



Governing the social

Reconfiguring state and civil society relations

Tim Reddel
Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian,
Queensland

Social Policy Working Paper No. 6

November 2006

Melbourne

In Social Policy Working Papers we seek to publish interesting findings and insights from recent research undertaken or presented at the Centre for Public Policy, a research and post-graduate teaching centre within the University of Melbourne, and the Brotherhood of St Laurence, a Melbourne-based community organisation whose work includes social policy research and advocacy. The views expressed in the papers, however, do not necessarily reflect any official position of the publishers. We expect and support the further development of these ideas and their subsequent publication in journal or book form.

Tim Reddel is the Executive Director of Policy, Research and Employment Screening at the Commission for Children and Young People and Child Guardian, Queensland. He was previously Director of Social Policy in the Policy Division of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

This paper is developed from a presentation at a symposium, 'Governments & Communities in Partnership: the Next Steps', organised by the Brotherhood of St Laurence and the Centre for Public Policy, University of Melbourne, in May 2005.

Published by

Brotherhood of St Laurence
67 Brunswick Street
Fitzroy Vic. 3065
ABN 24 603 467 024
Phone: (03) 9483 1183

www.bsl.org.au

and

Centre for Public Policy
University of Melbourne
Vic. 3010
Phone (03) 8344 9480

www.public-policy.unimelb.edu.au

ISSN 1832-4339

ISBN-13 978-1-876250-73-7

ISBN-10 1-876250-73-9

© Brotherhood of St Laurence and University of Melbourne Centre for Public Policy 2006

This publication may be downloaded for use in private study, research, criticism and review. Permission is granted for librarians to download a single copy to be made available to library users. The publication may not be reproduced in any other form without the permission of the publishers.

Abstract

The governance of social policies, programs and services is contested. Debates about government's role in addressing complex social problems often begin with the classic response of more targeted programs and services. There is also a contemporary fascination of governments with promoting the 'other' through a range of mixed strategies including privatisation, social capital and community building. This paper argues that this confusing public policy landscape is characterised by shifting risks and responsibilities between and within sectors and interests. A neo-liberal agenda based on the principles of public choice theory and of competition through purchasing and contracting appears hegemonic. Social policy and service systems remain fragmented and underdeveloped. This paper uses empirical research from contemporary studies of place-based policy making and community strengthening initiatives, together with a historical policy scan, to examine these trends. It highlights the limited conceptual and policy thinking underpinning the relationship between government and civil society. Slogans such as 'market flexibility', 'management control' and 'partnership' are posited by many policy makers as principles or rules to describe these directions. Drawing on a merging of new institutionalism and social governance theories, the paper offers some clarity to these debates and suggests opportunities for more productive research and policy development.

Introduction

There has been a resurgence of international policy interest in more engaged, integrated and community-focused public policy and service delivery. In responding to concerns about growing social exclusion, western governments, particularly in Europe, have popularised reforms centred on supposedly new ideas of 'devolution', 'partnerships' and 'community'. Recent policy interest by Australian governments and community organisations in social capital, community strengthening, citizen engagement and joined-up government reflects this broader context. Historical debates in Australia about social governance and the nature of state and civil society relations anticipate contemporary international politics, policy and theoretical debates. Indeed, decentralised social policy institutions have a significant track record in Australian public policy. For instance, regional councils for social development established by the Australian government in the early 1970s provided an important institutional platform for much current local policy development and action. Contemporary analysis highlights the ongoing role of such localised institutions in many of the current community strengthening and place-based policy initiatives (Reddel 2002).

Embedded in all this activity is the implicit assumption that more 'engaged' or 'inclusive' policy making and service delivery will enable more sites of participatory democracy and deliver improved outcomes for local communities, particularly those disadvantaged or 'excluded' from traditional political and policy systems. These theoretical and public policy aspirations, while intimately linked, remain underdeveloped in mainstream program development and service delivery. Network governance literature, particularly new institutionalist analyses, provides conceptual and practical direction by highlighting the

complexity of modern governing, policy making and practice (see Lowndes & Wilson 2003; Geddes 2006). Of particular relevance is the interaction of formal and informal rules or what Granovetter (1973) labelled 'the strength of weak ties' in an increasingly fragmented institutional environment. New institutionalism offers a pathway for exploring the linkages between disparate policy actors across various organisational, professional and agency boundaries and importantly a means of linking representative and participative forms of democracy and a focus on community outcomes within a local governance framework (Geddes 2006, p.77).

This paper will utilise these theoretical directions to critically examine contemporary local social governance practice in the Australian context. Focusing specifically on policy activity by Australian state governments such as Queensland's, the paper posits an institutional framework for local social governance based on the dimensions of policy implementation, practitioner skills, infrastructure and culture. Complementing these strategic and methodological concerns, the paper also considers whether the engagement of state and community institutions is simply administrative convenience or more positively enables meaningful participation and collaboration focused on improving community outcomes. The paper pays attention to the need for local social governance systems to ensure an institutional balance between state and civil society. The state has a critical governance role in facilitating, arbitrating and managing the plurality of networks and partnerships.

Theory and practice: participatory governance and institutionalism

A central concern for this paper is the paradox that while a consensus has existed for some time about the limits of traditional methodologies of community consultation and agency coordination, innovative and participatory governance models remain underdeveloped in both theory and practice. More inclusive governance and policy approaches remains a democratic imperative, but questions persist regarding the institutional capacity of governance systems to develop and maintain partnerships and networks beyond traditional interests, leaders and elites across public and civil sectors.

The tentative steps by policy makers, program administrators, community organisations and citizen groups to engage with one another outside the traditional routines of a consultation event and an agency coordination meeting seem often undefined, clumsy and shallow but also at times innovative and challenging given the dominance of administrative hierarchies and policy control agendas. This paper uses the participatory and institutional dimensions of governance theory and practice to examine democratic intent and capacity of local governance systems to deliver social outcomes or what Considine (2005) has called the collaborative advantage of networks.

Governance, the state and community

Traditional consultative models for defining state–civil society relations are no longer viable. Building on the classical critiques of Sherry Arnstein, Leonie Sandercock (1978, p.17) argues there are inherent limits to traditional technical consultative approaches which should not be 'a substitute for planning or for regular government' in addressing the needs of disadvantaged peoples. Conventional governance systems also resulted in fragmented

service delivery, role confusion between policy makers, purchasers and providers and concerns about accountability (Davis & Rhodes 2000). A new form of more participatory governance based on the interactions of socio-political systems involving the public, private and civil sectors has been promoted as an alternative model. This new mode of governance promotes management by negotiation and horizontal networks, policy communities and flexible organisational forms in preference to traditional methods of hierarchical command and control or market models (Rhodes 1997; Jessop 1999; Davis & Rhodes 2000; Considine 2001).

