

DEMESCI

International Journal of
Deliberative Mechanisms in Science



Hipatia Press

www.hipatiapress.com



Instructions for authors, subscriptions and further details:

<http://demesci.hipatiapress.com>

Quo Vadis – Citizen Participation in Germany

Regina Schröter¹

1) University of Stuttgart. Germany

Date of publication: July 15th, 2016

Edition period: January 2016 – July 2016

To cite this article: Schröter, R. (2016). Quo Vadis – Citizen Participation in Germany. *International Journal of Deliberative Mechanisms in Science*, 4(1), 65-81. doi:10.17583/demesci.2016.2183

To link this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17583/demesci.2016.2183>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

The terms and conditions of use are related to the Open Journal System and to [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC-BY\)](#)

Quo Vadis – Citizen Participation in Germany

Regina Schröter
University of Stuttgart

Abstract

Even though the discourse about citizen participation in Germany is influenced by the international context, it contains some specific German peculiarities. For example, in Germany there is a strong interdependence between the protest culture, the public discourse about democracy, and scientific research activities. This dependence has had a very strong impact on the participative structures in Germany. This article considers how these three social spheres have developed since the 1950s. While some parts of the German society were in favor for more citizen participation, the development of this idea took almost 50 years to spread. Today there is almost a unison demand for it not only within the public but also across all relevant parties. In this context, the article addresses some current discourses about the realization of participative processes in Germany. Finally, promising approaches and currently open questions, which might be important in the future, are discussed.

Keywords: citizen participation, protest, policy process, decision making

Quo Vadis – Participación Ciudadana en Alemania

Regina Schröter

University of Stuttgart

Abstract

El discurso sobre participación ciudadana en Alemania contiene peculiaridades alemanas, a pesar de estar influenciado por el contexto internacional. Por ejemplo, en Alemania hay gran interdependencia entre la cultura de protesta, el discurso público sobre la democracia y las actividades de ciencia e investigación. Esta dependencia tiene un gran impacto sobre las estructuras participativas en Alemania. Este artículo considera cómo estas esferas sociales se han desarrollado desde los cincuenta. A pesar de que algunos sectores de la sociedad alemana estaban a favor de más participación pública, el desarrollo de esta idea tardó casi cincuenta años en generalizarse. Hoy hay gran demanda de participación pública no sólo entre el público sino también entre varios actores sociales. En este contexto, este artículo analiza algunos aspectos sobre los actuales discursos referentes a procesos participativos en Alemania. Finalmente, el artículo gira en torno a varias prometedoras iniciativas y algunas preguntas que pueden ser importantes en el futuro de la participación pública.

Palabras clave: participación ciudadana, protesta, proceso político, decisiones

In recent years several large-scale and infrastructure-related projects in Germany led to pro-tests. Such projects are for example the railway project Stuttgart21, the Airport Berlin-Brandenburg International (BBI), but also several smaller projects as the construction of wind-turbines on regional level in the context of the German Energy-Transition (see Nolte 2011, 11). In many cases the protesters fear negative consequences for valued goods in their living environment originating from these projects. Being confronted with these protests a political and scientific discourse emerged, claiming almost in unison more citizen involvement. Citizen involvement in this context is proposed as method or tool that leads to better political decisions in objective means, higher legitimacy and fewer controversies within society (see Geißel et al 2014, 13f.; Hutter & Teune 2012: 9; Schröter 2016, 119). Generally public participation can be understood as “(...) as a set of processes that include representatives of different social groups organized by a third party with the purpose of initiating a discourse and cooperative counselling process aimed at informing collectively-binding decisions” (Schroeter et al. 2016, 117). Even though the link between protests and the claim to more citizen involvement seems to be logical at first glance, a closer look to the history of political culture in Germany reveals bigger and more frequent protests during the 70’s and 80’s. At this time vigorous large-scale protests e.g. against the structural expansion of the Frankfurt Airport with more than 100,000 participants took place (see Nolte 2012, 366; Rucht 1994, 263; Schröter 2016, 119). Protesters demanded next to other things more citizen participation without having significant success. Compared to these incidents the current protests happen in a minor extend but seem to have a stronger impact on political changes towards more citizen participation.

