

The header features a blue background with a network of white lines connecting various circular icons. The icons include a building, a hashtag, a book, a leaf, a heart, a gear, a group of people, a fish, a magnifying glass, a scale, a speech bubble with 'ABC', a circular arrow, and a puzzle piece. On the left side, there is a large graphic of a crowd of stylized human figures in yellow and orange, with a yellow archway over them.

The European Commission's Competence Centre on Participatory and Deliberative Democracy

Bibliography on Citizen Engagement

From PUS to PES – What's next?

Chilvers, J., & Kearnes, M. (2015). *Remaking participation: Science, environment and emergent publics*: Routledge.

Felt, U. (2000). Why Should the Public "Understand" Science? A Historical Perspective on Aspects of the Public Understanding of Science. In D. Meinholf & C. v. Grote (Eds.), *Between Understanding and Trust. The Public, Science and Technology* (pp. 7-38). Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Wynne, B. (1992). Misunderstood Misunderstandings: Social Identities and Public Uptake of Science. *Public Understanding of Science*, 1(3), 281-304.

Hagedijk, R. P. (2004). The Public Understanding of Science and Public Participation in Regulated Worlds. *Minerva*, 42(1), 41-59.

Debating Expertise

Blondiaux, L. (2007). Faut-il se débarrasser de la notion de compétence politique : Retour critique sur un concept classique de la science politique. *Revue française de science politique*, vol. 57(6), 759-774. doi:10.3917/rfsp.576.0759.

Collins, H. M., & Evans, R. (2002). The Third Wave of Science Studies. *Social Studies of Science*, 32(2), 235-296.

Collins, H. M., & Evans, R. (2003). King Canute Meets the Beach Boys: Responses to "The Third Wave". *Social Studies of Science*, 33(3), 435-452.

Jasanoff, S. (2003). Breaking the Waves in Science Studies: Comment on H.M. Collins and Robert Evans, 'The Third Wave of Science Studies'. *Social Studies of Science*, 33(3), 389-400.

Rip, A. (2003). Constructing Expertise: In a Third Wave of Science Studies? *Social Studies of Science*, 33(3), 419-434.

Wynne, B. (2003). Seasick on the Third Wave? Subverting the Hegemony of Propositionalism: Response to Collins & Evans (2002). *Social Studies of Science*, 33(3), 401-417.

Deliberation

Bächtiger, A. and Parkinson, J. (2019), Mapping and Measuring Deliberation: Towards a New Deliberative Quality. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Blondiaux, L. (2008). Démocratie délibérative vs. démocratie agonistique : Le statut du conflit dans les théories et les pratiques de participation contemporaines. *Raisons politiques*, 30(2), 131-147. doi:10.3917/rai.030.0131.

Bobbio, Luigi (2019). Designing effective public participation, *Policy and Society*, 38(1), 41-57, DOI: 10.1080/14494035.2018.1511193

Cooper E. & Smith G., (2012) Organizing Deliberation: The Perspectives of Professional Participation Practitioners in Britain and Germany, *Journal of Public Deliberation* 8(1). doi: <https://doi.org/10.16997/jdd.125>

Courant, Dimitri (2018). 'Deliberative Democracy, Legitimacy, and Institutionalisation. The Irish Citizens' Assemblies', *Les Cahiers de l'IEPHI*, n°72.

Fourniau, J. (2019). La sélection des mini-publics entre tirage au sort, motivation et disponibilité. *Participations*, hors série(HS), 373-400. doi:10.3917/parti.hs01.0373.

Fung, A. (2006), Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66: 66-75. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x

Fung, Archon. Putting the Public Back into Governance: The Challenges of Citizen Participation and Its Future. *Public Administration Review* 75.4 (July/August 2015): 513-522.

Grönlund, K., Bächtiger, A. and Setälä, M. (Eds.) (2014) *Deliberative Mini-publics: Practices and Prospects*, Colchester: ECPR Press

OECD (2020). *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions: Catching the Deliberative Wave*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/339306da-en>.

