



DEMOCRACY, PARTICIPATION AND PUBLIC GOVERNANCE: WHAT WAYS?

Pierre-Charles PUPION¹

This Issue 2 of the year 2016-2017 of the journal "Gestion et Management Public" addresses the question of democracy and the question of actors' participation in the conduct of organizations and public policies. The word democracy comes from ancient Greek δημοκρατία / *dēmokratía*), it is composed of the Greek terms "demos", the people "who inhabits the city" and the Greek terms "kratos", the powerful, in the sense of "able to govern ". According to Larousse dictionary, the word democracy designates a political system as a form of government in which sovereignty emanates from the people. It also refers to "a system of reports established within an institution, a group, etc., where opinions of those who have to carry out the tasks are taken into account.

A central question in public management is the participation of stakeholders in the conduct of organizations and public policies. The issue of stakeholder participation in decision-making is a central issue in terms of public management and public policy. Participation aims to improve decision-making by taking into account the perceptions of different players on the problems to be solved. Participation makes possible to integrate wider information and ideas, it facilitates the acceptance of public choices.

T

There is a continuum in this participation, ranging from consultation, to dialogue to negotiation (Roy and Damart, 2002, Bérard, 2013). The consultation is used to gather opinions and attitudes of the various actors before taking a collective decision. Dialogue helps to find an agreement between actors in order to solve a problem or to make a collective choice. The authority in charge of the decision presents it to the concerned individuals and promotes a dialogue with them. Negotiation is a situation where interdependent actors are looking for a solution acceptable to the parties in order to conclude a conflict.

The level of participation is measured in terms of its extent and depth (Edelenbos and Klijn, 2006; Ashmos et al., 1998). The extent of participation is estimated by the number and diversity of the actors involved, and by the chronology and occurrences of participation (Ashmos et al., 1998). The depth of participation corresponds to the degree to which actors can influence decision-making. It depends to a large extent on the involvement techniques which are used.

This issue gathers articles which explicitly or implicitly address the question of stakeholder participation in public policy and in public organization.

Interactive governance is a way for a government to involve citizens, social organizations, and various stakeholders in the public policy process (Edelenbos, 1999)

Our colleague, Jaeho EUN proposes an article entitled "Consensus Building Through

¹ Professeur des Universités à l'IPAG de l'Université de Poitiers, Président d'AIRMAP

Participatory Decision-Making.-Experiences and Lessons from Korea". He analyses the efficacy of citizen jury system, a participative decision-making. The citizen jury system was experimented in the metropolitan city of Ulsan to resolve the long-running local conflict over the food waste treatment and recycling project. This participatory arrangement resolved the conflict but provided a solution that was abandoned four months after its operationalization. Also, the author suggests a checklist of eighteen variables to consider for a successful implementation of participatory decision-making.

The governance of public organizations is sustained by tools and systems which come from New Public Management and enforce or not this democratic process.

The article of Jean-Claude PACITTO, Driss AHEDDA is entitled "French academic reform: from a managerial inspiration to a bureaucratic drift". It deals with the question of democracy, NPM and governance in the french universities. The authors show that the law on university autonomy passed in 2007 is focused on the president's powers. Adopted for a managerial perspective, it has paradoxically reinforced the bureaucratic mechanisms in the university. The central services play an increasing role and develop procedures that are often incompatible with the managerial approach. The development of managerial principles has induced a greater bureaucratization.

The article of Antoine MASINGUE, Audrey PHILIPPART, Jérémy LORAIN is entitled "The role of the Management Control Function within the organization of the county councils: a controversial issue. Contribution to the debate through the scenario method". It analyzes the place of the management control in a departmental council, in a functional perspective and in a structural point of view. The question of the reporting line and the positioning of management control are obviously linked to participatory vision of decision-making.

The article of Christelle PERRIN and Manel BENZERAFA is entitled "Realities and challenges of social utility and social utility indicators for social solidarity organizations".

It focuses on the realities and challenges of social utility evaluation and the use of socially indicators over a territory. They aim to highlight the processes leading players to identify and evaluate their social utility.

References

Ashmos D.P., Duchon D., Mcdaniel R.R. (1998). Participation in Strategic Decision Making: the Role of Organizational Predisposition and Issue Interpretation, *Decision Sciences*, 29, 1, 25-51

Bérard C. (2013), « Les démarches participatives en matière de politiques publiques : le cas de la propriété intellectuelle des innovations biotechnologiques », *Politiques et Management Public*, 30, 1, 51-73.

Edelenbos J., Klijn E-H. (2006). Managing Stakeholder Involvement in Decision Making: a Comparative Analysis of Six Interactive Processes in the Netherlands, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16, 3, 417-446.

Edelenbos, J. (1999) Design and management of participatory public policy making, *Public Management Review*, 1, 4, 569-578.

Roy B., Damart S., (2002). L'analyse Coûts-Avantages, outil de concertation et de légitimation?, *Metropolis*, 108-109, 7-16.

Touzard H. (2006). Consultation, concertation, négociation : Une courte note théorique. *Négociations*, 5, 1, 67-74.

Table of contents

1/ Editorial p. 1-4

2/ “Consensus Building through Participatory Decision-Making. —Experiences and Lessons from Korea—“ p. 5-20

Jaeho EUN, Professor, researcher, The Korean Institute of Public Administration

3/ « The French academic reform: from a managerial inspiration to a bureaucratic drift» p.21-38

Jean-Claude PACITTO, Associate Professor at the University of Paris Est, Laboratory : IRG Management jean-claude.pacitto@orange.fr

Driss AHEDDA PHD in management science, IUT Saint Denis de l'université Paris XIII ahedda.driss@yahoo.fr

4/ «The role of the Management Control Function within the organization of the county councils: a controversial issue. Contribution to the debate through the scenario method», p.39-58

Antoine MASINGUE¹, Associate professor at the department of management at Valenciennes University – Institute of Development and Prospective (IDP); Mails : amasingue@yahoo.fr / antoine.masingue@univ-valenciennes.fr

Audrey PHILIPPART, Auditor of the European Funds at the European Funds Control Department, Regional Council of the Hauts-de-France; Mails: audrey.philippart@nordpasdecalspicardie.fr / philippartaudrey@hotmail.fr

Jérémy LORAIN, Deputy Director in charge of the Evaluation of Public Policies and Control, of the North Department

Mail : jeremy.lorain@lenord.fr

5/ «Realities and challenges of social utility and social utility indicators for social solidarity organizations» p.59-75

Christelle PERRIN, Associate professor, LAREQUOI Laboratory of Management research: christelle.perrin@uvsq.fr

Manel BENZERAFA, Associate professor, Laboratory of Management research CEROS –Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense University