In this context the article examines the imposing question of what factors can be identified that corroborate to some degree the different political reactions to the demand of public participation. Therefore, the first two sections focus on protests and the public debate about citizen participation: The first part summarizes the history of citizen participation and protest while the second part refers to the current debate about it in Germany. The sections

three and four will discuss the scientific development within the field and the current debate about participation in science.

The History of Citizen Participation and Protest in Germany

The Federal Republic of Germany was founded in 1949, strongly aligned with the ideals of representative democracy, which involves that political parties play an important role within the political system. The people wields most of its power during political elections to select its representatives while only little direct influence on political decisions is granted. One reason for that can be seen in the experiences of the founding fathers and mothers of the German constitutional law (Grundgesetz) with the collapse of the Weimar Republic (see Geißel & Kersting 2014, 1; Sartori, 2006, 94).

With the spread and internalization of democratic values during the 60ies first political pro-tests emerged among young people, mainly students. The movement stood up for revolutionary ideas like anti-imperialistic and anti-capitalistic thoughts in connection with the philosophies of Marx, Lenin or Marcuse. But they also demanded more direct influence on democratic decisions (see Nolte 2012, 361ff.; Rucht 1994, 152). In response to these demands chancellor Willy Brand initiated a political initiative under the slogan “Let’s dare more democracy” (“mehr Demokratie wagen”). Based on this initiative more participatory chances mainly through changes within the urban planning legislation were offered. These new opportunities to participate were selective offers and information events within the planning process. A further expansion of participatory offers was not realized as the initiative dissipated soon (see Geißel et al., 2014, 13; Geißel & Kersting, 2014, 1). Direct citizen participation was extended but still limited.

In the 70ies and 80ies the New Social Movements originated from the student revolts. Despite its origins the New Social Movements overcame Marxist and communist ideas and broke up with the imagination to stand in line with the workers movement of the 19th century. All revolutionary claims were given up too. A diffuse concept to reform capitalism and the representative democracy replaced these ideas (see Nolte 2012, 361ff.; Rucht 1994, 152)

The terminus “New Social Movements” does not subsume all democratic protests at that time but refers to a certain type of protests that is strongly associated with the political left in Germany. The proponents of the different movements like the women’s movement, the peace movement, the movement against nuclear power or the environmental movement promoted non-conservative and post-materialistic values. They understood themselves as extra-parliamentary opposition that distanced itself sharply from the established political parties (see Rucht 1994, 246-250).

Especially the environmental or ecological movement had big impacts on the political landscape in Germany. The movement was organized as a non-hierarchical network of independent local groups quite similar to citizens’ initiatives. On regional and national levels contact and coordination agencies were established mainly to organize large-scale protests (see Nolte 2012, 366; Rucht 1994, 263; Schröter 2016). During the 70ies and 80ies many environmental associations were founded e.g. the association for environmental and nature preservation (BUND) but also national groups of international environmental organizations as Greenpeace or WWF. In the 80ies the Greens were institutionalized as a political Party on a national level (see Rucht 1994: 264ff.; Schröter 2016, 120).

All in all the New Social Moments successfully influenced the agenda and reshaped institutional structures within civil society and politics. This can be mirrored in the evolution of the landscape of political parties in Germany from three within the period between 1950 and 1980 up to six parties until today. Only their demand for more citizen participation was not responded: While the Social Democrats (SPD) and the Liberals (FDP) adopted a relatively open-minded attitude to the issue the more conservative Christ Democrats (CDU) remained reluctant (Rucht 1994, 249).

With the end of the 80ies the New Social Movements lost some of their dynamic and protests became less frequent. Reasons for this can be seen e.g. in the political establishment of non-conservative parties, the cease of political issues through the end of the Cold War 1989 and the absorption of ecological themes by the other parties (see Schröter 2016, 120ff.).

