

The art of effective participation: a scientific assessment

Michael Jones

Department of Geography,

Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)

NO-7491 Trondheim, Norway

E-mail: Michael.Jones@svt.ntnu.no

Introduction

The European Landscape Convention (ELC) recognizes that landscape is political and advocates principles of landscape governance that actively involve the broad population. Citizens' participation is a means of achieving the goal of the Council of Europe to strengthen democracy and good governance nationally, regionally and locally (Council of Europe 2005: I). The ELC refers in its Preamble (Council of Europe 2000) to the United Nation's Economic Commission for Europe's Aarhus Convention of 1998 (in force 2001) on access to information, public participation in decision-making, and justice in environmental matters (UNECE 1998). The emphasis on public participation in the ELC is closely related to maintenance of the diversity of European landscapes as an important common value and to recognition of the usefulness of diverse approaches to landscape protection, management and planning rather than a single universal approach. The European Landscape Convention is not prescriptive but allows a large degree of freedom regarding how the Convention and the requirement of public participation are implemented. This is necessary in order to take into consideration the large variety of administrative arrangements in different European countries as well as to take into account the aspirations of the many different types of stakeholders and the large number of regional and local authorities involved. Nonetheless, knowledge of how participation is practised in particular cases – both successful examples and less successful examples – can provide an important fundament for implementing effective participation elsewhere.

With this in mind, a workshop on “The ELC and Participatory Development Planning” was organized by myself and my Swedish colleague Marie Stenseke at the 23rd session of the Permanent Conference for the Study of the Rural Landscape (PECSRL) held in Lisbon and Óbidos, Portugal, in September 2008. We followed this up with a book project, *The European Landscape Convention: Challenges of Participation*, to be published by Springer in 2010. The book presents case studies of public participation in landscape matters from 11 European countries.

The present paper takes its point of departure in this book. The paper is in two parts. The first part is concerned with what we may call the art of effective participation in relation to landscape matters – learning from experiences of participation in practice. I summarize the content of the book, and point out some of the challenges of participation as well as some lessons of good practice. This part concludes with some points for further discussion that arise out of this work. The second part of the paper takes the discussion a step further by examining more specifically the question of scientific assessment of participation. Here I discuss typologies of participation and some criteria for assessing effective participation. This may provide ideas for a more systematic approach to evaluating the effectiveness of participation in relation to the European Landscape Convention.

I. The art of effective participation – learning from experiences of participation in practice

Objectives and aims of the book

The intention of the book *The European Landscape Convention: Challenges of Participation* is to present ongoing research on public participation in landscape conservation, management and planning. It discusses both participation theory and lessons from European examples showing how participation according to the ELC has been followed up and implemented in particular cases. Different experiences of participation are taken from selected countries in northern, southern, western and eastern Europe, including both Parties to the ELC and countries that have not signed or not yet ratified the Convention.

The objectives of the book are to present case studies illustrating the workings and experiences of public participation in landscape matters in the selected countries, and to contribute to understanding and evaluating the current state of participation in European landscapes. The book aims to explore the manner in which the ELC is implemented with

regard to procedures for participation, and to provide a basis for comparing experiences of the benefits, difficulties and limits of participation in countries which have both ratified and not ratified the ELC (Table 1).

Table 1. Countries represented in the study with date of ratification of the ELC

• <i>Ratified early:</i>	
Norway	23/10/2001
• <i>Ratified more recently:</i>	
Poland	27/9/2004
Belgium	28/10/2004
Portugal	29/3/2005
Netherlands	27/7/2005
France	17/3/2006
UK	21/11/2006
Spain	26/11/2007
• <i>Newly ratified:</i>	
Greece	17/5/2010
• <i>Signed but not ratified:</i>	
Sweden (signed 22/2/2001)	
• <i>Not signed:</i>	
Estonia	

(Source: Council of Europe 2010)

The book chapter by chapter

In the introduction, *Michael Jones and Marie Stenseke* present “The issue of public participation in the European Landscape Convention”. This chapter begins by introducing the ELC and its innovative features compared to earlier approaches to landscape. The Convention provides a new definition of landscape. It applies to all landscapes, not just selected ones, and underlines the diversity of landscapes as a value. It emphasizes that landscape is not an exclusive field for scientific and technical specialists but the concern of everybody, and advocates an enhanced role for public participation in landscape issues. Further, it highlights

the principle of subsidiarity, requiring that landscape matters should be dealt with as closely to the affected population as possible.