In recent years the term governance has enjoyed a revival in both interest and usage. A key factor in this revival has been the distinction between 'governance' and 'government'. Jessop (1998, p.30) defines governance as the modes and manner of governing and government as the institutions and agents charged with governing. A range of other definitions is evident in the literature. Rhodes (1997) saw governance as concerned with the processes and structures necessary for an organisation to achieve its goals, including the capacity of the organisational actors to relate to each other and to its stakeholders or citizens. Kooiman (1993, p.2) largely agrees with Rhodes and sees governance as the patterns that emerge from the activities of social, political and administrative actors and their purposeful efforts to guide, steer, control or manage aspects of society. Lowndes and Skelcher (1998, pp.318–19) argue governance is both a political and administrative concept and propose a three-part typology of market, hierarchical and network modes of governance. Considine (2001) amends this typology by proposing four ideal governance types: procedural, corporate, market and network.

Building on these ideas from the literature, the following table proposes a seven-part typology of governance modes focusing specifically on the relationship between state and civil society actors. In addition to the accepted notions of market, corporate/managerial and network or associational governance, social democratic, radical pluralist, corporatist and conservative communitarian modes of governance are discussed. Social democratic modes of governance are seen to be more interventionist and state-centred while promoting enhanced citizen participation in the political and policy institutions of liberal democracy (Everingham 2001). Radical pluralists challenge the traditional boundaries of social democratic approaches with a preference for non-institutional forms of collective political behaviour often as responses to unresolved societal tensions (Pixley 1998). From a more conservative pluralist tradition, corporatism involves representation by a limited number of hierarchically organised interests in governance and policy processes based on mediation and negotiation between these interests and the state (Schmitter 1974). Communitarianism traverses a variety of philosophical and conceptual positions including neo-liberal and more radical perspectives. Of particular interest is the conservative dimension which is often aligned to market governance modes with a strong preference for minimalist or passive state interventions complemented by a strong civil society, albeit one based on mutual obligation and a shifting of social responsibilities to under-resourced community associations (Etzioni 1993). In contrast, 'associational' governance relies on diverse networks and strong partnerships encompassing the public, private and civil society sectors. Importantly, local engagement of these diverse networks together with less organised and traditionally disengaged groups is supported by effective pathways to more centralised political and policy institutions of the state.

| Social governance mode | Organising principles | Exemplars of state/civil society relations |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| Social democratic | Participatory and democratic processes | Community participation, public sector reform & social citizenship |
| Radical pluralist | Social movements | Activism and critique from diverse groups and sectors |
| Corporatist | Bargained negotiation and consensus between organised interest groups | State-centric and managed access to policy makers for 'insiders' |
| Managerial/corporate | Top-down planning, management and monitoring with targeted input from 'key stakeholders' | Regulation and monitoring of inputs and outputs with unregulated policy advocacy negated by 'clientelism' |
| Market | 'The Contract' and minimalist state | Customer (individual) choice with limited regulation to manage political 'risks' |
| Conservative communitarian | Active civil society [for some!] but passive state | Social and political risks shifted to community |
| 'Associational' | Networks and partnerships of state, civil society and market interests | Diverse local engagement [including 'difficult' policy actors] but recognition of centralised political/policy processes of the state |

The network dimensions of associational modes of governance have been highlighted by Rhodes (1997). He lists a number of shared characteristics of governance, including reconfiguring the boundaries of the state to promote interdependence between public, private and civil sectors; ongoing interactions between governance actors based on trust, resource exchange, negotiated processes and shared outcomes; and autonomy from but connection to the state, reflected in the self-organising nature of networks and the capacity of the state to steer and manage (Rhodes 1997, p.53). Lowndes and Skelcher (1998) argue, however, that Rhodes overemphasises the consensual nature of networks without giving sufficient weight to the competitive aspects of network activity. There are dangers in establishing an ideal type of network governance as mutually exclusive with other modes based on markets, corporatism or hierarchies. Political, social and economic life is characterised by a mix of governance modes and processes.

Building on these debates, 'local social governance' has often been linked to the local partnership and community discourse. Multi-organisational and community-based partnerships have become dominant social inclusion methodologies, particularly in promoting more joined-up strategies to address cross-cutting community issues (Atkinson 1999; Lowndes & Skelcher 1998). Such partnerships as enacted in urban regeneration programs, local action zones and regional development initiatives reflect a confusing mix of market and collaborative principles. Lowndes and Skelcher (1998) argue that partnership is an organisational form that can operate in different modes of governance based either on markets, hierarchies or networks. Dangers exist, therefore, in uncritically

focusing on technical constructs such as partnership without a systemic analysis of underlying governance modes and outcomes.

Implicit in Third Way expressions of local social governance is the belief that the 'big state' of large public bureaucracies, publicly owned enterprises and broadly based welfare is redundant in the new environment of competition, privatisation and global capitalism (Adams & Hess 2001). The implications are of concern, leading to a passive acceptance of market or community-centred governance arrangements. A balance between the various institutions of the state and the civil society is of critical importance. The state is a fundamental strategic agent of local social governance (Amin & Hausner 1997). Accordingly, associational governance builds on general governance theory, particularly its focus on networks and support for a differentiated polity comprising an active state and engaged civil society. The state is not merely a collection of disaggregated and autonomous policy networks and communities, markets or hierarchies. State institutions have a primary role in coordinating, integrating and supporting the complexity of social, economic and political life. As Jessop (1998, p.43) argues, 'the exchange of information and moral suasion [have] become key sources of legitimation and the state's influence depends as much on its role as a prime source and mediator of collective intelligence as on its command over economic resources or legitimate coercion'. The vital contribution to local social governance of non-state actors, including citizens and the various manifestations of civil society and 'community', is critical but should not diminish the role of an active state. There are significant dangers in the promotion of passive community solutions that minimise the state's role and fail to adequately analyse both the macro structural and micro process dimensions of governance.