A closer look to the current protests reveals that still today many protesters identify them-selves as leftists (see Becké et al 2011, 19; Schröter 2015, 3, Schröter 2016, 120). Protesters show a strong consent for democratic values

like the freedom of speech, press and others. They still demand more options to participate directly in political decision processes. Despite form that, the attitudes of current protesters differ much from that in the 80ies. Many people criticize the condition of the democratic system in Germany. They feel their interests being ignored because political decision makers are more committed to the interests of economy. This leads to deep mistrust of the political parties and of the politicians (see [Bebnowski et al. 2010, 13](#); [Becké 2011, 12](#); [Schröter 2015, 2](#)).

In detail the values among the protesters did not vanish but appear much more individualized and diversified. Protesters still use arguments that indicate a wish to preserve the environment. But these argumentations are striking: Often the argument for environmental preservation is linked to the region in which most of the protesters live. In other words the protesters refer to the concept of homeland in the sense that they identify themselves strongly with a certain region. It is very likely that changes are rejected within a region, if the residents within that area perceive this region as being burdened with too many changes. Compared to the environmental movement back in the 70ies the argumentations focus not so much on environment in an ecological sense but on the concept of nature (see [Marg et al 2013:106f](#), [Schröter 2016, 121](#)). Overarching altruist values are transferred to the context of an actual project. Not surprisingly most protesters engage for a specific goal referring to one crucial project.

Another interesting observation during public participation processes and debates is the mixing of alternative and conservative arguments and ideas. Political positions that used to be incompatible turn to converge whilst political positions that traditionally seemed to be quite similar become increasingly conflicting. One example is a conflict between “green” positions that could be observed during the planning phase of a wind turbine project in Ehingen (a community located in the Baden-Württemberg, southwest of Germany.) During the project a conflict flared up between the Greens and the BUND (Federation for Environment and Nature Germany) on the one side and NABU (Federation for Preservation of Nature) on the other. One group emphasized that wind turbines might cause accidents with animals like birds and bats, while the other group pointed out that wind turbines contribute to

climatic perseverance (see Schröter 2015, 3; Südwestpresse 2015: w/o. P.; Schröter 2016, 121).

All in all current protests are much more project related. Protesters use a portfolio of conservative and alternative arguments that rather blur established political positions than representing a strong opposition between them. The protests itself appear as a coalition of meanings against a certain project yet representing no common normative core.

Citizen Participation – Current Status of the Public Debate

The label “crisis of democracy” reflects much of current public debate about citizen participation in Germany. Since the 90ies this debate centered on changes regarding major institutions of democracy in Germany. A frequently used term is “disenchantment about politics”. It refers to a number of empirical observations, e.g. to the decline of total voters within national and federal elections, the decreasing number of party memberships but also to increasing dis-trust towards political elites. In this context political decision-makers and public administration began to offer more citizen participation within decisions processes on a communal level. These offers were often punctual, informal and had no direct impact on the decision (see Merkel 2015, 8). During the 2000s many German cities and communities published guidelines for citizen participation to implement high quality participation processes (see Geißel & Kersting 2014, 1, Klages 2014, 6). Participatory processes comprised citizen households, but also par-ticipation methods to resolve conflicts e.g. about public construction projects.

The protests against large-scale and infrastructure related projects in the last years lead to ex-acerbating perceptions of the “democratically crisis”. With the protests new termini like “Wutbürger” (literally fury citizen) entered the debate (see Krubjuweit 2010, 26). Many citizens not just those protesting criticize the political system for offering too little direct influence on important political decisions. The negative positions towards the functioning of the political system among those people protesting make it very unlikely that public conflicts can be solved by changing the party system, similar to the 80ies (see Geißel et al 2014, 13f.; Hutter &Teune 2012, 9; Schröter, 2016, 121f.).