Pellizzoni, Luigi (2001), The myth of the best argument: power, deliberation and reason. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 52: 59-86. doi:10.1080/00071310020023037

Smith, G.(2009) *Democratic Innovations: Designing Institutions for Citizen Participation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Torney, D. (2021). Deliberative mini-publics and the European Green Deal in turbulent times: The Irish and French climate assemblies. *Politics and Governance*, 9(3), 380-390.

Material Deliberation/Participation

Davies, S. R., Selin, C., Gano, G., & Pereira, Â. G. (2012). Citizen engagement and urban change: Three case studies of material deliberation. *Cities*, 29(6), 351-357.

Marres, N. (2011). The Costs of Public Involvement: Everyday Devices of Carbon Accounting and the Materialization of Participation. *Economy and society*, 40(4), 510-533.

Marres, N. (2012). *Material participation: technology, the environment and everyday publics*: Palgrave Macmillan.

Quaglia, A., Guimaraes Pereira, Â., (2021). *Engaging with Food, People and Places*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, doi:10.2760/73283, JRC121910.

Wickson, F., Strand, R., & Kjølberg, K. L. (2015). The workshop approach to science and technology ethics. *Science and engineering ethics*, 21(1), 241-264.

What is a public? Engagement and Performativity

Felt, U., & Fochler, M. (2008). The Bottom-Up Meanings of the Concept of Public Participation in Science and Technology. *Science and Public Policy*, 35(7), 489-499.

Felt, U., & Fochler, M. (2010). Machineries for Making Publics: Inscribing and De-scribing Publics in Public Engagement. *Minerva*, 48(3), 219-238. doi:10.1007/s11024-010-9155-x

Macnaghten, P. (2010). Researching technoscientific concerns in the making: narrative structures, public responses, and emerging nanotechnologies. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(1), 23-37.

Macnaghten, P., & Guivant, J. S. (2011). Converging citizens? Nanotechnology and the political imaginary of public engagement in Brazil and the United Kingdom. *Public Understanding of Science*, 20(2), 207-220.

Michael, M. (1992). Lay Discourses of Science: Science-in-General, Science-in-Particular, and Self. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 17(3), 313-333.

Michael, M. (2009). Publics performing publics: of PiGs, PiPs and politics. *Public Understanding of Science*, 18(5), 617-631.

Rommetveit, K., & Wynne, B. (2017). Technoscience, imagined publics and public imaginations. *Public Understanding of Science*, 26(2), 133-147.

Turnhout, E., Van Bommel, S., & Aarts, N. (2010). How participation creates citizens: participatory governance as performative practice. *Ecology and Society*, 15(4).

Welsh, I., & Wynne, B. (2013). Science, scientism and imaginaries of publics in the UK: Passive objects, incipient threats. *Science as Culture*, 22(4), 540-566.

Open Science, DIY, Citizen Science – Challenging Participation Buzzwords

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of planners*, 35(4), 216-224.

Felt, U., Igelsböck, J., Schikowitz, A., & Völker, T. (2012). Challenging Participation in Sustainability Research. *International Journal of Deliberative Mechanisms in Science*, 1(1), 4-43.

Irwin, A. (2001). Constructing the Scientific Citizen: Science and Democracy in the Biosciences. *Public Understanding of Science*, 10(1), 1-18.

Lindtner, S. (2015). Hacking with Chinese Characteristics The Promises of the Maker Movement against China's Manufacturing Culture. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 0162243915590861.

Activism

Epstein, S. (1998). *Impure science: AIDS, activism, and the politics of knowledge* (Vol. 7): University of California Press.

Rabeharisoa, V., & Callon, M. (2004). Patients and Scientists in French Muscular Dystrophy Research. In S. Jasanoff (Ed.), *States of knowledge: The co-production of science and social order* (pp. 142-160). New York: Routledge.

Young, I. M. (2001). Activist challenges to deliberative democracy. *Political theory*, 29(5), 670-690.