New institutionalism

While 'institutionalism' is not a single coherent body of theory (Lowndes 2001) and has a variety of permutations including rational choice and critical social action, new institutionalism provides an indicative theoretical resource for explaining these contested governance relationships while being attentive to the factors which enable and/or constrain networked political and policy action (Considine 2005b, p.5). New institutionalism emerged in the 1980s as a reaction to the antisocial prescriptions of rational choice theory and individualism. Rather than continuing the descriptive and atheoretical approach of traditional public administration writings, new institutionalists canvassed a broader range of theoretical ideas. These included informal conventions as well as formal arrangements and rules, the role of values and power relations or structures and importantly the interactions between individuals and institutions (Lowndes 2001, p.1953). Granovetter's (1973) concept of 'the strength of weak ties' was critical in understanding the nature and form of new inter-organisational partnerships and networks involving often dispersed structures, groups and individuals. This discourse can open up previously closed networks or cliques and facilitates information flows which promote greater participation and engagement between policy actors across organisational fields (Davies 2004).

Building on these ideas, a more integrated and authoritative institutional framework for participatory governance can be suggested. Jessop's (1998) coordinated 'institutional ensemble' and Fung and Wright's (2001) institutional design properties are important theoretical resources. New institutional theory provides further insights particularly in

understanding the relationship between ideals, values, behaviours, structure and organisation (March & Olsen 1989; Goodin 1996; Bogason 2000; Lowndes & Wilson 2001). Institutions are not simply administrative and political organisations. They comprise a set of networks, interrelated norms, routines and incentives that have the capacity to generate order and promote a collective understanding of meaning (March & Olsen 1989, p.160; Bogason 2000, p.110; Lowndes & Wilson 2001, p.632).

At a more practical level, Lowndes and Wilson (2001) use a new institutionalist framework to analyse the role of local governments in the United Kingdom in social capital development and democratic renewal. They argue the state is crucial in shaping the institutional conditions for social capital development and can promote the 'virtuous combination of civic engagement and good governance' (Lowndes & Wilson 2001, p.631). Institutional design is not constant and should proceed via 'a creative combination of recollection and innovation and a serious engagement with both values and context' (Goodin 1996, pp.31–2). From these perspectives, participatory governance requires institutions and infrastructure, which combine 'civic engagement with good governance'.

A 'local-state' that fosters these network forms (or 'weak ties') is critical, but should not be seen as a substitute for the welfare state, the mainstream economy or authoritative central governance systems (Amin, Cameron & Hudson 2002, p.125). As Geddes (2006, p.78) cautions, new institutionalist analyses of network governance can undermine authoritative political and policy making systems and fail to grapple with broader shifts in the political economy, especially the dominance of neo-liberalism. A diverse 'institutional ensemble' of state, market and civil society structures and networks is required to negotiate the complexity of political, social and economic life (Jessop 1999). Local social governance must embrace the pragmatics of traditional hierarchical and rule-based political and policy regimes while also acknowledging that local systems can overtly and covertly undermine innovative political and policy processes (Lowndes & Wilson 2001, p.642). Indirect and direct processes of meta-governance are required to regulate network actors through strategic resource allocation, managing patterns of participation and direct intervention in network conflicts (Sorenson & Torfing 2004, p.15).

Contemporary policy and practice illustrate the political, administrative and community dimensions of these complex themes. Governance is an interactive process where no single institutional actor, whether public, civil or private, has the knowledge or resources to address social problems unilaterally (Stoker 1998, p.22). Privileging interactions based on collective action can often lead to ambiguous outcomes which are open to interpretation by policy actors. Given the process and relational nature of these institutional dynamics, the substantive and outcome dimensions of network and participatory forms of social governance requires a closer examination and analysis of public policy practice.

Partnerships and community: emerging themes in public policy

An emerging policy consensus?

Current interest by Australian policy makers in joined-up and engaged policy and programs should also acknowledge a historical legacy and broader international parallels. National strategies and programs from the United States during the 1960s such as the *War*

on *Poverty* and *Head Start* were early examples of joined-up and community-based service social policy models aspiring to reform what the responsible cabinet secretary in the Nixon administration called the 'bureaucratic labyrinth' of uncoordinated government programs (Waldfoegel 1997, p.464). More recently in the United Kingdom, programs targeting vulnerable and 'excluded' children, families and communities such as *Sure Start*, *Every Child Matters* and the *New Deal for Communities* have been central planks of the Blair government's modernisation agenda for welfare reform. These initiatives aim to bring together multiple programs and are based on a mix of relationships and governance systems linking clients, service providers and government agencies in differing ways. Of particular importance are the new systems of regulations, procedures, metrics and time measurement aimed at demonstrating greater accountability and performance of these new arrangements. Building on the government-in-community discourse, a foundation principle of these programs has been what Anna Coote (1999) called the Blair government's focus on 'investing in other people'. This embrace of non-state actors has taken various and often confusing manifestations including 'steering not rowing', as government agencies contract out service delivery, intersectoral partnerships, stakeholder consultation and local engagement policy practices (Atkinson 1999).

Rediscovering community and joined-up government

In recent times, political imperatives in Australia including the influence of One Nation politics, coupled with broader concern about the consequences of spatial socio-economic disparities for national solidarity and political stability, have placed the themes of 'regions' and 'place' on the national policy agenda (Pritchard & McManus 2000). Complementing a partial rebirth of spatial policy has been the current Australian government's interest in social capital, community and participation as important, if largely undefined, components of family and social welfare policy (McClure 2000). The Australian government appears to argue that social capital and community association are best left alone without unwanted interference from governments, their bureaucracies or indeed their resources (Everingham 2001). Despite some limited attempts by the Commonwealth to develop more institutionalised approaches to community association and social capital in rural and regional policy (see Beer et al. 2003), a neo-liberal market (mixed with conservative communitarian) governance regime remains in the ascendancy at the national level.

The Australian government's Department of Family and Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaCSIA) *Stronger Families and Communities Strategy* focuses on supporting early childhood. It emphasises the need for services to work collaboratively, and respond to local community needs, to enhance outcomes for young children. Funding streams include the Communities for Children and the Family Links programs. These initiatives reflect some of the Australian government's policy rhetoric concerning the notions of social capital, community building and integrated service delivery as important, if perhaps poorly defined components of family and social welfare policy (see McClure 2000). The Australian government's welfare reform agenda targeting remote Indigenous communities, based on so-called shared responsibility and regional partnership agreements, has been given considerable prominence by both mainstream conservative pundits and some Indigenous leaders (see Pearson 2005).

There has, however, been significant policy interest by state jurisdictions in local governance and community strengthening (IPPA 2002). The New South Wales government has also implemented an engagement strategy that includes the trialing of place management initiatives, together with more generic policies and programs (Mant 2002). In Queensland, the Beattie Labor government has aspired to a community responsive policy development and program delivery (Smyth & Reddel 1999). Specific initiatives based on spatial and people-centred policies have been implemented, aimed at providing public sector leadership for a citizen engagement agenda (Queensland Department of the Premier and Cabinet 2001).