But in conjunction with the mixture of conservative and alternative positions also new political possibilities come in sight: The approximation between these political positions helped conservative parties to assume ideas they earlier rejected as being alternative e.g. the idea of citizen participation. Currently conservative parties have better possibilities to take over new ideas without displeasing their supporters. One of these ideas is to offer more citizen participation on federal and national levels. Empirical investigations show that regardless to their engagement in the protests many German citizens are in favor for more citizen participation (see Scheer et al. 2014, 15). A positive position on citizen participation appears democratically responsive as well as necessary to address risen distrust in political parties.

All this leads to an increasing use of public participation methods on federal and national levels since 2005. People are asked to participate in consultative processes, deliberating about issues like the future energy supply, climate and traffic but also what having a good live means to them. As an example for the new willingness to listen to the demands of citizens among political parties and administrative bodies the project of “BEKO” can be mentioned. It is a state-wide participation initiative in Baden-Württemberg on the future of energy production and use. With high effort the input of over 1500 citizen was included in a legislative proposition on future energy use (see Schroeter et al 2016, 119). In Baden-Württemberg also a new political campaign “the policy of being heard” was instigated in 2012. Citizen participation has become a cross-party demand that is supported by most of the general public (see Gabriel & Kersting 2014, 81).

Next to political decision makers and administrative officials, public participation processes are increasingly used within the planning process of entrepreneurial projects that might trigger public criticism, e.g. the contraction of automotive test tracks. More and more entrepreneurs fear their projects and along with them their investments being delayed or even stopped. Reasons for this are next to protests, legal actions initiated by NGOs and citizen groups. In this context the German industry is about to change its behaviour towards public participation: For example, the VDI (literally “Association of German Engineers”, an umbrella organization of a variety of enterprises including also global-players) published a guideline on public participation (the VDI 7000) fostering its members to use more and more structured participation. Even

though his new favour for participation is certainly stronger motivated by the reliability of investment planning than by social justice or democracy theory, it still reflects some change towards the topic (see VDI 7000).

Policy Process Research – Scientific Roots of Public Participation

The scientific discourse about public participation in Germany is closely related to the protest culture of Germany at the one hand and to the political discourse about public participation on the other. The debate is strongly influenced by political scientists as well as sociologists. Within political science the discourse about public participation can be put into a contextual relationship with policy process research. In the US the field was strongly influenced by the work of Harold Lasswell. His merit was twofold: he understood policy process research as scientific analysis and at the same time as a contribution to serve democracy (see Saretzki 2008, 34). The field is still reflecting this dichotomy between political consulting and scientific work. Second Lasswell presented a depiction of seven functional categories within the political process. This was basic concept for the idea of the policy cycle. While the approach was widely spread within the USA, especially in the 1960ies and 70ies, political scientists in Germany were skeptical about it (see Weible 2014, 7). In the first years after 1968 many younger scientists refused it as being too little critical of the ruling classes, elderly scientist criticized it as too less normative and too much behavioristic (see Janing & Toens 2008, 7). Reform policies in the early 1970ies led to a growing demand for policy consultation in Germany and changed that situation somewhat. Apart from the mainstream some research about planning processes was now carried out resulting in a euphoric atmosphere about planning within science and public. This came to an early end due to the oil crisis in the mid 70ies but also because the attempts to control other social systems by political interventions failed. The approaches of “Political control” were more and more criticized for being technocratic e.g. by the proponents of the New Social Movements (see Saretzki 2008, 40).

With the 80ies many new theories within the international field of policy process research were developed. In contrast to the policy cycle approach these concepts emphasize the constructivist character of policies (see Weible

2014, 8). At the same time there was second, mi-nor, discourse about public participation especially in Germany. This discourse was mostly carried out among philosophers e.g. by Jürgen Habermas or Karl-Otto Apel who developed normative theories within the field of citizen participation that are still significant today. In connection to this discourse a minor group of social scientists who worked within a more empiric field proposed public participation e.g. as a possibility to reduce infrastructure and technology related conflicts. Since the 70ies and 80ies many case studies (national and international) were carried out and led to a growing body of literature about different participation methods, classifications and evaluations (see Rowe and Frewer 2004, 515; Rowe & Frewer 2005, 256-258; Wesselink 2011, 2689)