Trust and Credibility

Hilgartner, S. (2000). *Science on stage: Expert advice as public drama*: Stanford University Press.

Wynne, B. (2006). Public engagement as a means of restoring public trust in science—hitting the notes, but missing the music? *Public Health Genomics*, 9(3), 211-220.

Emerging Technologies and Governance

Barben, D. (2010). Analyzing Acceptance Politics: Towards an Epistemological Shift in the Public Understanding of Science and Technology. *Public Understanding of Science*, 19(3), 274-292.

Barben, D., Fisher, E., Selin, C., & Guston, D. H. (2007). Anticipatory Governance of Nanotechnology: Foresight, Engagement, and Integration. In E. J. Hackett, O. Amsterdamska, M. Lynch, & J. Wajzman (Eds.), *The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies* (Third Edition ed., pp. 979-1000). Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: MIT Press.

Durant, J. (1999). Participatory Technology Assessment and the Democratic Model of the Public Understanding of Science. *Science and Public Policy*, 26(5), 313-319.

Guston, D. (2013). Understanding 'Anticipatory Governance'. *Social Studies of Science*. doi:10.1177/0306312713508669

Participation and Science Fiction

Delgado, A., Rommetveit, K., Barceló, M., & Lemkow, L. (2012). Imagining High-Tech Bodies Science Fiction and the Ethics of Enhancement. *Science Communication*, 34(2), 200-240.

De Smedt, J., & De Cruz, H. (2015). The Epistemic Value of Speculative Fiction. *Midwest Studies In Philosophy*, 39(1), 58-77.

López, J. (2004). Bridging the Gaps: Science Fiction in Nanotechnology. *HYLE—International Journal for Philosophy of Chemistry*, 10(2), 129-152.

Miller, C. A., & Bennett, I. (2008). Thinking Longer Term about Technology: is there Value in Science Fiction-inspired Approaches to Constructing Futures? *Science and Public Policy*, 35(8), 597-606.

Milner, A., Burgmann, J., Davidson, R., & Cousin, S. (2015). Ice, fire and flood Science fiction and the Anthropocene. *Thesis Eleven*, 0725513615592993.

Thurs, D. P. (2007). Tiny Tech, Transcendent Tech Nanotechnology, Science Fiction, and the Limits of Modern Science Talk. *Science Communication*, 29(1), 65-95.

Watts, L. (2014). Future Archaeology. Re-animating Innovation in the Mobile Telecoms Industry. In A. Herman, J. Hadlaw, & T. Swiss (Eds.), *Theories of the Mobile Internet: Materialities and Imaginaries*. London: Routledge.

What actually is Politics?

Brown, M. (2009). *Science in Democracy. Expertise, Institutions and Representation*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press

Durant, D. (2011). Models of democracy in social studies of science. *Social Studies of Science*, 41(5), 691-714.

Latour, B. (2004). Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern. *Critical Inquiry*, 30(2), 225-248.

Warren, M. E. (1999). What is political? *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 11(2), 207-231.

Winner, L. (1986). Do Artefacts Have Politics? *The Whale and the Reactor. A Search for Limits in an Age of High Technology* (pp. 19-39). Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Post-Normal Science and Mode 2

Funtowicz, S., & Ravetz, J. (1992). *Three Types of Risk Assessment and the Emergence of Post-Normal Science*. Westport: Praeger.

Funtowicz, S., & Ravetz, J. (1993). Science for the Post-Normal Age. *Futures*, 25(7), 739-757.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *New Production of Knowledge: Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Hessels, L. K., & Lente, H. v. (2008). Re-Thinking New Knowledge Production: A Literature Review and a Research Agenda. *Research Policy*, 37(2008), 740-760.