Second, the chapter provides a brief discussion of landscape concepts. Three prevailing notions of landscape are presented – landscape as morphology, landscape as scenery, and landscape as polity – and then the ELC’s definition of landscape as an ‘area as perceived by people’.

Third, the chapter discusses the diversity of landscapes as an important common value. Respect for and promotion of cultural diversity is part of the Council of Europe’s objective of promoting a model of democratic culture based on respect for law while actively involving civil society and citizens (Council of Europe 2005: III).

Fourth, participation as provided for by the Aarhus Convention and followed up by the European Landscape Convention is presented, followed by a discussion of the provisions in the ELC for implementation. The chapter concludes with a section on the ELC and participation in practice, briefly introducing the individual chapters.

Implementing participation

The first part of the book deals with the implementation of participation theoretically and through case studies. *Michael Jones*, in a chapter rhetorically titled “European landscape and participation – rhetoric or reality?”, provides a theoretical analysis of participatory procedures in which lessons are drawn from the literature on participation, including a critique of prevailing orthodoxy regarding participatory approaches in Third World development projects. Five justifications for participation are presented: reinforcement of local and regional identity, democratization, improved legitimacy for decisions, information exchange, a means of tackling conflicts, and social justice through the acceptance of heterogeneity. The conditions for and challenges to participation are then discussed. Among the criticisms raised are that participation is costly, it is time-consuming, and participatory processes reflect the existing power relations between different social groups. Hence costs and benefits of participation need to be considered; the institutional dynamics of participation need to be addressed, including the danger of manipulation; the issue of local versus non-local stakeholders needs to be discussed; the challenge of combining deliberative democracy and representative democracy needs to be faced; and dispute-resolution procedures, including mediation, need to be found.

The extent to which participation has been implemented varies in Europe from country to country. In their chapter titled “The Dutch approach: Public participation and the role of

NGOs and local authorities in the protection, management and development of cultural landscapes in the Netherlands”, *Henk Baas, Bert Groenewoudt and Edwin Raap* examine how implementation of the ELC has gained a fair degree of success in the Netherlands through well-considered efforts to involve the general public, scientists and local authorities in a process of working together in landscape planning. An innovative feature is the use of ‘landscape biographies’, combining both experts’ and local people’s views of landscape history, as a guide to what should be considered as important in the formulation of Landscape Development Plans.

Karoline Daugstad, in her chapter on “The participatory dimension in nature conservation processes: Examples of ideology and practice from Norway”, discusses a decentralized approach to nature conservation. Despite problems of cooperation between local authorities with different priorities, she finds that local management has reduced local opposition to nature conservation. However, she also found that women tend to be absent from management boards and committees.

Anna Majchrowska examines “The implementation of the European Landscape Convention in Poland”. She finds that lack of strong commitment at ministerial level has hindered the drawing up of a national landscape policy and provided an obstacle to the introduction of effective public participation. She also points out the lacking tradition for public participation in Poland, something that is probably shared by several former East European countries.

The chapter by *Berezi Elorrieta and Dolores Sánchez-Aguilera*, titled “Landscape regulation in regional territorial planning: A view from Spain”, shows that delegation of landscape regulatory powers to Spain’s regional autonomous communities respects regional differences but results in varying fulfilment of the objectives and obligations of the ELC.

In her chapter “In search of the Greek landscape: A cultural geography”, *Theano S. Terkenli* explores the absence of a well-developed landscape conscience in Greece, resulting in a lacking concern for landscape issues in both public and private life.

Participatory methods in practice

The second part of the book presents examples of participatory methods in practice through a series of case studies. *Yves Michelin, Thierry Joliveau, and Claire Planchat-Héry* write on “Landscape in participatory processes: Tools for stimulating debate on landscape issues? A conceptual and methodological reflection from research-action projects in France”. Their chapter discusses the advantages and limitations of different tools in participatory processes

concerning landscape projects in France and presents a typology of techniques for landscape mediation.