After a view euphoric years about the triumph of democracy after 1989 the “crisis of democracy” became more and more an important subject within the scientific discourse, leading to new concepts within the policy analysis. These are for example the concepts of participative policy analysis and discursive policy analysis. At the heart of both is the demand for a stronger comprehension of citizens within the policy making process. While the participative concept claims to overcome expert related decision making by including the knowledge of citizens, the discursive concept takes a more constructivist perspective stressing the procedural steps like problem framing, arguing and a commons search for solutions (see Saretzki 2008, 43f.). All in all, the current situation within the policy process research can be interpret as carried by a participative or deliberative turn.

The Current Debate about Public Participation in Sciences

Scientific works about public participation (somehow still in the tradition of Lasswell) refer mainly to two fields, a theoretical and an empirical one. The theoretical field contains questions about theories of democracy and society that allow to discuss the opportunities and limitations of citizen participation in the context of the democratically crisis. The reasoning for and against citizen participation contains very different arguments ranging from normative to instrumental and substantive ones (see Wesselink et al. 2011, 2690). These arguments are linked with a variety of different perspectives on the aims of citizen participation. Generally, these can be traced back to six

philosophical traditions that contribute to subject of citizen participation. The six theoretical concepts are the functionalist concept, the neo-liberal concept, the anthropologic concept, the emancipatory concept, the post-modernist concept and the discursive concept (see Renn & Schweizer 2009, 177ff.).

With the help of this classification some differences between national discourses about citizen participation become visible: In contrast to the theoretical discourse in the US relatively little attention to the anthropologic concept is paid in Germany. Other concepts like the discursive are much more popular. The reason for this is not at least the fact that one of the most known social-philosophers of the 20st century influenced especially the German theoretical discourse about citizen participation: Jürgen Habermas. He promotes a consensual conception of democracy. The idea of discursive democracy is at the heart of his work. This means the fundament of democratic decision making is coming to a rational consensus between individuals. Within a rational discourse individuals exchange and challenge mutually arguments and rea-sons without any external pressure. A consensus as result of a discourse is not just the basis for a democratic decision but additionally leads to social integration as the actors communicate about values and norms. Social coherence, inclusion in democratic procedures and democracy are closely related within this concept (see Bora 2005, 18f.; Mouffe 2010, 19-21).

Together with the political debate that emphasizes very much on the idea of citizen participation to deal with the “crisis of democracy” the above depicted discourse appears be currently almost hegemonic. Less attention is paid to other ideas that contribute to the debate. One well-known political scientist within that field is Chantal Mouffe. She claims the individual rationalism if being self-consistent in the sense of Habermas had to contain a irreducible element that has to reject any idea of political antagonism within a political decision (see Mouffe 2010, 19). While Habermas is emphasizing on consensual decision-making in politics, Mouffe points to an antagonistic component within these processes that generally leads to the exclusion of different interests, positions and groups. According to her opinion the potential of democracy is the institutionalization of the antagonistic moment within the democratic process such as debates or even elections (see Mouffe 2010, 22). From that point of view political conflicts and disagreements seem to be necessary conditions for democracy. These reasons lead to the

conclusion, that the current democratic crisis should be resolved by exacerbating conflicts within the political system, that is to sharpen political differences between political parties that have become more and more similar during the last decades i.e. by pursuing catch-all strategies (see Mouffe 2010, 45).

Besides these ideas other existing suggestions favor proposals for reforms on the top of political hierarchies. For example, the implementation of political decision-making bodies with a very high level of expertise within a certain field. Independent from parties and politics such expert boards could make supreme-court-like decisions. To extend the terms of office for certain committees is another suggestion. This could help to minimize delaying unpleasant decisions or very popular decisions in the context of election campaigns (election gifts) (see Offe 2003, 18f).

