



## ONLINE LIBRARY

([www.onekhmer.org/onlinelibrary](http://www.onekhmer.org/onlinelibrary))

**Title:** Democratic Process

<b>Name of Author</b>	Sonariddh Mao
<b>Name of University</b>	University of Melbourne
<b>Country of Study</b>	Australia
<b>Major</b>	Public Policy and Management
<b>Degree</b>	Master
<b>Course Title</b>	Public, Policy and Public Service
<b>Type of Document</b>	Assignment
<b>Year</b>	

The complex state of the twenty-first century focuses on the modernization of public policy processes that postulate simplification in complex public service deliveries to the educated population globalized economic environment and free flow of citizenry. The participation of citizens is pioneering policy decision-making in the areas of coherent and customized policies that advocate ethical and justified public conducts (Parker & Gallagher 2007). The involvement of citizens to become political figures can assist in abating complex social problems. The public policy cycle decides the steps of relevant policy making to the alteration of improved policy on a whole. The engagement and involvement of policy are increasingly effectiveness in the making and implementing coherent policy.

The modern public policy instrument is the inception of public interaction spaces or participation programs between governmental representatives and the public. These public interactive spaces are utilized to promote social objectives associated with social exclusion and democratic strengthening process (Barnes et al. 2003). The understanding of the expansion in shareholders' programs, especially in public bodies taken from the social interactive spaces, can potentially increase the public service delivery methods in policy decision-making and social objectives (Barnes et al. 2003).

Public administration is a vehicle for expressing values and preferences of citizens, communities and society (Bourgon 2007). The Paradigms of public administrative transform from rigid structure to networked structure. The discipline, delivery methods, core focus, governmental instruments and actors are continuously changing over time given the changing collective values expressed by the community and citizenry. The networked government is to understand the expressed and individualized needs of citizens. The value that citizens hold changes over time, therefore the paradigm of government must be altered to adapt to the values in term of understanding, defining, delivering and implementing (Bourgon 2007).

The modern approach to public policy is the instrument that utilizes increased public participation in public policy decision-making and social interaction in strengthening the democratic process (Barnes et al. 2003). The call for public participation and public interaction space programs are influenced by the community development process in 1970s,

consumer behavior in 1980s and responsive public services in the 2000s. These new approaches are also aligned with the central government's objectives in the UK. Public participation and interactive spaces can increasingly provide needed support foundation and legitimacy to the public decision-making process in many sectors of the government, as well as strengthening community development process and public capacity (Barnes et al. 2003).

The public interaction spaces and public participation programs include "citizen's juries, area committees, neighborhood forums, tenant groups, user group and specific interest groups. (Lowndes, Pratchett & Stoker 2001)." The inceptions of each group and program can be traced from various sources including increased public participation from the government, voluntary or shared interests from public bodies and political bodies (Barnes et al. 2003).

The study conducted by Barnes et al (2003) branches to how public bodies express or establish a space that they can be involved and contributed, as well as the facilitation process utilized by the governmental representatives in legitimizing public participation and drawing public support from public interaction in contributing to public policy decision-making process and delivery methods. The concluded results are concerning with the sustainability of maintaining public interaction with various groups, as well as legitimizing the process accounting marginalizing 'counter public' notion.

The Australian government has been maintaining regular contacts with influential individuals or groups, but private lobbying from vested interest groups or political representatives has been put-under the spotlight by OECD (Bishop & Davis 2002). The shift to direct public participation, as a result from increased discontent and distrust of political representatives, has given a rise to direct involvement in the policy-process from affected shareholders through public participation. The demand for direct participation from the citizenry has sparked a new democratic process, therefore rethinking the power-sharing dynamic of the public and government (Bishop & Davis 2002).

The linkages of public policy decision-making process with public participation can be emphasized because of the demand for enhanced democratic process. The shift to public participation has been elevated because of the democratic deficit, where the democratic system has been ineffective in satisfying the needs and wants of the citizenry (Hindess 1997). The growing distrust and discontent in the democratic process have been called in regards to

the legitimacy problems with policy decision-making and public services delivery. Therefore, the implementation of public participation and social interaction space can be effective in legitimizing the policy decision-making process as well as abate dissatisfied citizens by creating a justified process that is transparent and fair to the citizenry (Bishop & Davis 2002).

The emergent of public distrust has been constituted by decreasing social capital, which seems to linked to decreased interaction amongst the public and private entities as well as their functions in creating a functional society (Putnam 2000). The restructured democratic processes that linked with public participation are highlighted by transparent process and shift to increased control for the citizenry with monitoring agencies. The prevailing of direct democracy has promoted more prominent and lasting role of citizenry. The role of representative democracy has been declining in citizenry's satisfaction, which can credited by inaccessible representative politicians whom are less concerned with citizenry but administrative and lobbying tasks (Bishop & Davis 2002).

The shift from output to outcome is one of the most important indicators in the governmental paradigm (Moore 1995). The increased collaboration of agencies and sectors are important policy decision-making and implementation processes in the post-NPM era. The tools of governmental paradigm give rise to increased political involvement of various stakeholders that are tailoring to services that are required by individual citizen. These changes are the definition of effective government.