A further chapter by *Claire Planchat-Héry*, with the title “The Prospective Vision: Integrating the farmers’ point of view into French and Belgian local planning”, discusses the application of a participatory method in two communities in respectively France and Belgium, allowing farmers’ views to be heard and involving them in planning. The Prospective Vision is a technique that uses graphic and social landscape representations as a means of collaborative learning.

The chapter by *Isabel Loupa Ramos* is titled “‘Landscape Quality Objectives’ for remote rural landscapes in Portugal: Addressing experts’ and stakeholders’ perspectives on future developments”. Through the use of landscape scenarios she gauges the views of the public regarding desirable and undesirable future landscapes in a remote rural area. She points out the need to balance the aspirations of different types of public, in this case external urban and local rural interests.

In a chapter with the title “Landscape perception through participation: Developing new tools for landscape analysis in local planning processes in Norway”, *Morten Clemetsen, Erling Krog and Kine Halvorsen Thorén* examine a methodology involving ‘sense of place’ investigations as a means of incorporating local perceptions of a Norwegian fjord landscape into planning processes. This complements traditional landscape analysis involving expert descriptions of landscape character.

Neil Spencer presents a case study on “Participation within the landscape of the River Dart Catchment, Devon, England”. Participatory management of the river catchment landscape is achieved by bringing different interest groups together to identify shared values and propose priorities for an action plan in a mix of public meetings and workshops, as well as through the organization of a Catchment Festival.

The chapter on “Regional Landscape Strategies and public participation: Towards implementing the European Landscape Convention in Sweden” by *Anders Larsson, Anna Peterson, Elinor Bjärnborg, Christine Haaland and Mats Gyllin* presents a pilot study for participation in a Regional Landscape Strategy for Scania (Skåne) in southern Sweden. Their example provides a method of participatory planning involving equestrians and landowners who were in conflict, and illustrates a process of mutual learning.

Monika Suškevičs and Mart Kylvik, in “The role of information, knowledge and acceptance during landowner participation in the Natura 2000 designations: The cases of Otepää and Kõnnumaa, Estonia”, find that one-way external communication, whereby the

landowners were told what Natura 2000 designations involved, was not sufficient in itself to gain acceptance. Acceptance was enhanced with active landowner participation.

In the book's concluding chapter, *Marie Stenseke and Michael Jones* discuss on the basis of the case studies "Benefits, difficulties and challenges of participation under the European Landscape Convention". Challenges to participation include public indifference, political and administrative power structures, diverging perspectives, and how to ensure democratic involvement. Positive lessons and cases of good practice show, nonetheless, that there are democratic gains to be made from participation. Methods may vary in detail, but techniques to ensure effective two-way communication are essential. Finally the chapter discusses the ELC in relation to European Union (EU) Directives, the future role of science in participatory approaches, and new issues emerging.

Challenges of participation, positive lessons, and issues for further discussion

In summary, the following main challenges to effective participation were variously identified through the case studies:

- Lacking government interest
- Top-down planning legacy
- Mistrust of participation by central agencies
- Poor coordination between different government sectors
- Differing expectations between public authorities and the public regarding the role of participation
- Differing views of experts and users
- Fraught relationship between deliberative democracy and representative democracy
- Lack of organized stakeholder involvement
- Certain groups do not participate
- Public indifference to landscape issues
- Landscape concerns viewed by the authorities, businesses and sometimes the public as an obstacle to development
- Participatory research not followed up by implementation.

From examples of good practice, the following positive lessons of participation can be listed:

- Fuller mutual knowledge of problems and perceptions
- Gauging the visions of involved groups for future landscapes
- Identifying problems and disagreements at an early stage
- Role of procedures of mediation between conflicting interests

- Cooperation between experts and locals
- Combining conservation with development
- Creating feelings of ‘local ownership’ of landscape decisions and measures
- Following participatory processes with implementation of desirable measures.

Six sets of issues for further discussion can be identified:

(1) Tackling hindrances to effective participation

Hindrances to effective participation that need to be tackled include the perception that it is costly and time-consuming in relation to possible benefits, lack of trust between different interest groups, apathy among the general public, passive or active opposition, vested interests, manipulation, and lack of mediating procedures.

(2) The changing role of science

The obligation of public participation under the ELC challenges the role of experts in landscape matters and exposes taken-for-granted hierarchies, something which may not always be liked by those concerned. Four different tasks can be envisaged for landscape scientists in the future:

- Providing knowledge on landscape perceptions and meanings of landscape among different groups
- Awareness-raising through a two-way process involving both experts and involved interests
- Designing participatory methods and procedures
- Critical examination of participatory approaches and practices.