Next to theoretical works empiric investigations refer to public participation in at least two distinct perspectives. The first perspective are studies that have a strong project relation. Within that context research questions ranging idiosyncratically between normative questions of how participation should be designed and practical considerations to realize these normative standards. One of the most frequently discussed topics in this regard is to avoid biases in the selection of participants. Many evaluations show a disproportionate number of elderly, males that are formally very well educated. One suggestion to provide a more balanced participation structure is e.g. to use random sampling or to set up elections in order to select “citizen participation representatives” (see Bebnowski et al 2010, 5; Becké et al 2010, 5; Butzlaff et al. 2013, 74; Marg et al. 2013, 96; Merkel & Petring 2011, 10; Schröter 2015, 4). Surprisingly there are almost no theoretical efforts that try to explain how public participation works.

Next to this, there is a growing body of literature about qualitative and quantitative studies that overcome the case specific perspective. One example is a study that has been carried out by the Bertelsmann Foundation 2014. Within a representative sample of N=2007 it is one of the biggest quantitative studies that has been conducted about multiple democracy in the last years in Germany (see Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2014). Frankenberger et al carried out another interesting work in the context of the study “Monitoring Democracy in Baden-Württemberg”. Using qualitative methods, the authors were able to

depict political living worlds. The values characterizing these different living worlds were closely related to different types of participation like social participation and citizen participation (see Frankenberger et al., 2015, 151-221).

Summary

All in all, the development and the current discourses can be interpreted as a participative turn that reached the German society. The demand for citizen participation has been playing a central role since the early 1960ies within many protest movements. But only since 2000 it spread into the general public, as well as in political and administrative decision-making bodies. Important reasons for that may be seen in convergence between alternative and conservative world views but also within the current protests and the perception of the “democratically crisis”. This change is also reflected by the scientific discourse.

But nevertheless the future of citizen participation in Germany seems to be open. At the moment many participative processes at different levels of governance are taking place. These efforts are accompanied by the hope to realize the opportunities that come along with participative concepts. Simultaneously many commercial providers for moderation and facilitation appear. These take over the work of volunteers and contribute to the commercialization of science and public participation. These providers insist on more citizen participation due to their economic interests. Advising political decision makers in that way could lead in the long run to an inflationary use of citizen participation methods and to participation fatigue (see Saretzki, 2008, 49).

Even though much research within the field of citizen participation is done, many open questions about how participation processes work remain. One of the most pressing questions is the lack of a theory about public participation that interprets public participation as a social situation. Within such a theoretical framework, assumptions about the question how public participation works could be addressed. This could help to develop a more realistic view on the question how much the organization of a participation process could influence its results. But aside from the scientific discourse still

some questions remain open. Within the political field one major discussion focuses on the question whether the German democratic system should prefer to realize the ideal of participative over the ideal of plebiscitary democracy or vice versa. Another virulently discussed question refers to multi-level governance – due to the federalist structures on a lower system level and the fact that the German political system as a whole nests within the European Union, citizen participation has to deal with some complex issues.

Notes

¹ There are already two articles published by Regina Schröter in German language, focusing on the comparison of different protest events in Germany and to some extent to the advantages of citizen participation in this context. In order to promote transparency these articles are cited within the text, along with the originally studies.

² Habermas qualifies the assumption about consensus being the result of a discourse which was published e.g. in “The theory of communicative action” in later works (see Habermas 1981 (1995)).