Reviews, critiques and evaluations of state-based programs in Queensland and Victoria provide more structural insights into the operation of partnerships and networks from a place management and community strengthening perspective (Keast et al 2004; Reddel & Woolcock 2004; Wiseman 2006). A common theme across these jurisdictions was recognition of the limits of localism and the need for social governance systems to engage more effectively both horizontally and vertically with governments (politicians and officials), community agencies and local citizens. New forms of accountability which balance these differing governance relationships while importantly focusing on community outcomes should therefore be explored and tested through initiatives such as the place management, community and neighbourhood renewal programs in New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria. It is also recognised that such changes in governance and accountability systems are risky to both governments and community agencies. Definitive outcome measures are required to demonstrate the real benefits to governments and communities of collaborative networks such as systematic change, relationship building, innovative service delivery and community inclusion (Keast et al 2004, p.370).

The Queensland experience: from management to engagement?

Queensland provides a relevant site for examining in some depth the intersection of the paper's theoretical and public policy concerns with the network, participatory and outcome dimensions of local social governance. Despite a chaotic and reactionary political legacy, recent policy making and program development in this Australian state provides data for examining the practice of local social governance in increasingly complex, fragmented and contested political, policy and governance environments.

Initially responding to the electoral success of Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party in 1998, the Beattie government in Queensland has constructed a range of initiatives around the need to address increasing citizen alienation and disillusionment with traditional political and policy processes (Smyth & Reddel 1999). These initiatives and later the citizen engagement agenda of the Beattie government should be seen in some contemporary historical context. The previous Labor Party Goss government sought to reform the state's institutions after 32 years of conservative rule, based on the discourse of openness, accountability and responsiveness, in contrast to Queensland's legacy of political corruption and citizen disengagement (see Reddel 2002). Complementing these institutional reforms was the limited rediscovery of improved agency coordination, service integration and community consultation (Reddel 2002). A short-lived minority National and Liberal Party coalition government (1996–1998) replaced the Goss government. Significantly this period also saw an emerging place and community trend in Australian

public policy. Increasing momentum for more community sensitive policies was informed by a developing research agenda on locational disadvantage, together with the increasing recognition of the political dimensions of spatial inequality as exemplified by the One Nation Party (Davis & Stimson 1998).

In response, the Beattie government elected in 1998 promised more responsive policy development and program delivery (Smyth & Reddel 1999). A whole of government approach emphasised multidimensional responses to the needs of clients and communities, centred on more responsive government policy processes and improved place-based service delivery (see Queensland Department of the Premier and Cabinet 2001). The language of community, participation, engagement and cross-government practice has been used to describe the broad intent of these initiatives. There is an implicit view that traditional notions of consultation and centrally managed community input into the policy process are no longer sufficient to manage community expectations and the complexity of modern political life (Davis 2001, p.230). Multi-sector partnerships and various forms of citizen engagement appear central in the Beattie government's policy and program announcements (Queensland Government 2001, p.10).

Since there is limited evaluated or analytical documented research regarding these initiatives, three programs have been selected to illustrate citizen engagement and local social governance in Queensland. These initiatives encompass political, program delivery and integrated service models of policy practice and engagement. From this examination, the effectiveness of these approaches will be discussed and the theoretical and public policy implications for new forms of local social governance explored.

Community Renewal Program

The re-engagement of disaffected citizens and places is an accepted policy benefit of local social governance and has been a key feature of one of the Beattie government's major social/economic program initiatives – the Community Renewal Program (CRP). Its primary aim is to reduce the level of disadvantage and raise the confidence and image of identified disadvantaged communities. Key features of the CRP include a place-based focus; delivery of services across a range of government activities; participation by government officials, elected political representatives, local community members, community organisations and the private sector; and an emphasis on the collection and analysis of indicators of community well being. The CRP is administered by the Department of Housing, with a program budget of approximately \$84 million for 1998 to 2004 which is distributed to fifteen local communities across Queensland.

The planning, implementation and governance of the CRP involve a complex network of networks and interests. The CRP has attempted to develop new methodologies of citizen engagement, local partnership and inter-agency collaboration. Given its place focus, these methodologies have varied across program sites, but network building and an integrated view of local community needs have been critical strategies. Community involvement in program decision making and engagement with local networks have been formalised by establishing area-based community reference groups comprising local residents and community groups (Walsh & Butler 2001). These groups vary in their representativeness, resources and overall decision making capacity. Indeed the formal evaluation of the CRP raised concerns about their representativeness, particularly observing they were 'drawing

on those who are already engaged' (Walsh & Butler 2001, p.33). Some concerns also linger about the capacity of community reference groups to allocate considerable funds to local community projects.

Regardless of the existing stocks of local social capital, the need to enhance engagement across diverse communities and build local accountability remains a challenge for the CRP. Structures such as community reference groups should be seen as only one pathway into a community. Engaging diverse local groups and interests (such as young people) requires innovation, leadership, skills development and dedicated resources (Walsh & Butler 2001, p.34). Building a more formal partnership capacity involving political representatives, government agencies (state and local government) and the community sector is critical for enhancing the governance arrangements of the CRP. Significantly, partnership building encompasses existing institutions and structures while also exploring the viability of new central and local governance arrangements. However, the precise mechanisms to formalise inter and intra-government partnerships and local engagement (e.g. formal protocols or memoranda of understanding) remain undeveloped (Walsh & Butler 2001, p.42).

This overview and evaluation has been complemented by a localised account of CRP and related interventions in one of the most disadvantaged areas of South East Queensland – the suburb of Goodna, thirty kilometres west of Brisbane. The Goodna Service Integration Project (SIP) highlights some key lessons for developing more participatory, engaged and integrated service and local governance models. SIP's model was based on an alignment of local community outcomes with state government priorities and a measurement model based on social and community well-being frameworks. Strategic leadership was provided by government, community members and a local university research centre, complemented by community learning strategies involving stakeholders ranging from local residents to elected representatives (Woolcock & Boorman 2003).

Community forums were a fundamental engagement method used in SIP. Their primary goal was 'to provide a sustainable and participatory mechanism by which diverse members of the Goodna community can have input into service provision' (Woolcock & Boorman 2003, p.94). This goal was operationalised through an eleven-part organising framework outlining SIP agency roles and responsibilities, complemented by less formal processes to engage marginalised groups and strategies to build collaborative relationships with government agencies. These strategies included shared communication and decision making protocols and opportunities for shared learning. Communication tools such as quarterly updates that documented recent actions arising from SIP's community forums which were distributed widely across stakeholders proved especially effective in sustaining momentum and authenticity.