The consensus of public participations from numerous sources can however be daunting tasks given conflicting interests and broad setting of the community strengthening process. In accordance to Bishop & Davis (2002), the public policy world has shaped a clearer definition of public participating and citizen-centric to be the collaboration of shareholders in directly or indirectly affecting the policy decision process and delivery on issues that affect them, as indicated by the term on World Bank. OECD has further added a similar definition of 'customer-influenced and participation in the public sector services', therefore public managers or agencies must be able to clearly identify the shareholders in order to coherently gather their data in term of feedbacks through various collection methods. The collection from direct and partial participation will influence the policy decision-making process, thus abating the unilateral process of the government (Bishop & Davis 2002).

The understanding of the public participation processes can be divided into four models with various degrees of participation from the community and citizenry. Firstly, the continuum model, influenced by Sherry Arnstein (1969, 1971) and Carole Pateman (1970), emphasizes on the degrees of participation where the division of power can be based on true participation to token participation. The problem associated with the continuum model is the varying degree of participation; therefore the lines between the divisions of power are likely ambiguous until true participation is available. Secondly, the model is specifically linked with policy issue, therefore the identification of stakeholders are explicitly linked to the ramification of policy issues (Thomas 1990, 1993). Public managers can assume different approaches from the flexibility of the second models in approaching relevant stakeholder in accordance to the emerging issues.

Thirdly, this model further extends the first and second model with degrees of participation and availability of management choices (Shand & Arnberg 1996). Therefore, the linkage of policy issues to relevant stakeholders and coherent management techniques can be used to further clearly identify the level of power divisions between the governmental representative and citizenry. Lastly, the model does not use continuum of policy issues as a basis given the actual nature of policy and administration. Values change over time thus one set of value can become predominant, furthermore, its influence can potentially transform the role of government and the practices of public administration given arising public needs (Bourgon 2007). Therefore, the degrees of participation and management choices must be further ramified on positivist theory, not normative theory. The affected stakeholders, choices, and policies are needed to be considered on discontinuous term to clearly identify the degrees of participation and availability of management choices (Bishop & Davis 2002).

The tools of governmental paradigms are increasingly focused on the co-production aspects such as collaborative service delivery, networked government, co-design and more. The connection of government decision and public decision must be emphasized in order find the common ground in order establish effective public policy. Co-production is the joined efforts of government and stakeholder in designing, producing, implementing thus adding values from varying expertise. The who, what, when of the co-production method can helpful in assisting policymaker in identifying stakeholders and how to influence them using coherent

incentives. This process contributes the public value process mapping and causal map (Bishop & Davis 2002).

The interdependence and substitution relationship can contribute the increased utilization co-production. The design of incentive can be psychological, financial or cultural to increase participation and engagement of citizenry. Self-efficacy can be used to realize the targeted group of stakeholders. The design and decoding of public opinion can be increased using social media mechanisms and meaningful reinforcement. The engagement triangle is helpful in helping the stakeholders and governmental agents to strengthen many aspects of their collaboration. This small niche gives rise to social entrepreneur, thus identifying and solving social problems consistently and innovatively.

The role of public participation is increasingly highlighted in the public policy's literature, as the growing distrust and discontent of representative democracy has reached an all-time high. The new paradigm of direct democracy has given expectation to the community and citizenry in having a voice in the policy and social issues surround affected community. Public participation has both theoretical and empirical benefits and downfalls, therefore, the varying degrees of public participation and management choices as shown as the models can give applicable foundation for future relevance policy decision-making process and public services delivery.

#### References:

Adams, D & Michael H 2001, 'Community in Public Policy: Fad or Foundation', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol 60, No. 2, pp. 13-23.

- Arnstein, S 1971, 'A Ladder of Citizen Participation in the USA', *Journal of the Town Planning Institute*, Vol.57, No.4, pp. 176–82.
- Barnes, M, Newman, J, Knops A and H. Sullivan 2003, 'Constituting 'the Public' in Public Participation', *Public Administration*, Vol. 81, No. 2, pp. 379–399.
- Bishop, P & Glyn D 2002, 'Mapping Public Participation in Policy Choices', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 14-29.
- Bourgon, J 2007, 'Responsible, responsive and respected government: towards a New Public Administration Theory', *International Review of Administrative Services*, vol. 73, no.1, pp.9-26.
- Hindess, B 1997, 'Democracy and Disenchantment', *Australian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 32, no.1, pp. 79–92.
- Klijn, EH & Chris, S 2007, 'Democracy and governance networks: Compatible or not?', *Public Administration*, Vol. 85, No. 3, pp. 587-608.
- John, K 2010, 'The Life and Death of Democracy', *Simon and Schuster*, pp. 41-47.
- Lowndes V, Pratchett L & Stoker G 2001, 'Trends in Public Participation: Part 2 – Citizens' Perspectives', *Public Administration*, Vol. 79, No. 2, pp. 445-455.
- Moore, MH 1994, 'Public Value as the Focus of Strategy', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 53, No.3, pp. 296-303.
- Pateman, C 1970, *Participation and Democratic Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Putnam, RD 2000, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, Simon and Schuster: New York.

Shand, D & Arnberg, M 1996, ‘‘Background Paper’ in Responsive Government: Service Quality Initiatives’, *Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris*

Thomas, JC 1993, ‘Public Involvement and Governmental Effectiveness: A Decision-making Model for Public Managers’, *Administrative Science and Society*, vol. 24, no.4, pp. 444–69.