

ANTICIPATION 2019
Hanna-Kaisa Pernaa
Doctoral student
School of Management
University of Vaasa
Finland

May 29, 2019

Proposal for the New Ideas Sessions

Deliberative anticipation

The paper discusses the possibilities of integrating the theory of deliberative democracy and the discipline of anticipation for addressing the challenges of complex public policies. The conceptual arrangement conjoins the field of future studies and the contemporary administrative science discourse. The paper introduces the summary of a dissertation with an estimated time of completion in August 2019.

Policy-making requires acknowledging the public service systems as entities of interacting perspectives and further, as a co-evolving and transforming ecosystem (e.g. Eppel 2012; 2017; Coaffee & Headlam 2008). Comprehension of this interaction elucidates the policy-making future consequences and changes the administrative *foci* to enabling and cultivating the interaction between the constituents. The interpretation of good governance comprehends participation as increasingly fundamental in approaching complex issues. The value of inclusion is emphasized in the design and implementation of fundamental systemic changes (Fung 2006; 2007; Mitleton-Kelly 2011; Gutmann & Thompson 2018

Societies seen from complexity perspective are in continuous evolution with emerging and changing dynamics, political and ideological movements and by – hopefully – learning from them. It is also characteristic of any complex, human system to have multiple and interrelated challenges with several dimensions and ways to address them. The process of choosing our societal objectives and our mutual interactions accordingly become essential in the state of flux and proliferating uncertainty. Even if the increasing amount of data enhances the knowledge and awareness of interconnectedness in complex issues, it does not exclude ethical and moral discourse. (Mannermaa, 1988; Dennard, Richardson & Morçöl, 2008.)

Deliberative democracy theory is a normative theory focusing in objective of policy legitimation by means of communicative processes (e.g. Fishkin 2009). An essential attribute of deliberative democracy is its requirement of collective and appreciative argumentation preceding the decision-making. The conception rests upon the ideal of collective argumentation, emphasizing its participative (e.g. citizens, service users, inhabitants) attributes. By means of various deliberative arrangements (e.g. citizens' juries or panels, mini-publics, deliberative polling) an equal discourse is reached. (Chambers 2003; 2017; 2018; Mansbridge et al. 2012.)

In the paper, "deliberative anticipation" is understood as fertile soil to advance the multidiscipline and participative, future oriented discussion to function as a foundation for governance and policymaking. Anticipation is associated with the administrative discipline in affecting the future by emphasizing the policy objectives set by communities. By contemplating the potential of anticipative thinking in meeting communal policy-making complexity, the paper suggests accommodating the deliberative democracy ethos for the use of societal, anticipative visioning. This requires recognizing the public engagement as expertise beyond corporate and representative involvement (see Pernaa 2017) and as imperative to the value-based and anticipative societal discourse.

References

- Chambers, S. (2003). Deliberative democratic theory. *Annual Review of Political Science* 6: 1, 307–326.
- Chambers, S. (2017). Balancing epistemic quality and equal participation in a system approach to deliberative democracy. *Social Epistemology* 31:3, 266–276.
- Chambers, S. (2018). The philosophic origins of deliberative ideals. In A. Bächtiger, J.S. Dryzek, J. Mansbridge & M.E. Warren, M.E. (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 55–69.
- Coaffee, J. & Headlam, N. (2008). Pragmatic localism uncovered: the search for locally contingent solutions to national reform agendas. *Geoforum* 39: 4, 1585–1599.
- Dennard, L. F., Richardson, K. A. & Morçöl, G. (2008). Editorial. In L. F. Dennard, K. A. Richardson & G. Morçöl (Eds.), *Complexity and policy analysis: Tools and methods for designing robust policies in a complex world*. Goodyear, AZ: ISCE Publishing. 1–22
- Eppel, E. (2012). What does it take to make surprises less surprising? The contribution of complexity theory to anticipation in public management. *Public Management Review* 14: 7, 1–22.
- Eppel, E. (2017). Complexity thinking in public administration's theories-in-use. *Public Management Review* 19: 6, 845–861.
- Fishkin JS (2009). *When the people speak: Deliberative democracy and public consultation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review* 66, 66–75.
- Fung, A. (2007). Minipublics: Deliberative Designs and Their Consequences. In S.W. Rosenberg (Ed.). *Deliberation, participation and democracy: Can the people govern?* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 159–183.
- Gutmann, A. & Thompson D. (2018). Reflections on deliberative democracy: When theory meets practice. In A. Bächtiger, J.S. Dryzek, J. Mansbridge & M.E. Warren, M.E. (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 900–912.
- Mannermaa, M. (1988). Complexity and systems thinking in futures research: From "neutral" scenarios to value considerations. *Systems Practice* 1: 3, 279–205.
- Mansbridge, J., Bohman, J., Chambers, S. et al. (2012). A systemic approach to deliberative democracy. In: J. Parkinson & J. Mansbridge (Eds). *Deliberative Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1–26.
- Mitleton-Kelly, E. (2011). A Complexity Theory Approach to Sustainability. *The Learning Organization* 18: 1, 45–53.
- Pernaa, HK. (2017). Deliberative future visioning: utilizing the deliberative democracy theory and practice in futures research. *European Journal of Futures Research* 5: 13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-017-0129-1>.