From a local governance perspective, SIP highlighted the strength of collaborative network arrangements, the need for defined community goals and outcomes to guide these networks and the accepted 'messiness' of government and community relations (Reddel & Woolcock 2004). It also showed that effective citizen engagement needed to resource relationship building at multiple levels within government departments, between government agencies and community associations and across the three tiers of government.

Brisbane Place Project

Reflecting local social governance's attention to joined-up spatially sensitive policy agendas, the Brisbane City Council (BCC), the Queensland government, local community agencies and business groups collaborated in progressing a 'place' approach to address social and economic disadvantage in several Brisbane communities. Three communities (Inner City Brisbane, the suburbs of Stafford and Zillmere and the South West Corridor) have been targeted as 'place projects', under the collective title of the 'Brisbane Place Project'.

A recent evaluative study provides a comprehensive account of the Brisbane Place Project (Thompson et al. 2002). The institutional arrangements and methods of engagement varied across the three locations. The Inner City place project's development and operation has been impacted by the complexity of issues (such as community safety, homelessness and illicit drugs) and the number of stakeholders from government, community agencies and businesses located in this area. In contrast, the Stafford/Zillmere place project was characterised by limited existing networks, services and community infrastructure. The presence of the CRP in Inala had important implications for the development and operation of the South West Corridor place project. CRP through its resources and associated local planning activities has impacted not only Inala but also the surrounding areas of Carole Park and Darra.

Each of the three projects has developed at its own pace and been influenced by factors such as differing demographic characteristics, the level of government and community activity and individual and collective interpretations of processes and outcomes. The evaluative study found that the Brisbane Place Project has been characterised by its developmental character. This has been a major feature of all three projects and appears inevitable given the overall Project's focus on local collaboration and the lack of a cross-government strategic framework for a place-based approach. The study found that operationalising this ideal of collaboration, while supported by the majority of stakeholders, remains a challenge for all sectors. It is not easy to achieve an appropriate balance between government leadership, the statutory responsibilities of public sector agencies and calls for more participatory and localised decision making reflecting the diversity of communities.

Two specific themes of the evaluative study are relevant to this paper. First, the three place projects have in differing ways attempted to operationalise key local governance dimensions such as networks and partnerships between sectors, appropriate organisational structures, devolved decision making, integrated service delivery and enhanced local institutional capacity. Progress was made, particularly in the Inner City project, in developing leadership and building networks and partnerships between sectors. The South West Corridor project addressed particularly the role of resident participation. The three place projects to varying degrees have brought together stakeholder groups from diverse sectors (local and state government, business, community agencies and residents), resulting in new, or stronger, sectoral relationships.

However, the long-term authority and strength of these local governance arrangements remain untested. At the strategic level, the links between the three place projects and key governance bodies such as regional managers from government agencies were largely undefined. Enhancing the regional planning and decision making role of regional managers

was seen as a critical factor in formalising these links and strengthening local governance arrangements in Brisbane. The capacity of local partnerships, particularly in achieving equity in decision making between government, community and business sectors, is untested. The distinctive organisational and professional cultures and systems of different sectors remain a significant challenge. The role of traditional local coordination and planning structures such as steering committees and working groups in promoting dialogue between stakeholders, engagement with diverse groups and local decision making is underdeveloped. Notions such as integrated service delivery and devolved decision making based on these traditional structures have been promoted through the Place Project but require further development within limited resources and existing program arrangements.

Second, the Brisbane Place Project has achieved a high level of participation and representation between the diverse government, community and private sector groups involved. The three place projects have achieved cross-sector participation, with some variation of stakeholders at both the steering committee and working/reference group levels and variation in the method of involvement, particularly in terms of engaging local residents and business interests. Local government has been the one strong consistent player across the three projects. Factors such as the Project's objectives and outcomes, the diversity of community expectations and the available resources have impacted on the extent of participation and representation.

Cape York Partnerships

Arguably the most innovative episode in local social governance in Queensland to date is the Cape York Partnerships. The *Cape York Justice Study Report* (Fitzgerald 2001) highlighted the multidimensional nature of social and economic problems in Cape York communities, pointing to ill health, poor education outcomes, alcohol, violence, crime and the way these were interlinked with issues of land rights, governance and economic development. Economic development, the report emphasised, could not be separated from social development – a point given added weight by the critique of so-called 'welfare dependency' by the Indigenous Cape York leader, Noel Pearson. The report emphasised the central link between economic and social policy and enhanced local community action when making its recommendations (Fitzgerald 2001, p.369).

The Beattie government's response, *Meeting the Challenges, Making Choices* (Queensland Government 2002), proposed such an integrated model and demonstrated a greater willingness to experiment with new forms of governance and citizen engagement through systems such as the Cape York Partnership Unit, which uses negotiation tables linked to action plans and regional budgets. These negotiating tables facilitate structured dialogue between government departments and local communities as the basis for action planning and resource allocation. Action plans have been negotiated in each local community and are designed to meet the immediate needs of the community (such as reducing alcohol-related social problems) and to promote economic development opportunities. These plans recognise the rights of the local community: 'to country, culture safety, security, education and health'. A community governance strategy has also been implemented, based on reform and support of the existing Indigenous community councils and improved planning and service delivery by state agencies. In addition, a system of 'community champions' was established, with Directors-General of state government departments nominated or approached by local communities to 'champion' specific communities. Their role includes

advocating for the community in government decision making, encouraging private investment and infrastructure, and developing ongoing positive working relationships with local communities. Significantly, the state government's response not only focused on improved planning but also directly addressed key economic and social issues such as achieving better health and educational outcomes and alleviating rampant substance abuse and community violence.

Understanding the institutional dimensions of social governance

This episodic scan of Queensland local social governance activity is necessarily incomplete. The three case studies do highlight, however, a lack of consensus regarding theoretical and methodological directions for local social governance strategies. Despite some evidence of policy innovation including attempts to engage diverse community groups in policy making, particularly in the Cape York case, these expressions of local social governance (inter-agency collaboration, place management, community engagement and local partnerships) appeared to be struggling with the challenges of building authoritative democratic state capacity in the face of public sector reforms based on a 'recipe' of competition and neo-liberalism, citizen disengagement and a 'retreat from the state'. Caution, control and an over-reliance on organised 'stakeholder' interests and a preference for technical policy models, are too often the default position for policy makers and practitioners. In response, the 'partnership' discourse has become the core governance principle.