(3) Market forces

Communicative planning, which advocates broad deliberative public participation, is challenged by new public management, which accepts consultation but also favours entrepreneurialism and tends to depoliticize issues in favour of market mechanisms (Sager 2009). When landscape management is made a market issue, public involvement and collaborative planning may easily become weakened. Emerging green partnerships, in which landscape management is based on economic agreements, aim at economic efficiency but may not provide a long-lasting incentive to maintaining desired landscapes if payments cease.

Another phenomenon, driven by the market, is the ever growing tourist industry, in which the temptation to create landscapes that are deemed attractive for tourists risks promoting a trend towards homogenization.

(4) Biodiversity conservation

There exists a widespread perception that the conservation of nature and biological diversity is primarily the preserve of biologists, despite wide acknowledgement that stakeholder involvement, communication and collaboration are of vital importance and that local knowledge and public awareness play significant roles for maintaining and enhancing biodiversity (Stenseke 2006c). A complicating factor is that the landscape definition used in biology and ecology differs from that expressed in the ELC. The landscape perspective of species, habitats and ecosystems excludes social and immaterial considerations. This concept of landscape and the one linked to the agenda of the ELC have developed in separate scientific fields and have seldom confronted one another.

(5) Climate change

The emergence of climate change as an issue has to a large degree been dependent on expert investigations and analyses, while it only to a limited degree is immediately apparent – with some exceptions – for people in their lived landscapes. Climate warming still tends to be a top-down issue. Further, the effects of mitigation of harmful consequences of climate warming through measures taken at the local level are rarely directly observable. Even global agreements will take time before their results show. Nonetheless, there is potential for public participation in deciding how to act upon climate change predictions. While experts can inform the public of what direct changes might be expected in the landscape as a result of climate warming, the public needs to be involved in discussions of the landscape changes that might result from mitigatory measures such as the promotion of renewable energy.

(6) Multicultural society

A final issue concerns the growing multicultural character of European society and landscapes. Minorities include not only old-established regional and ethnic minorities, but increasingly also recent immigrants, often living together in particular areas of towns, and leaving their mark on the landscape in ways that are perceived both positively and negatively by the old-established majority. The building of mosques and other unfamiliar religious structures, and the development of ethnically distinctive urban districts, are frequently matters

of heated debate. More contentious still are temporary migrants such as guest workers, asylum seekers and refugees, who have restricted rights and entitlements. Even more contentious are illegal immigrants, often working as labourers in the construction industry or in agriculture, or as hotel workers and domestic helpers, who are without formal rights. A participatory democracy without discrimination means that such groups should not be dealt with summarily but also be heard in matters concerning the physical environment in which they find themselves (Jones 2007: 622-623). In the same way as deprived groups are often in practice excluded from real participation, immigrants are often forgotten or exclude themselves when participation in landscape issues is discussed. Landscapes that physically reflect neglect, social inequality, discrimination and exploitation raises questions of justice that the Aarhus Convention explicitly deals with and the European Landscape Convention implicitly through its democratic ambitions.

II: Scientific assessment of participation

The issue of public participation in planning has generated a large body of literature over the last forty years. Since the advent of the ELC in 2000, a range of studies have dealt with participation specifically in relation to European landscapes. However, despite the celebration of the ELC's tenth anniversary in 2010, there is still relatively little literature that critically examines participation in relation to the provisions of the Convention (Prieur and Dourousseau 2006; Jones 2007; Olwig 2007). Among other things, there is a need to develop systematic approaches to the scientific assessment of participation in landscape matters. In the following, I focus on literature in related fields that can provide useful precedents for assessing the form and genuineness of participatory procedures and for evaluating the effectiveness of participation.

In an early work, *Public Participation in Planning*, W.R.D. Sewell and J.T. Coppock (1977) called attention to six crucial questions, the answers to which will affect the level and form of public participation in practice:

- Who should participate?
- Who is likely to participate?
- How much participation is possible and desirable?
- On what issues and at what stages in decision-making is public participation desirable?

