HOW PRACTICES OF GENUINE DIALOGUE AND PARTICIPATORY COMMUNICATION WORK TOGETHER IN PUBLIC AND CITIZEN DIPLOMACY PARTNERSHIPS

Mediating public-private partnership (P3) stakeholder relationship-building, information/broadcasting/social media interactions, stakeholder conflict, inter-city cooperation, and design/monitoring/evaluation (DME) depends on the inter-related practices of "genuine dialogue" and "participatory communication."[1] The "genuine dialogue" model assesses strategic communication and engagement practices.[2] Genuine dialogue connotes deliberative, "power-free" decision-making [3] needed in a complicated global network of communities with overlapping and divergent interests. Participatory communication aids diplomatists around the world in identifying 'with whom' to engage 'strategically' as well as relationally among global publics, also drawing insights from stakeholder management and corporate social responsibility. [4]

Participatory communication and genuine dialogue practices complement each other to mediate the diversity of stakeholder experience and perspectives in strategic engagement. Participatory communication is a human rights-based approach to achieving socioeconomic progress that has over the past 40 years been practiced with local stakeholders and beneficiaries across international and domestic sectors, from public health to education, cultural exchange, the environment, and humanitarian crises.[5]

The table below displays eight genuine dialogue and 15 participatory communication practices for engaging strategic publics as partners. Tracking progress in using the situationally-oriented practices facilitates measurement of sustainable positive change in P3s.[6]

Relational Tactics for Strategic Engagement: Dialogic and Participatory Communication Practices								
Participatory Communication[7]	**Genuine Dialogue**[8]							
	Mutual-ity	Presence	Commit-ment	Authent-icity	Trust	Respect	Collaboration	Risk
Listening Openly		▼				▼		
Giving Voice	▼	▼						
Relating as Partners	▼					▼	▼	
Forming Multiple Information Channels				▼			▼	

Relational Tactics for Strategic Engagement: Dialogic and Participatory Communication Practices								
Participatory Communication[7]	**Genuine Dialogue[8]**							
	Mutuality	Presence	Commitment	Authenticity	Trust	Respect	Collaboration	Risk
Jointly Strategizing, Implementing, Evaluating							▼	
Increasing Horizontal Dialogue			▼		▼			
Prioritizing Process	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Designing Messages Together		▼			▼			
Raising Consciousness			▼	▼				
Activating Informal/ Formal Networks							▼	
Contextualizing Policy Problems	▼	▼		▼				
Fostering Inclusiveness, Continuity, Diversity						▼		
Encouraging Ownership			▼	▼		▼		▼
Deliberating to Understand and Motivate	▼						▼	▼
Experimenting to Transform and Sustain	▼				▼			▼
▼ Indicates where a participatory communication practice reinforces a practice in genuine dialogue.								

For example, <u>mutuality</u> in genuine dialogue sees stakeholder groups recognizing their interdependence and working to value equally each other's interests and offering

opportunities for self-expression rather than objectify each other to meet particularistic needs.[9] Mutuality is operationalized by six participatory communication practices, as indicated by the table's blue triangles:

(1) Opportunity for self-expression is a function of "voice,"[10] or "expression of dis/satisfaction with societal-level goods or services" in development[11] and free expression and checks on credibility in the context of social media exchanges in public diplomacy.[12]

(2) Mutuality involves treating stakeholders more as partners, not targets,[13] suggesting potential of P3s as highly participatory along the continuum from weak to strong participation.[14]

(3) Like the other genuine dialogue practices, mutuality prioritizes process over final campaigns, to increase skills and resources over time in local communities;'[15]

(4) Grounding problem definition in local context and project histories, e.g., prior disaster relief experience,[16] fosters recognition of interdependence and mutual interests.

(5) Formal and informal deliberation promotes mutual understanding when lead stakeholders and participant stakeholders (engaged by the leads in project activities and events) identify and enact what motivates them. Deliberative communication avoids assuming or taking for granted each other's motivations as well as increasing top-down persuasion.[17] The box below provides a framing and example of this critical practice.

> *"[D]eliberators are amenable to changing their judgements, preferences, and views during the course of their interactions, which involve persuasion rather than coercion, manipulation, or deception….[and] would allow argument, rhetoric, humour, emotion, testimony or storytelling, and gossip."[18]*
>
>
> For example, a presentation on entrepreneurship to kick off a webchat generates informal dialogue useful for policy and program feedback.[19] In another example, diasporans feeling empathy for, or rejection by, heritage country nationals and wanting to "give back" in ways also viewed constructively in residence countries may occasion a formal personal story during a fundraising event about assisting a relative in a war zone from afar.

