory processes that focus our interest are located.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>Emphasis Objectives / justifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macro-Structural/Aggregated</td>
<td>Intrinsic (democratic deepening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Culture</td>
<td>Civic Society Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>Social Networks’ Density and Proliferation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of corruption and accountability</td>
<td>Democratic Administrative Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Democratic Ethos, Kathi y Cooper 2005)</td>
<td>(Faggoto y Fung, 2006; Baiochi 2004; Wampler, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fung 2003, Speer 2012, Ackerman 2003)</td>
<td>(…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso-Organizational configurations</td>
<td>Extrinsic (Political outcomes and outputs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proliferation of social actors, democratic networks and politization (politicization of proximity)</td>
<td>Responsiveness/open agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy among social actors and public authorities</td>
<td>Transparency and access to public information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embeddedness</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(…)</td>
<td>Political consensus/Reduction of conflictiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(…)</td>
<td>(…)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Empowerment of citizens and civic virtue at the individual level (Pincock, 2012; Funes et al. 2013, Talpin, 2011)
Participatory culture among office personnel

Curricular adaptability in democratic terms

Source: Own elaboration.

**Table 2.** Proposal for the operationalization of the democratizing effects on organizational configuration of civil society participatory processes in the field of public policy. Proliferation of social actors, politicized and democratic networks (empowerment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Empirical Manifestations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social groups</strong></td>
<td>Increasing number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversification (agendas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **In the interaction with citizens (social bases)** | **Increasing trend toward bilateral channels and communication practices.**  
Establishing mechanisms (formal and informal) of internal democracy | **Internal democracy values**  
Responsiveness to popular/social demands.  
Public transparency (sense of accountability to the community)  
Collective and public identities that include democratic values |
|---|---|---|
| **Interactions among groups** | **Various and frequent contacts (dense networks)**  
Collaborative Practices (vs. competitive) | **Orientation to work in inclusive networks**  
Mutual trust and solidarity  
Collective or public identities, including "community consciousness" |

Source: Own elaboration.
**Table 3.** Proposal for operationalization of the democratizing effects on the nature of the interactions between social actors and administration (public authorities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Empirical Manifestations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Structural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the network of actors</td>
<td>Configuration of a network of policy (diversity of actors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Politically relevant) regular and meaningful contact - beyond the instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversification of contact channels (formal and informal channels, beyond those specified in the design).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange interactions (resources, information, and legitimacy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the objectives and practices</td>
<td>Extension of consensual deliberative practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practices of redefinition of objectives (framing) and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control over the distribution of formal and informal rules of interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redefining roles: facilitation, empowerment and strategic roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appearance of (formal or informal) to techniques to share knowledge between actors (vs. exclusion).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appearance of evaluative processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.
Table 4. Summary of effects and factors which explain changes in the civil society and its relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family of Effects</th>
<th>Specific Effects</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside Social Organizations</td>
<td>Frustration/ Negative memories</td>
<td>No concrete policy results/Binding Results (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td>Poor Information (during and after) (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td>“Easy issues” (minor relevance issues to discuss) (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal democratization and acquisition of participatory skills</td>
<td>Organizations whiz previous process of reflection and openness to change (Context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Views to Participatory Institutional Processes</td>
<td>Non central role given to social organizations (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontality, Rotation of posts, Democratization</td>
<td>Organizations with a previous process of reflection, democratization and openness (Context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New consolidated resources: Information, knowledge, methodologies, democratic practices and funds</td>
<td>Continuity (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clientelistic practices</td>
<td>Etiquettes to social organizations promoted by public administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-interests practices</td>
<td>Selective allocation of public resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material resources</td>
<td>Economic/material incentives and subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing the number</td>
<td>Decentralization of capacities + participatory councils +subsidies (Context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Issues in Agenda (holistically thinking)</td>
<td>General and strategic plans for neighborhoods (Design)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss in contentious character and protests (change in repertoires)</td>
<td>Issues in agenda and public subsidies (Design)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New debates on democracy</td>
<td>Social actors and tools for mobilization (Design)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Network of Organizations**

<p>| Increasing interaction between organizations | Incentives: economic, knowledge, expertise, information (Design) Brokerage by public actors (Design) |
| Mutual knowledge and recognition | Face-to-face encounters (Design) Long-term contact (Design) Openness to the other’s arguments (Context) |
| Transformation of the perception towards other actors | Long-term contact (Design) |
| Bias Mobilization/Plural Mobilization | Tools to mobilize actors and the type of actors mobilized (Design and context) |
| Increasing and plural interaction | Area of the Policy (issues at stake) (design) |
| No increasing interrelation and coordination | Specialization and competitiveness for resources, services and decision-making (Context) |
| Competitiveness | Number of proposals and prioritization process (design) Competitive allocation of resources (Design) Mobilization of Bias and public selection of actors (Design and context) |
| Learning and amplifying dynamics of | Number of proposals and criteria for prioritization (Design) Concrete projects of Local Development (Design) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations and Individuals</th>
<th>Increasing Contact with Non Organized Citizens</th>
<th>Open to all processes, participatory budget (Design) Certification Processes (Design)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive interaction to individuals</td>
<td>Positive Redefinition of the other views</td>
<td>Plural actors, decision making over common-good projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative interactions to individual participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Displacement of organization in open-to-all spaces (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness and transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizations which have a previous process of reflection (Context) Public authorities requirement (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Network</td>
<td>Increasing interaction between organizations and authorities</td>
<td>Incentives: economic, knowledge, expertise, information (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement of Social Actors and distrust</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion of individuals (open to all instruments) (Design) Bias selection of organizations (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Stable Networks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory councils and other permanent structures with collective actors (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing and Plural Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area of the Policy (Issues at stake) (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Plural Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilizations of Bias and Formal/Informal Selection of Actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller-client paradigm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unequal status between public administration and social actors (Context) Self-interested practices (Context) Lack of decision-making power for social actors (Context and design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative Paradigm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared decision-making (Design) Deliberative skills between actor (Context) Spaces and meetings for arguments-exchange (Design) Empowerment (Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Effects (and factors)</td>
<td>Success/Non-success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own Elaboration