

National Collaborating Centre  
for **Healthy Public Policy**

[www.ncchpp.ca](http://www.ncchpp.ca)

# DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES: SELECTED RESOURCES

INVENTORY | AUGUST 2011



Centre de collaboration nationale  
sur les politiques publiques et la santé

National Collaborating Centre  
for Healthy Public Policy

*Institut national  
de santé publique*

Québec 



National Collaborating Centre  
for **Healthy Public Policy**

[www.ncchpp.ca](http://www.ncchpp.ca)

# DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES: SELECTED RESOURCES

INVENTORY | AUGUST 2011



Centre de collaboration nationale  
sur les politiques publiques et la santé

National Collaborating Centre  
for Healthy Public Policy

*Institut national  
de santé publique*

Québec 

## **AUTHOR**

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

## **LAYOUT**

Madalina Burtan  
National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy

Production of this document has been made possible through a financial contribution from the Public Health Agency of Canada through funding for the National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy (NCCHPP).

The National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy is hosted by the Institut national de santé publique du Québec (INSPQ), a leading centre in public health in Canada.

The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of the Public Health Agency of Canada.

*This document is available in its entirety in electronic format (PDF) on the Institut national de santé publique du Québec website at: [www.inspq.qc.ca](http://www.inspq.qc.ca) and on the National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy website at: [www.ncchpp.ca](http://www.ncchpp.ca).*

*La version française est disponible sur les sites Web du Centre de collaboration nationale sur les politiques publiques et la santé (CCNPPS) au [www.ccnpps.ca](http://www.ccnpps.ca) et de l'Institut national de santé publique du Québec au [www.inspq.qc.ca](http://www.inspq.qc.ca).*

*Reproductions for private study or research purposes are authorized by virtue of Article 29 of the Copyright Act. Any other use must be authorized by the Government of Québec, which holds the exclusive intellectual property rights for this document. Authorization may be obtained by submitting a request to the central clearing house of the Service de la gestion des droits d'auteur of Les Publications du Québec, using the online form at <http://www.droitauteur.gouv.qc.ca/en/autorisation.php> or by sending an e-mail to [droit.auteur@cspq.gouv.qc.ca](mailto:droit.auteur@cspq.gouv.qc.ca).*

*Information contained in the document may be cited provided that the source is mentioned.*

LEGAL DEPOSIT – 2<sup>nd</sup> QUARTER 2012  
BIBLIOTHÈQUE ET ARCHIVES NATIONALES DU QUÉBEC  
LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES CANADA  
ISBN: 978-2-550-64531-3 (FRENCH PRINTED VERSION)  
ISBN: 978-2-550-64532-0 (FRENCH PDF)  
ISBN: 978-2-550-64533-7 (PRINTED VERSION)  
ISBN: 978-2-550-64534-4 (PDF)

© Gouvernement du Québec (2012)

## **ABOUT THE NATIONAL COLLABORATING CENTRE FOR HEALTHY PUBLIC POLICY**

The National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy (NCCHPP) seeks to increase the expertise of public health actors across Canada in healthy public policy through the development, sharing and use of knowledge. The NCCHPP is one of six Centres financed by the Public Health Agency of Canada. The six Centres form a network across Canada, each hosted by a different institution and each focusing on a specific topic linked to public health. In addition to the Centres' individual contributions, the network of Collaborating Centres provides focal points for the exchange and common production of knowledge relating to these topics.

## FOREWORD

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

This inventory is intended to launch inquiry into the subject of deliberative processes as applied to public policy and thus does not claim to be exhaustive. It is based on a review of the literature on this subject carried out by the NCCHPP during Summer 2009. An update of this document was conducted in August 2011. It reflects the information available at the time the review was carried out.

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

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>AN OVERVIEW OF DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Tools of democratic governance .....	1
1.1.1	Articles .....	1
1.1.2	Books and monographs .....	1
1.1.3	Organizations.....	2
1.2	Tools for applying research-based knowledge .....	3
1.2.1	Articles .....	3
1.2.2	Books and monographs .....	3
1.2.3	Organizations.....	4
<b>2</b>	<b>THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Articles.....	5
2.2	Books and monographs .....	5
<b>3</b>	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHIC SEARCHES .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Key-terms .....	7
3.2	Databases and search engines.....	7
3.3	Scientific journals.....	8

# 1 AN OVERVIEW OF DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES

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

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

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

## 1.1 TOOLS OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

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

### 1.1.1 Articles

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

Sintomer, Y. & Blondiaux, L. (2002). L’impératif délibératif. *Politix – Revue des sciences sociales du politique*, 15(57), 17-35. Retrieved from : [http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/polix\\_0295-2319\\_2002\\_num\\_15\\_57\\_1205](http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/polix_0295-2319_2002_num_15_57_1205).

### 1.1.2 Books and monographs

Bekker, M. (2007). *The Politics of Healthy Policies: Redesigning health impact assessment to integrate health in public policy*. Delft: Eburon Academic Publishers.