- What weight should be attached to the views of well-organized, articulate interest groups as against the views of the unorganized public?
- How can meaningful views on regional and national issues be obtained?

The power dimension is critical for how genuine participation is in practice. The extent to which nominal participation means genuine participation varies in the relationship between local communities and governing bodies. This has been described in various typologies of participation, all broadly similar but with certain variations. The seminal work is Sherry Arnstein's 'Ladder of citizen participation' (1969), exemplified by federal social programmes in the USA. Her typology contains eight levels of participation with each rung of the ladder corresponding to the extent of citizen's power in determining the end product. At the bottom are (1) *manipulation*, aiming in the name of participation to 'educate' citizens in what is essentially a public relations vehicle for the power-holders, and (2) *therapy*, aiming to 'cure' the participants through activity resembling group therapy, aiming to adjust their values and attitudes to those of society at large. Manipulation and therapy represent according to Arnstein 'non-participation' rather than genuine participation. The next two rungs are (3) *informing* citizens of their rights, responsibilities and options, frequently through one-way information via news media, pamphlets, posters, and responses to inquiries, and (4) *consultation* by means of attitude surveys, neighbourhood meetings, and public hearings. Informing and consultation allow citizens to hear and be heard, but do not guarantee that their views will be heeded, and are therefore termed 'tokenism' by Arnstein. Rung (5) is *placation*, in which citizens begin to have some influence by being invited to offer advice, although tokenism is still apparent in that power-holders retain the right to decide after judging the legitimacy or feasibility of the advice. Further up the ladder, citizens can enter into (6) *partnership*, enabling them to negotiate with power-holders through participation in joint boards and committees. Partnership works most effectively, says Arnstein, when citizen leaders are accountable to the community, and have access to financial resources, giving them real bargaining power. The topmost rungs are (7) *delegated power*, where citizens have the dominant decision-making authority over a particular plan or programme, and (8) *citizen control*, in which participants or residents govern an institution or neighbourhood, with full control over policy and management without outside interference. Arnstein points out that her typology has its limitations. Neither deprived groups, citizens nor power-holders are homogenous groups but encompass divergent views, competing vested interests, and various sub-groups. The achievement of genuine participation can be hindered by racism, paternalism,

and resistance to power redistribution on the part of power-holders. Or it can be hindered by inadequate political or socioeconomic infrastructure and knowledge base on the part of citizens, including difficulties of organizing representative and accountable citizen groups, particularly in deprived communities characterized by alienation and distrust.

Arnstein's typology has been applied in Sweden to the co-management of natural resources (Zachrisson 2004: 13) and adapted to studies of landscape management by geographers Marie Stenseke (2006 a; 2006b; 2009) and Kristina Thorell (2007).

The effectiveness of participatory approaches is dependent on the degree to which government authorities or others with power allow real involvement by the public and different interest groups. Some useful lessons can be drawn from literature critiquing the prevailing orthodoxy regarding participatory approaches in Third World development projects (Selman 2004: 368-371). The agricultural historian Jules N. Pretty (1995) has studied participation in connection with the promotion of sustainable agriculture in development programmes. He identifies two overlapping schools of thought regarding participation in agricultural development. The first views participation as a means of increasing efficiency – 'if people are involved, they are more likely to agree with and support the new development'. The second regards participation as a fundamental right, the aim of which 'is to initiate mobilization for collective action, empowerment and institution building' (Pretty 1995: 1251). Pretty has developed a much-cited typology of participation, which appears to derive in part from Arnstein's. He identifies seven types of participation, ranging from 'manipulative and passive participation, where people are told what is to happen and act out predetermined roles, to self-mobilization, where people take initiatives largely independent of external institutions' (1995: 1253). *Manipulative participation* is simply a pretence, in which local people are ostensibly represented but have no power. *Passive manipulation* involves sharing information without listening to people's responses. In *participation by consultation* people answer questions but the problems are defined and information-gathering determined by external agents. *Participation for material incentives* is where people participate by providing labour in return for financial or other incentives, but they have no stake in prolonging their involvement when the incentives come to an end (landscape management agreements provide a European example). These first four types of participation provide stakeholders with little or no real influence and are unlikely to have positive lasting effects on people's lives. *Functional participation* involves affected groups as a means of achieving project goals and reducing costs; there may be some shared decision-making, but only after the major decisions have been made by external agents. In *interactive participation* people take part in the

analysis of problems and development of plans; participation is seen as a right, and people have responsibility for local decisions, hence having a stake in maintaining new structures or practices. Finally, under *self-mobilization* people take initiatives independently of external institutions.