The research literature supports this practice experience and identifies major limitations to local partnerships, particularly the significant neo-liberal tendencies as highlighted by the New Labour political project in the United Kingdom. Fundamental to this neo-liberal politics is a diminution of state power and a shift of policy responsibilities and risk to under-resourced local communities (Geddes 2000; 2006). It is clear that a linear assembly of local policy and/or service networks encompassing key stakeholder groups does not necessarily convert into a formalised network mode of governance that is inherently more engaged, participatory, accountable or capable of responding to the complex social and economic needs. Damgaard (2006) makes an important distinction between networks as a way of organising stakeholders and networks as the central means of governing (i.e. network governance). As discussed earlier, partnerships and networks can and will operate in differing modes of governance based on markets, hierarchies or networks. Newman (2000) argues that partnerships and networks in the United Kingdom have been characterised by an undeveloped appreciation of power dynamics, undifferentiated citizenship and the implicit dominance of professional cultures in determining policy directions. The linking of network governance and new institutionalist theoretical traditions provides some direction in key areas such as clarifying the roles of state and non-state actors and the need for new rules, values, institutions and procedures to capture the interactive dimensions of contemporary governance processes. Placing networks as the core mode of governance requires personal, organisational and political effort and resources. Policy makers need also to influence the attitudes and perceptions of local policy actors, service providers and other interests to be actively engaged in networks and partnerships (Damgaard 2006, p.689). Such meta-governance needs to carefully balance central direction with an appreciation of local diversity, power differentials and the need for formal network structures. Critically, however, the efforts necessary to build and

sustain networks and partnerships must be outcome-focused (that is, make a difference) for vulnerable people and communities.

Based on the theoretical links between participatory governance and new institutionalism discussed in the first part of this paper and indicative trends in historical and recent policy practice, three key dimensions emerge as the basis for building sustainable forms of local social governance: networks and partnerships as critical implementation strategies; a new skills base and culture of policy practice based on stakeholder analysis and diplomacy; and new forms of infrastructure based on devolved and centralised institutions. This mix of micro and macro approaches is consistent with new institutionalism's interest in norms, routines and power relations and participatory governance's focus on the role of an active state in relation to an engaged civil society. These three dimensions, while not all-embracing, do provide architecture for assembling the strategies, techniques and procedures for actioning local social governance systems. This contrasts with previous work focused on narrow linear policy making models, consultation processes and administrative techniques by examining the structural, cultural and behavioural dynamics of policy practice.

Implementation strategies: networks, partnerships and confrontation?

Networks provide a strategic discourse for the implementation of local social governance. The inherent complexity and differentiation of politics and policy making suggest networks of individuals, groups, organisations and interests as the best foci for effective and inclusive coordination strategy especially in implementing solutions to complex local problems (Peters 1998). Despite concerns about their organisational and technical predilections, partnerships have a complementary potential in developing a flexible, citizen-centred and outcome-focused form of governance (Lowndes & Skelcher 1998). Implementation strategies based on confrontation, coercion and closure, commonly found in hierarchical and market forms of governance, have a place in networks and partnerships. However, these approaches are secondary to the collaborative, pragmatic and negotiative character of networks and partnerships (Marsh 1995).

Networks and partnerships are important alternative methodologies to traditional notions of consultation and agency coordination. Reflecting on the limits of contemporary community strengthening initiatives, it is evident that hierarchical modes of governance tend to overwhelm the tentative attempts at more inclusive, diverse and horizontal relationships and action. Networks and partnerships are discussed largely in terms of their processes and structures. Their problem-solving strength and outcome orientation are not fully explored.

There is a diversity of perspectives evident in network literature and theory (Marsh & Rhodes 1992; Bogason & Toonen 1998). Much of this work and related critiques of UK partnership (see Geddes 2000; Newman 2001) appear too generalised and uncritical of power differentials, differences between state and civil society networks and the diversity of network properties and fails to embrace democratic ideas such as citizenship. Such critiques raise serious questions about the capacity of networks and partnerships to resolve complex economic and social problems (Newman 2001).

Networks and partnerships as effective policy implementation methodologies require elaboration. In general terms, network theorists such as Rhodes (1997) and Marsh and

Smith (2000) argue for a differentiated analysis based on relative power, structure and resource exchange within and between networks. Five ideal types of policy network have been described: tightly integrated policy communities, professional, intergovernmental, producer and loosely integrated issue-based networks (Marsh & Rhodes 1992). From this tradition, Grantham (2001) has differentiated between three types of implementation networks: policy, administrative and opportunity. A policy network (or community) is characterised by closed and stable networks with considerable legal–constitutional resources. Administrative networks operationalise the outputs of policy networks and control important organisational and expert resources. Opportunity networks often take the form of civil society actors (e.g. social movements), have more informal resources such as local knowledge and engage in the policy process to secure additional resources (such as finance and influence) (Grantham 2001, pp.854–5). Policy implementation occurs through the patterns of social relations (actions) between actors within these interdependent networks.

Notwithstanding the dangers of either over-categorisation or simplification in this typology, some differentiation is necessary in explaining networks and partnerships as implementation strategies for participatory local social governance. Otherwise the notions may become purely descriptive or normative. Implementing social governance through networks and local partnerships requires a capacity to engage the diversity of policy actors and environments across the state and civil society.

Skills and culture: stakeholder analysis and diplomacy

A distinctive skills base is necessary to support implementation of participatory governance through networks and partnerships. Traditional forms of management expertise and technical knowledge are still relevant, but supplement rather than dominate policy making and governance practice. Skills such as diplomacy, negotiation and innovative problem solving are increasingly highlighted as critical policy attributes. Davis and Rhodes (2000, p.96) describe the key skill as the capacity to ‘put oneself in another person’s shoes and to build trust’. Hess and Adams (2002) argue that the skill base for the contemporary public policy making emerge from new understandings of knowledge linked to notions of cooperative and local inquiry. Despite the promise of these ideas, a more systemic understanding of how such policy skills are developed and sustained is necessary. Given the dominance of rational and technocratic systems, there is a tendency for skills such as analysing local knowledge and diplomacy to be commodified into expert-driven practices such as the evidence-based policy making based on of ‘what works’ (Parsons 2001, p.104). Developing and maintaining the skills base for participatory governance requires leadership and policy systems which embrace networks and partnerships. Policy making has been described as the craft of network management based not on the personal attributes of any individual or group but on a ‘system of strategic interactions’ which integrates and creates opportunities for dialogue and deliberation (Agranoff & McGuire 2001, p.314).

Developing and maintaining such an approach is much less a technocratic or structural endeavour than one interested in process and behaviour (Parsons 2001, p.106). The focus should be on relationship building and the creation of a climate of trust and joint problem solving. The technologies of local social governance must actively foster such a culture across political, policy making and organisational domains. Leadership and commitment are necessary at all levels of the state and civil society.