- Bohman, J. & Rehg, W. (1997). *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Callon, M., Lascoumes, P. & Barthe, Y. (2001). *Agir dans un monde incertain : Essai sur la démocratie technique*. Paris: Le Seuil.
- Dryzek, J.S. (2002). *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elster, J. (1998). *Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fung, A. & Wright, E.O. (2003). *Deepening Democracy: Institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance*. London: Verso Press.
- Fischer, F. (2003). *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive politics and deliberative practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fishkin, J. & Laslett, P. (2003). *Debating Deliberative Democracy*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gastil, J. & Levine, P. (2005). *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for effective civic engagement in the twenty-first century*. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass.
- Hajer, M.A. & Magenaar, H. (2003). *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding governance in the network society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

### 1.1.3 Organizations

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

#### North America

Canada:

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

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

Canadian Policy Research Networks  
<http://www.cprn.com> (FR/EN)

United States:

Center for Deliberative Democracy (Stanford University)  
<http://cdd.stanford.edu> (EN)

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

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

## Europe

Denmark:

Danish Board of Technology  
<http://www.tekno.dk> (EN)

## International

International Association for Public Participation  
<http://www.iap2.org> (EN)

## 1.2 TOOLS FOR APPLYING RESEARCH-BASED KNOWLEDGE

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

### 1.2.1 Articles

Lavis, J.N. (2006). Moving Forward on Both Systematic Reviews and Deliberative Processes. *Healthcare Policy*, 1(2), 59-63. Retrieved from: <http://www.longwoods.com/product.php?productid=17877&cat=412&page=1>.

Pineault, R., Tousignant, P., & Roberge, D. (2007). Involving Decision-Makers in Producing Research Syntheses: The case of the research collective on primary healthcare in Quebec. *Healthcare Policy*, 2(4), 1-17. Retrieved from: <http://www.longwoods.com/product.php?productid=18867>.

### 1.2.2 Books and monographs

Canadian Health Services Research Foundation. (2006). *Weighing up the evidence: Making evidence-informed guidance accurate, achievable, and acceptable*. Ottawa. Online: [http://www.chsrf.ca/migrated/pdf/weighing\\_up\\_the\\_evidence\\_e.pdf](http://www.chsrf.ca/migrated/pdf/weighing_up_the_evidence_e.pdf).

Lomas, J., Culyer, T., McCutcheon, C., McAuley, L., & Law, S. (2005). *Conceptualizing and Combining Evidence for Health System Guidance*. Ottawa: Canadian Health Services Research Foundation. Retrieved from: [http://www.chsrf.ca/migrated/pdf/insightAction/evidence\\_e.pdf](http://www.chsrf.ca/migrated/pdf/insightAction/evidence_e.pdf).

Denis, J.L., Lehoux, P. & Champagne, F. (2004). A Knowledge Utilization Perspective on Fine-Tuning Dissemination and Contextualizing Knowledge. In L. Lemieux-Charles, & F. Champagne (Eds.), *Using Knowledge and Evidence in Health Care: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. (pp. 18-40). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

### **1.2.3 Organizations**

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

#### **North America**

Canada:

Canadian Health Services Research Foundation, Decision Support Synthesis Program  
<http://www.chsrf.ca/Programs/PastPrograms/DecisionSupportSynthesisPrograms.aspx> (FR/EN)

Institutes of Health Economics, Consensus Development Conferences Program  
<http://www.ihe.ca/research/consensus-development-conference-program> (EN)

United States:

National Institutes of Health, Consensus Development Program  
<http://consensus.nih.gov> (EN)

#### **Europe**

United Kingdom:

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence  
<http://www.nice.org.uk> (EN)

#### **International**

Evidence-Informed Policy Network  
<http://www.who.int/rpc/evipnet> (EN)

## 2 THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES

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

### 2.1 ARTICLES

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

Carpini, M.X.D., Cook, F.L. & Jacobs, L.R. (2004). Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation, and Citizen Engagement: A review of the empirical literature. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 315-344. doi: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.121003.091630

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.2 BOOKS AND MONOGRAPHS

Abelson, J. & Gauvin, F.P. (2006). *Assessing the Impacts of Public Participation: Concepts, evidence and policy implications*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks. Online: [http://www.cprn.org/documents/42669\\_fr.pdf](http://www.cprn.org/documents/42669_fr.pdf).

Abelson, J. and the Effective Public Consultation (EPC) Research Team. (2004). *Towards More Meaningful, Informed and Effective Public Consultation*. Final Report to the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation. Online: [http://www.chsrf.ca/migrated/pdf/abelson\\_final\\_e.pdf](http://www.chsrf.ca/migrated/pdf/abelson_final_e.pdf).

Davies, C., Wetherell, M., Barnett, E., & Seymour-Smith, S. (2005). *Opening the Box: Evaluating the Citizens Council of NICE*. Report prepared for the National Coordinating Centre for Research Methodology, NHS Research and Development Programme: Open University. Online: [http://www.pcpoh.bham.ac.uk/publichealth/methodology/docs/invitations/Citizens\\_council\\_Mar05.pdf](http://www.pcpoh.bham.ac.uk/publichealth/methodology/docs/invitations/Citizens_council_Mar05.pdf).

OECD. (2005). *Evaluating Public Participation in Policy Making*. Paris: OECD Publications.

### 3 BIBLIOGRAPHIC SEARCHES

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

#### 3.1 KEY-TERMS

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 3.2 DATABASES AND SEARCH ENGINES

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

### 3.3 SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS

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

Healthcare Policy

<http://www.longwoods.com/publications/healthcare-policy> (EN)

Health Policy

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

Journal of Public Deliberation

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

*Politix : Revue des sciences sociales du politique*

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

Public Understanding of Science

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

Science, Technology, & Human Values

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

Social Science & Medicine

[www.elsevier.com/locate/socscimed](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/socscimed) (EN)





[www.ncchpp.ca](http://www.ncchpp.ca)



Centre de collaboration nationale  
sur les politiques publiques et la santé

---

National Collaborating Centre  
for Healthy Public Policy

*Institut national  
de santé publique*

Québec 