References

- Asano, Becké, Ana Belle/Hartmann, F., Hermann, C., Heyne, L., Hoeft, C. & Marg, S. (2011). *Die Proteste gegen den Flughafen Berlin Brandenburg (BER/BBI). Eine explorative Analyse der Protestteilnehmer*, http://www.demokratie-goettingen.de/content/uploads/2011/08/Stuttgart21_II.pdf . Zugriff 06.03.2015
- Bebnowski, D., Herman, C., Heyne, L., Hoeft, C., Kopp, J. & Rugenstein, J. (2010). *Neue Dimensionen des Protests? Ergebnisse einer explorativen Studie zu den Protesten gegen Stuttgart 21*, <http://www.demokratie-goettingen.de/content/uploads/2010/11/Neue-Dimensionen-des-Protests.pdf>. Zugriff 09.03.2015
- Bertelsmann Stiftung, Staatsministerium Baden-Württemberg (Ed.) *Partizipation im Wandel. Unsere Demokratie zwischen Wählen, Mitmachen und Entscheiden*. Gütersloh, Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Bora, A. (2005). Einleitung 1: »Partizipation« als politische Inklusionsformel. In: Gusy, C., Haupt, H-G. (Ed.) *Inklusion und*

Partizipation. Politische Kommunikation im historischen Wandel.

Frankfurt a.M., Campus. 15-34

- Frankenberger, R., Buhr, D. & Schmid, J. (2015). Politische Lebenswelten. Eine qualitative Studie zu politischen Einstellungen und Beteiligungsorientierungen in ausgewählten Kommunen in Baden-Württemberg. In: Baden-Württemberg Stiftung (Ed.) *Demokratie-Monitoring Baden-Württemberg 2013/2014*. 151- 221
- Geißel, B. & Kersting, N. (2014). Zwischen Parteiendemokratie und partizipativen Innovationen – Beteiligungskultur in Deutschland. In: *eNewsletter Wegweiser Bürgergesellschaft* 12. 201. vom 20.06 2014, http://www.buergergesellschaft.de/fileadmin/pdf/bei-trag_geissel_kersting_140620_end.pdf. Zugriff 26.08.2015
- Geißel, B., Roth, R., Collet, S., Tillmann, C. (2014). Partizipation und Demokratie im Wandel – Wie verändert sich unsere Demokratie durch neue Kombinationen repräsentativer, deliberativer und direktdemokratischer Elemente? In: Bertelsmann Stiftung, Staatsministerium Baden-Württemberg (Ed.) *Partizipation im Wandel. Unsere Demokratie zwischen Wählen, Mitmachen und Entscheiden*. Gütersloh, Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung. 11-39.
- Hutter, S. & Teune, S. (2012). Politik auf der Straße: Deutschlands Protestprofil im Wandel. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 25 – 26, 9-16.
- Janning, F. & Toens, K. (2008). Einleitung. Janning, Frank / Toens, Katrin (Ed.): *Die Zukunft der Poliy-Forschung. Theorien, Methoden, Anwendungen*. 7- 20.
- Klages, H. (2014). Bürgerbeteiligung auf kommunaler Ebene. Verschiedene Ansätze einer Verstärkung und Institutionalisierung von Beteiligung. *Stadt Beteiligt. Wie gute Beteiligung verankert wird*. Berlin, Heinrich Böll Stiftung. 6-8.
- Kurbjuweit, D. (2010). Der Wutbürger. *Der Spiegel* 41/2010. 26-27
- Marg, S. & Hermann, C., Hambauer, V. & Becké A. B. (2013) Wenn man was für die Natur machen will, stellt man da keine Masten hin. Bürgerproteste gegen Bauprojekte im Zug der Energiewende. In: Marg, S.; Geiges L., Butzlaff F. & Walter, F. (Ed.) *Die neue Macht der Bürger. Was motiviert Protestbewegungen*. Bonn, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. 92-136.