Infrastructure: devolved and centralised institutions

An 'institutional ensemble' comprising a mix of policy, discourse, negotiation and arbitration-based structures is required to negotiate the complexity of political, social and economic life (Jessop 1998). This institutional ensemble is based on design properties such as administrative and political devolution; centralised supervision and coordination which connect local institutions to higher order structures; and authoritative state leadership to mobilise and legitimise deliberative and democratic action (Fung & Wright 2001). Embedded in this institutional ensemble is the unresolved tension between liberal representative and direct participatory democracy.

Two overarching themes are evident from this preliminary analysis. First, the role of central authority, supervision and support is of critical importance to local social governance. Recent scholarship has emphasised localism and community as key elements of governance reform (Adams & Hess 2001). Centralised bureaucracies and political institutions are seen to be either antagonistic or at worst an interference to (as the current Australian government argues) the 'ability of people to generate their own solutions to their own problems' (Harris 2000, p.287). The privileging of localism and community, at the expense of central authority, has important implications for the infrastructure and institutional arrangements of participatory governance. The distance between the dominating political, policy and administrative centre and more localised and participatory processes remains substantial. There appears no authoritative framework for participatory policy making (Reddel 2002, p.53). This results in a lack of institutional capacity and central supervision to give authority and leadership to localised participatory processes.

The second theme relates to the limited capacity of participatory institutions. Attempts have been made to foster and legitimise the role of less formal groups, associations and networks in the policy process. However, given a lack of resources and the paucity of models, institutional development is constrained. Traditional modes of corporatist representation, consultation, advice and agency coordination remain in the ascendancy. Institutional models such as mediating structures, deliberative arrangements including citizen forums or juries, and partnership agreements between policy actors are possible alternatives to traditional political, policy and administrative frameworks (Smith & Wales 2000). The promotion and implementation of such innovative institutional models are critical to sustainable participatory local social governance systems.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to reflect on theory and practice. Mapping the linkages between the new institutionalism and participatory governance requires further in-depth analysis. The translation of values, norms and routines into authoritative governance mechanisms that link representative and participatory democratic organisation has not been fully addressed. For instance, the assumption that networks and partnerships are inherently democratic and participatory is questionable. There are diverse network and partnership forms which describe a wide array of relationships and meanings including hierarchies, markets and associations. The role and form of the central, regional and local state in this process also seems unclear. The increasing focus on the localised and devolved role of the state, which has paralleled the rediscovery of community, should not exclude analysis of regional, national and global influences on the capacity of networked governance systems

to deliver community outcomes (see Amin et al. 2002, pp.81–2). Granovetter's 'weak ties' are not sufficient to sustain effective partnerships to address complex social and economic concerns. Centralised statist approaches which complement representative and participatory democratic organisation are critical elements of a local social governance framework (see Davies 2004, p.582).

Despite the popularity of network and participatory governance notions in many national and international public policy and research communities, the proposition that a major shift has occurred in political and policy thinking and practice is difficult to sustain. The exercise of traditional political power and the distribution of economic resources is predominantly the gift of centralised bureaucratic and narrowly based political party systems. Managerial government, while dominant, appears incapable of addressing many of the complexities confronting local communities. Policy initiatives as illustrated by the Queensland experience remain the most common but also limited expressions of innovative and participatory social governance aimed at moderating the excesses of managerial governance. The contemporary challenge is to learn from these and other policy experiences using the theoretical directions highlighted in this paper to build a sustainable program of local social governance based on a coordinated set of public and civil institutions that are evolutionary, learning-centred, adaptable and truly democratic.

References

- Adams, D & Hess, M 2001, 'Community in public policy: fad or foundation?', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol.60, no.2, pp.13–23.
- Amin, A, Cameron, A & Hudson, R 2002, *Placing the social economy*, Routledge, New York.
- Amin, A & Hausner, J (eds) 1997, *Beyond market and hierarchy: interactive governance and social complexity*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Agranoff, R & McGuire, M 2001, 'Big questions in public network management research', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol.11, no.3, pp.295–326.
- Atkinson, R 1999, 'Discourses of partnership and empowerment in contemporary British urban regeneration', *Urban Studies*, vol.36, no.1, pp.59–72.
- Beer, A, Maude, A & Pritchard, B 2003, *Developing Australia's regions: theory and practice*, UNSW Press, Sydney.
- Bogason, P 2000, *Public policy and local governance: institutions in postmodern society*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Bogason, P & Toonen, TA 1998, 'Introduction: networks in public administration', *Public Administration*, vol.76, no.2, pp.205–27.
- Coaffee, J & Healey, P 2003, 'My voice: my place: tracking transformations in urban governance', *Urban Studies*, vol.40, no.10, pp.1979–99.
- Coote, A 1999, 'The helmsman and the cattle prod', in A Gamble and T Wright (eds), *The new social democracy*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- Considine, M 2001, *Enterprising states: the public management of welfare-to-work*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK.

Considine, M 2005a, *Partnerships and collaborative advantage: some reflections on new forms of network governance*, Centre for Public Policy, Melbourne.

Considine, M 2005b, *Making Public Policy*, Polity Press, Cambridge UK.

Damgaard, B 2006, 'Do policy networks lead to network governing?', *Public Administration*, vol.84, no.3, pp.673–91.

Davies, J 2004, 'Conjuncture or disjuncture? An institutionalist analysis of local regeneration partnerships in the UK', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol.28, no.3, pp.570–85.

Davis, G & Rhodes, R A W 2000, 'From hierarchy to contracts and back again: reforming the Australian public service', in M Keating, J Wanna & P Weller (eds), *Institutions on the edge: capacity for governance*, Allen and Unwin, St Leonards, NSW.

Davis, R & Stimson, R 1998 'Disillusionment and disenchantment at the fringe', *People and Place*, vol.6, no.3, pp.69–80.

Davis, G 2001, 'Government by discussion', in P Botsman & M Latham. (eds), *The enabling state: people before bureaucracy*, Pluto Press, Annandale, NSW.

Etzioni, A 1993, *The Spirit of Community; Rights, Responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda*, Crown Publishers, New York.

Everingham, C 2001, 'Reconstituting community: social justice, social order and the politics of community', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, vol.36, no.2, pp.105–22.

Fitzgerald, T 2001, *Cape York Justice Study Report*, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Brisbane.

Fung, A & Wright, E O 2001, 'Deepening democracy: innovations in empowered participatory governance', *Politics and Society*, vol.29, no.1, pp.5–41.