While these typologies can be used to assess the degree of genuine participation achieved in participatory procedures, other methods can allow evaluation of how effective particular participatory approaches are. In a study of public participation in Environmental Impact Assessment, environmental researchers Nicola Hartley and Christopher Wood (2005) found that, although the Aarhus Convention advocates ‘early’ and ‘effective’ participation (UNECE 1998: Article 6, §§2-4), these terms remain largely undefined and there remain questions concerning how to implement effectively the Aarhus principles. They developed ten evaluation criteria for assessing the degree of achievement of ‘early’ and ‘effective’ participation in concrete cases: communication; fairness; timing; accessibility to information; information provision; influence on decision-making; competence of the public; interaction; compromise; and trust. They identified certain barriers impeding ‘early’ and ‘effective’ participation in environmental impact analyses of proposed waste disposal sites in the United Kingdom: the participation time provisions of current legislation; technical complexity of project proposals; varying developer and stakeholder attitudes concerning what constitutes ‘effective’ participation; poor provision of legal and procedural information; and financial constraints. They concluded that the degree to which participation procedures according to the Aarhus Convention will be strengthened will depend on how its ideals are interpreted and incorporated into legislation and practice.

Recently I have been involved in a comparative assessment of the adequacy of public participation in landscape characterization assessments in England, Norway, Slovakia and Malta, led by Elisabeth Conrad (Conrad et al. forthcoming). In this work, five key factors in the functioning of public participation processes, derived from a broad literature, are identified:

(1) Scope: This is the rationale for involving the public, and relates to the typologies of participation ranging from the less participatory end of the spectrum (information and communication) to the more participatory end (two-way exchanges and empowerment of participants). The scope of participation should further be made explicit from the outset to avoid raising false expectations.

(2) Representativeness: This is the extent to which the public involved in the process is inclusive and represents all those affected. Key considerations are: (i) whether all persons

with a legitimate interest in the issue are clearly and systematically identified; (ii) whether participants are appropriately selected from among the group of stakeholders; (iii) whether there is balance between participants acting as representatives and participants acting in their own individual capacity; and (iv) whether special efforts are made to involve those who may ordinarily find it difficult to participate.

(3) *Timeliness:* This is the extent to which the public is involved early on and throughout the process, or only at the final stages in a process that is by then largely completed.

(4) *Convenience:* This is the extent to which the process of participating is rendered easy for the public. Relevant considerations include notice, timing and location of participation events, and methods for engaging the public, all of which may influence the public's motivation to become involved.

(5) *Influence:* This is the influence of the public participation process on the final results, and hence an indicator of the effectiveness of the outcome, reflecting whether the output of the participatory process has a real influence on policy and planning. Important considerations are: (i) the extent to which the public actually participated in the process; (ii) the extent of transparency concerning the incorporation of public views in final outputs; and (iii) the effectiveness of the process in terms of the outcomes, performance and sustainability.

This set of criteria allows both qualitative assessment and quantitative assessment through scoring. Application of the method to landscape character assessments in England, Norway, Slovakia and Malta indicated that the implementation and practice of participation fell short of the ELC's ambitions. Three conclusions were drawn. First, there is need to incorporate better public perceptions of landscape, since landscape characterization is based disproportionately on expert opinion. Second, in view of shortcomings found in the participatory mechanisms used, there is need to develop more effective methods of public engagement, tailored to different local contexts. Third, there is need for more explicit assessment of public participation procedures, introducing a stronger element of rigour.

Concluding remarks

It is important to emphasize that the European Landscape Convention does not prescribe particular participatory approaches or methods. Effective participation involves finding the best tools for two-way communication between the authorities and experts on the one hand and the general public and stakeholders on the other hand. It is probably true to say that processes of participation are as important as the actual methods used. The goal of citizen

participation is to enhance democracy. Deliberative democracy, dependent on broad participatory approaches, must work together with representative democracy, which gains its legitimacy from elections, as well as with market mechanisms, which can be considered as another expression of democratic choice. Democracy is safeguarded by open debate and transparent, fair decision procedures. Where there are strong conflicts of interest, dispute-resolution procedures and arbitration become important. Hence the role of mediation in landscape disputes needs to be paid more attention. Lessons can be drawn from studying both successful and less successful cases of public participation. It would, however, be advantageous for fulfilment of the European Landscape Convention's objective of public participation in landscape matters if agreed criteria were established for assessing effective participation and systematic evaluation of participatory projects instituted in order to promote good practice.