- Merkel, W. & Petring, A. (2011). Partizipation und Inklusion. *Demokratie in Deutschland 2011*. Ein Report der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, https://www.wzb.eu/sites/default/files/zkd/dsl/partizipation_und_inklusion.pdf. Zugriff 26.08.2015
- Merkel, W. (2015). Die Herausforderungen der Demokratie. In: Merkel, Wolfgang (Ed.) *Demokratie und Krise. Zum schwierigen Verhältnis von Theorie und Empirie*. Wiesbaden, Springer VS, 7-44.
- Mouffe, Ch. (2010). *Über das Politische. Wider die kosmopolitische Illusion*. Bonn, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.
- Nolte, P. (2011). Von der repräsentativen zur multiplen Demokratie. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte I(2)*, 5-12.
- Nolte, P. (2012). *Was ist Demokratie? Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Nördlingen, Beck.
- Offe, C. (2003). *Herausforderungen der Demokratie. Zur Integrations- und Leistungsfähigkeit politischer Institutionen*. Frankfurt/ New York: Campus.
- Renn, O. & Schweizer, P. J. (2009). Inclusive Risk Governance: Concepts and Application to Environmental Policy Making, *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 19 (3), 174-185.
- Rowe, G. & Frewer, L. (2004). Evaluating Public-Participation Exercises: A Research Agenda. *Science Technology & Human Values* 29(4), 512-556. doi: [10.1177/0162243903259197](https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243903259197)
- Rowe, G. & Frewer, L. (2005). A Typology of Public Engagement Mechanisms. *Science Technology & Human Values*, 30(2), 251-290. doi: [10.1177/0162243904271724](https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243904271724)
- Rucht, D. (1994). *Modernisierung und neue soziale Bewegungen*. Frankfurt/New York, Campus.
- Sartori, G. (2006). *Demokratiethorie*. (3. Auflage,) Darmstadt, WGB.
- Saretzki, T. (2008). Policy-Analyse, Demokratie und Deliberation: Theorieentwicklung und Forschungsperspektiven der „Policy Sciences of Democracy“ In: Janning, F. & Toens, K. (Ed.) *Die Zukunft der Policy-Forschung. Theorien, Methoden, Anwendungen*. 34- 54
- Schröter, R. (2015). Großprojekte im Spannungsfeld zwischen Pluralismus und Schließung. Welchen Beitrag können Öffentlichkeitsbeteiligungsverfahren im Umgang mit Protesten – auch

gegen Projekte der Energiewende – leisten? http://www.netzwerk-buergerbe-teiligung.de/fileadmin/Inhalte/PDF-Dokumente/newsletter_beitraege/nbb_beitrag_schroeter_150709.pdf.
Zugriff: 14.08.2015

- Schröter, R. (2016). Proteste gegen Groß- und Infrastrukturprojekte – ein Vergleich. *Forschungsjournal Soziale Bewegungen*. 29 (1), 119-123.
- Schroeter R., Scheel, O., Renn, O. & Schweizer, P. (2016). Testing the value of public participation in Germany: Theory, operationalization and a case study on the evaluation of participation. *Energy Research & Social Science*. 13, 116–125. doi: [10.1016/j.erss.2015.12.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.12.013)
- Südwestpresse (without author) (2015). *NABU gegen Windkraft auf Ehinger Alb*. Artikel vom 26.02.2015.
<http://www.swp.de/ehingen/lokales/ehingen/Print-Entruestung-Windkraft-Ortsverband-Ablehnung-Windrad-Naturschutzbund-Osterholz-Gruene-Nabu-gegen-Windkraft-auf-der-Ehinger-Alb;art4295,3070841>. Zugriff: 14.04. 2015
- VDI 7000 (2013) Frühe Öffentlichkeitsbeteiligung bei Industrie- und Infrastrukturprojekten.Draft.
- Weible, C. (2014). Introducing the Scope and Focus of Policy Process Research and Theory. In: Sabatier, P. & Weible, C. (Ed.). *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder, Westview Press. 3-21.
- Wesselink, A., Jouni, P., Fritsch, O. & Renn, O. (2011). Rationales for Public Participation in Environmental Policy and Governance: Practitioners' Perspectives. *Environment and Planning* 43(11), 2688-2704. doi: [10.1068/a44161](https://doi.org/10.1068/a44161)

Regina Schröter is a Fellow at ZIRIUS where she researches on sustainability, risk governance research, and social systems theory.

Contact Address: University of Stuttgart, Seidenstrasse 36, 70174 Stuttgart, Germany. Email: regina.schroeter@sowi.uni-stuttgart.de