Geddes, M 2000, 'Tackling social exclusion in the European Union? The limits to the new orthodoxy of local partnership', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol.24, no.4, pp.782–800.

Geddes, M 2006, 'Partnerships and the limits to local governance in England: institutionalist analysis and neoliberalism', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol.30, no.1, pp.76–97.

Goodin, R 1996, 'Institutions and their design' in R Goodin (ed), *The theory of institutional design*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Granovetter, M 1973, 'The strength of weak ties', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol.78, pp.1360–80.

Grantham, A 2001, 'How networks explain unintended policy implementation outcomes: the case of UK rail privatization', *Public Administration*, vol.79, no.4, pp.851–70.

Harris, P 2000, 'Participation and the New Welfare', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, vol.35, no.4, pp.279–301.

Healey, P 1997, *Collaborative planning: shaping places in fragmented societies*, Macmillan Press, London.

Hess, M & Adams, D 2002, 'Knowing and skilling in contemporary public administration', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol.61, no.4, pp.68–79.

- IPAA 2002, *Working together: integrated governance*, Institute for Public Administration Australia, Brisbane.
- Jessop, B 1998, 'The rise of governance and the risks of failure: the case of economic development', *International Social Science Journal*, vol.50, no.155, pp.29–46.
- Jessop, B 1999, 'The changing governance of welfare: recent trends in its primary functions, scale and modes of coordination', *Social Policy and Administration*, vol.33, no.4, pp.348–59.
- Keast, R, Mandell, M, Brown, K & Woolcock, G 2004, 'Network structures: working differently and changing expectations', *Public Administration Review*, vol.64, no.3, pp.363–71.
- Kooiman, J 1993, 'Governance and governability: using complexity, dynamics and diversity', in J Kooiman (ed), *Modern governance*, Sage, London.
- Lowndes, V 2001, 'Rescuing Aunt Sally: taking institutional theory seriously in urban politics', *Urban Studies*, vol.38, no.11, pp.1953–71.
- Lowndes, V & Skelcher, C 1998, 'The dynamics of multi-organizational partnerships: an analysis of changing modes of governance', *Public Administration*, vol.76, no.2, pp.313–33.
- Lowndes, V & Wilson, D 2001, 'Social capital and local governance: exploring the institutional design variable', *Political Studies*, vol.49, no.4, pp.629–47.
- Lowndes, V & Wilson, D 2003, 'Balancing revisability and robustness? A new institutionalist perspective on local government modernisation', *Public Administration*, vol.81, no.2, pp.275–98.
- Mant, J 2002, 'Place management as an inherent part of real change; a rejoinder to Walsh', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol.61, no.3, pp.111–16.
- March, J & Olsen, J 1989, *Rediscovering institutions: the organisational basis of politics*, Free Press, New York.
- Marsh, I 1995, *Beyond the two party system*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne.
- Marsh, D & Rhodes, R A W (eds) 1992, *Policy networks in British government*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Marsh, D & Smith, M 2000, 'Understanding policy networks: towards a dialectical approach', *Political Studies*, vol.48, no.1, pp.4–21.
- McClure, P et al. 2000, *Participation support for a more equitable society: The Report of the Reference Group on Welfare Reform*, viewed May 2005, <<http://www.facs.gov.au>>.
- Newman, J 2001, *Modernising governance: New Labour, policy and society*, Sage Publications, London.
- Parsons, W 2001, 'Modernising policy-making for the twenty first century: the professional model', *Public Policy and Administration*, vol.16, no.3, pp.93–110.
- Pearson, N 2005, *The Cape York Agenda: address to the National Press Club, Canberra*, Cape York Institute for Policy and Leadership, Cairns.
- Peters, B G 1998, 'Managing horizontal government: the politics of coordination', *Public Administration*, vol.76, no.2, pp.295–311.

- Pixley, J 1998, 'Social movements, democracy and conflicts over institutional reform', in P Smyth & B Cass (eds), *Contesting the Australian way: states, markets and civil society*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Pritchard, B & McManus, P (eds) 2000, *Land of discontent: the dynamics of change in rural and regional Australia*, UNSW Press, Sydney.
- Queensland Department of the Premier and Cabinet 2001, *Community Engagement Division: directions statement*, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Brisbane.
- Queensland Government 2002 Meeting Challenges, *Making choices: the Queensland Government's response to the Cape York Justice Study*, GoPrint, Brisbane.
- Reddel, T 2002, 'Beyond participation, hierarchies management and markets: new governance and place policies', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol.61, no.1, pp.50–63.
- Reddel, T & Woolcock, G 2004, 'From consultation to participatory governance? A critical review of citizen engagement strategies in Queensland', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol.63, no.3, pp.75–87.
- Rhodes, R AW 1997, *Understanding governance: policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability*, Philadelphia Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Sandercock, L 1978, 'Citizen participation: the new conservatism', in P Troy (ed), *Federal power in Australia's cities*, Hale and Iremonger, Sydney.
- Schmitter, P 1974, 'Still the century of corporatism', *Review Politics*, vol.36, no.1, pp.85–131.
- Smith, G & Wales, C 2000, 'Citizen juries and deliberative democracy', *Political Studies*, vol.48, no.1, pp.51–65.
- Smyth P & Reddel, T 1999, 'Place management: a new way forward in redressing social exclusion?', *National Housing Action*, vol.14, no.2, pp.9–14.
- Sorenson, E & Torfing, J 2004, *Making governance networks democratic*, Working paper, Centre for Democratic Network Governance, Roskilde University, Denmark.
- Stoker, G 1998, 'Governance as theory: five propositions', *International Social Science Journal*, vol.50, no.1, pp.17–28.
- Sullivan, H 2001, 'Maximising the contribution of neighbourhoods – the role of community governance', *Public Policy and Administration*, vol.16, no.2, 29–48.
- Thompson, A, Woolcock, G, Reddel, T, Muirhead, B & Jones A, 2002, *Evaluation of the Brisbane Place Project: final report*, Report to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, University of Queensland, Brisbane.
- Waldfoegel, J 1997, 'The new wave of service integration', *Social Service Review*, vol.71, no.3, pp.463–84.
- Walsh, P & Butler, K 2001, *Transforming places, engaging people: summary report Community Renewal evaluation*, Queensland Department of Housing, Brisbane.
- Wiseman, J 2006, 'Local heroes? Learning from recent community strengthening initiatives in Victoria', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol.65, no.2, pp.95–107.
- Woolcock, G & Boorman, C 2003, *Doing what we know we should: the final report of the Goodna Service Integration project*, University of Queensland, Ipswich.