(6) Inherent in mutuality is recognizing partner and stakeholder interdependence and the equal value of each other's interests. This recognizing is supported by <u>experimenting with ways to frame power-sharing</u> strategies and tactics that expand knowledge and practice in transformational and sustainable public and citizen diplomacy and development.[20] E.g., communicating about education and training for daughters and mothers that *strengthens families*, rather than *threatens sons and fathers*.

Effective communication in strategic engagement is challenging in the complex, ever-blurring territorial and sectoral boundaries in which public and citizen diplomacy P3s and other projects are conceived and executed. It is made more challenging because the ideas of "strategy" and "engagement" are analytically and operationally fuzzy. To translate policy rhetoric into programmatic reality, diplomatists managing the cultural, political, and technological context of strategic engagement have the option of process-tools of partnering, mediating, and dialogic and participatory communication. Especially if project management integrates DME at the outset of planning to the determination of impact, governmental as well as nongovernmental and private sector partners and stakeholders have more capacity to address multi-stakeholder interests and demonstrate return on investment.

---

[1] The genuine dialogue model is developed on pages 14-21 in Kathy R. Fitzpatrick, *U.S. Public Diplomacy in a Post-9/11 World: From Messaging to Mutuality* (Los Angeles: Figueroa Press, 2011), accessed 6 March 2016 at http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/sites/uscpublicdiplomacy.org/files/legacy/publications/ perspectives/CPDPerspectives_Mutuality.pdf. Participatory communication's relevance to strategic engagement in public diplomacy is explored in R. S. Zaharna, "The public diplomacy challenges of strategic stakeholder engagement," in Ali Fisher and Scott Lucas (eds.), *Trials of Engagement: The Future of US Public Diplomacy* (Martinus Publishers, 2010): 201-230. It is also explained in: Silvio Waisbord, "The strategic politics of participatory communication," in K. G. Wilkins, T. Tufte, and R. Obregon (eds.), *The Handbook of Development Communication and Social Change* (John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2014): pp. 147-167; Silvio Waisbord, 2015, "Three Challenges for Communication and Global Social Change," *Communication Theory, 25*: 144–165. doi:10.1111/comt.12068; 2015; and James Pamment, 2016, "Rethinking diplomatic and development outcomes through sport: Toward a participatory paradigm of multi-stakeholder diplomacy," *Diplomacy & Statecraft 27*(2), 231-250, DOI: 10.1080/09592296.2016.1169787.
[2] Fitzpatrick, 2011.

3 Ibid, pp. 25, 36.
4 Zaharna, 2010.
5 Zaharna 2010; Waisbord, 2014; Waisbord, 2015; Pamment, 2016.
6 Zaharna, 2010, p. 207, citing Alfonso Gumucio Dagron, "Introduction," *Making Waves: Stories of Participatory Communication for Social Change*, New York, The Rockefeller Foundation, 2001, https://www.ircwash.org/sites/default/files/Gumucio-2001-Making.pdf
7 The 15 participatory communication practices listed in the table are drawn from: Zaharna, 2010; Waisbord, 2014; Pamment, 2016; Dagron, 2001; Kathryn S. Quick and Martha S. Feldman, 2011, *Journal of Planning Education and Research 31*(3), pp. 272–290; and Waisbord, 2015.
8 The eight genuine dialogue practices in the table are drawn from and directly attributable to Fitzpatrick, 2011, where they are fully developed.
9 Fitzpatrick, 2011, pp. 19, 21.
10 Waisbord, 2014.
11 See p. 1117, AbouAssi, Khaldoun, and Deborah L. Trent. "Understanding local participation amidst challenges: Evidence from Lebanon in the global south," *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations 24* (2013): 1113-1137.
12 See p. 151, A. Arsenault, 2009, "Public diplomacy 2.0," in: P. Seib (ed.), *Toward a New Public Diplomacy*, Palgrave Macmillan Series in Global Public Diplomacy, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 135-153.
13 Pamment, 2016.
14 AbouAssi and Trent, 2013.
15 Zaharna, 2010, p. 207, citing Dagron, p. 35.
16 Waisbord, 2014; Waisbord, 2015.
17 Ibid.
18 John Dryzek, 2002, *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*, New York: Oxford University: p. 1, quoted on p. 44, Deborah L. Trent, *Transnational, Trans-Sectarian Engagement: A Revised Approach to U.S. Public Diplomacy toward Lebanon*, Doctoral Thesis (2012), accessed 25 February 2018 at http://pqdtopen.proquest.com/doc/1038836409.html?FMT=AI
19 Zaharna, 2010, pp. 210-212.
20 Waisbord, 2015, p. 159.