Nowotny, H., Scott, P., & Gibbons, M. (2001). *Re-thinking Science. Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Spaces of engagement

Arendt, H. (1998) [1958]. The public realm: the common. In *The Human Condition* (pp. 50-57) Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Crawford, M. (1999). Blurring the boundaries: public space and private life. In: Chase, J., Crawford, M., Kaliski, J. (Eds) (2008), *Everyday urbanism* (pp. 22-35), New York: Monacelli Press.

Foucault, M. (1984) [1967]. Of other spaces: utopias and heterotopias. Translated by J. Miskowiec. Or. ed. "Des Espace Autres", *Architecture, movement, continuité*, March.

Holston, J. (1995). Spaces of insurgent citizenship. *Planning Theory*, 13, pp. 35-51.

Hou, J. (2012) Beyond Zuccotti Park: Making the Public. *Places Journal*, September, <https://doi.org/10.22269/120924>

Lefebvre, H. (1974) [1991]. *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 1-67.

Mitrasinovic, M (2016). Concurrent Urbanities: Design, Civil Society, and Infrastructures of Inclusion In M. Mitrasinovic (ed.) *Concurrent urbanities: designing infrastructure of inclusion*. New York: Routledge, pp. 179-203.

Evaluation of participatory processes

Abelson, J., & Gauvin, F. P. (2006) *Assessing the impacts of public participation: Concepts, evidence and policy implications*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

Bobbio, L. (2019) Designing effective public participation, *Policy and Society*, 38(1), 41-57, DOI: 10.1080/14494035.2018.1511193

Burgess, J., Stirling, A., Clark, J., Davies, G., Eames, M., Staley, K., & Williamson, S. (2007). Deliberative mapping: a novel analytic-deliberative methodology to support contested science-policy decisions. *Public Understanding of Science*, 16(3), 299-322.

Christensen, H. (2020) How citizens evaluate participatory processes: A conjoint analysis. *European Political Science Review*, 12(2), 239-253. doi:10.1017/S1755773920000107

Després, C., Brais, N., & Avellan, S. (2004). Collaborative planning for retrofitting suburbs: transdisciplinarity and intersubjectivity in action. *Futures*, 36(4), 471-486.

Garard, J., & Kowarsch, M. (2017). If at first you don't succeed: Evaluating stakeholder engagement in global environmental assessments. *Environmental science & policy*, 77, 235-243.

Macintosh, A. (2004). Using information and communication technologies to enhance citizen engagement in the policy process. [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/promise-and-problems-of-e-](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/promise-and-problems-of-e)

[democracy/using-information-and-communication-technologies-to-enhance-citizen-engagement-in-the-policy-process_9789264019492-3-en](#)

Motsi, G. (2009). Evaluating Citizen Engagement in Policy Making, paper presented at the Canadian Society for Evaluation Conference, Institute on Governance. <https://iog.ca/research-publications/publications/evaluating-citizen-engagement-in-policy-making/>

OECD (2021), Evaluation Guidelines for Representative Deliberative Processes, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/10ccbfcb-en>.

Rowe, G., & Frewer, L. J. (2000). Public Participation Methods: A Framework for Evaluation. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 25(1), 3–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016224390002500101>

Rowe, G., Marsh, R., & Frewer, L. J. (2004) Evaluation of a Deliberative Conference. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 29(1), 88–121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243903259194>

Smith, G.(2009) *Democratic Innovations: Designing Institutions for Citizen Participation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turnhout, E., Metze, T., Wyborn, C., Klenk, N., & Louder, E. (2020). The politics of co-production: participation, power, and transformation. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 42, 15-21.

Van Oudheusden, M. (2011). Questioning ‘participation’: a critical appraisal of its conceptualization in a Flemish participatory technology assessment. *Science and engineering ethics*, 17(4), 673-690.

Talking about Idiots

Horst, M., & Michael, M. (2011). On the Shoulders of Idiots: Re-thinking Science Communication as 'Event'. *Science as Culture*, 1-24. doi:10.1080/09505431.2010.524199

Michael, M. (2012). “What Are We Busy Doing?” Engaging the Idiot. *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 37(5), 528-554.