References

- Arnstein, S.R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *AIP Journal*, 35, 216-224.
- Conrad, E., Cassar, L.F., Jones, M., Eiter, S., Izakovicova, Z., Barankova, Christie, M., & Fazey, I. (forthcoming). Public participation in landscape policy: Practices do not match the rhetoric.
- Council of Europe (2000). *European Landscape Convention, Florence, 20.X.2000*, ETS No. 176. <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm>. Accessed 6 March 2007.
- Council of Europe (2005). *CM(2005)80 Final 17 May 2005 Action Plan*. http://www.coe.int/t/dcr/summit/20050517_plan_action_en.asp. Accessed 8 June 2010.
- Council of Europe (2010). European Landscape Convention CETS No.: 176: Status as of 11/102010. <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?NT=176&CM=8&DF=&CL=ENG>. Accessed 11 Oct 2010.
- Hartley, N., & Wood, C. (2005). Public participation in environmental impact assessment – Implementing the Aarhus Convention. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 25, 319-340.
- Jones (2007). The European Landscape Convention and the question of public participation. *Landscape Research*, 32, 613-633.
- Jones, M., & Stenseke, M. (Eds.) (2010, in press). *The European Landscape Convention: Challenges of Participation*, Landscape Series vol. 13. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Olwig, K.R. (2007). The practice of landscape 'conventions' and the just landscape: The case of the European Landscape Convention. *Landscape Research*, 32, 579-594.
- Pretty, J.N. (1995). Participatory learning for sustainable agriculture. *World Development*, 23(8), 1247-1263.
- Prieur, M., & Durousseau, S. (2006). Landscape and public participation. In *Landscape and Sustainable Development: Challenges of the European Landscape Convention* (pp. 165-207). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Sager, T. (2009). Planners' role: Torn between dialogical ideals and neo-liberal realities. *European Planning Studies*, 17, 65-84.
- Selman, P. (2004). Community participation in the planning and management of cultural landscape. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 47, 365-392.
- Sewell, W.R.D., & Coppock, J.T. (1977). A perspective on public participation in planning. In W.R.D. Sewell & J.T. Coppock (Eds.), *Public Participation in Planning* (pp. 1-14). London: John Wiley.
- Stenseke, M. (2006a). *Lokalt inflytande i landskapsvården: En forskningsöversikt med bäring på skötsel av naturbetesmarker*, Occasional Papers 2006:1. Göteborg: Kulturgeografiska institutionen, Handelshögskolan vid Göteborgs Universitet.
- Stenseke, M. (2006b). *Vad kan vi lära av "Ölandsmodellen?" : Om förutsättningar för lokal delaktighet i landskapsvården*, Occasional Papers 2006:5. Göteborg: Kulturgeografiska institutionen, Handelshögskolan vid Göteborgs Universitet.
- Stenseke, M. (2006c). Biodiversity and the local context: Linking seminatural grasslands and their future use to social aspects. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 9, 350-359.
- Stenseke, M. (2009). Local participation in cultural landscape maintenance: Lessons from Sweden. *Land Use Policy*, 26, 214-223.
- Thorell, K. (2008). *Naturvårdsplanering med förankring i det lokala: Villkor för delaktighet och underifrånperspektiv i vården av värden i odlingslandskapet*, Meddelanden från Göteborgs universitets geografiska institutioner, serie B, nr 114. Göteborg: Handelshögskolan vid Göteborgs universitet.
- UNECE (1998). *Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice on Environmental Matters Done at Aarhus, Denmark on 25 June 1998*. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. <http://www.unece.org/env/pp/treatytext.htm>. Accessed 11 March 2010.
- Zachrisson, A. (2004). *Co-management of Natural Resources: Paradigm Shifts, Key Concepts and Cases*, Mountain Mistra Programme report, Report no. 1. Umeå: Mountain Mistra Programme.

