UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The place where streams seek ground. Towards a new territorial governmentality: the meaning and usage of the concept of territorial cohesion in the European Union

Hissink Muller, B.M.

Publication date
2013

Citation for published version (APA):
Hissink Muller, B. M. (2013). *The place where streams seek ground. Towards a new territorial governmentality: the meaning and usage of the concept of territorial cohesion in the European Union.*

Appendix A Methods used

Introduction

For doing phronetic social science there would not be one fixed methodology (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 162). Nevertheless, the first chapter of the methodological framework (Chapter 4) showed that discourse analysis comes in handy when you take this alternative analytical route for social science, just as the Foucaultian approach to hereby focus on the relationships between politics and science when it concerns the concept of territorial cohesion. To tell how to study the concept in such a way, this methodological appendix subsequently discusses the specific methods used in the research's discourse analysis below. Before the explanation of how actually to perform discourse analysis puts forward an absence of rules to follow (§A.2), however, what this interpretative method actually does during analysis will be treated (§A.1). An analysis analyses something though. The chapter's third section therefore accounts for how this discourse analysis gathers information (§A.3). This chapter concludes these used methods by psychologically characterising their process and cartographically characterising the results they produce (§A.4).

A.1 What (this) discourse analysis does

A.1.1 Discourse analysis interprets texts by analysing interpretations

Although a discourse analysis does not lock itself up in the realm of text, the interpretative search for meaning of this methodology, *in casu* a mapping of 'territorial cohesion', does imply the analysis of interpretations which appear in texts – at least because linguistic representations of the world and linguistic practices form parts of a discourse. The precautions this section shows below as holding for text analysis are therefore also valid for the Foucaultian approach. For what the Foucaultian approach aims, however, brings us beyond text, *via* intertextuality, to practices, power, knowledge, and, eventually, strategies (see §A.1.2 to A.1.5). What is – not unsolvable, but – problematic for this research on the concept of territorial cohesion, is, then, that this path beyond text focuses on the historicity of regimes of truth (see §A.1.6). Nonetheless, to get beyond text analysis, first the question of how to interpret texts needs to be treated.

The extraction of meaning through textual analysis is associated with the hermeneutic model of interpretation which poses that an interpretation is produced as a result of 'the interaction between the text being studied and the intellectual framework of the interpreter' (Johnston&Prat&Watts, 2000: 825; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 155). When we try to understand something, we namely 'bring to it a whole set of preconceptions [which] provide a context in which we make sense of and interpret the meaning of the text' (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 23). To let the outcome of such an inductive process of interpretation be determined as much by the research object instead of the researcher, an attempt should therefore be made – in line with the Foucaultian approach which tries not to objectify before analysis – to bring as few a priori ideas as possible with us (e.g. no need to account for existing theories about structuring processes) (Gioia&Pitre, 1990: 588). Nevertheless, textual analysis remains inevitably selective: 'in any analysis, we choose to ask certain questions about social events and texts, and not other possible questions' (Fairclough, 2003: 14). Then again, these questions are what this research on territorial cohesion analyses: it orders interpretations of the concept shown in texts and their preconceptions. That is, the question this research asks about a text is 'Which questions are and can be asked with territorial cohesion?' – e.g. 'Territorial cohesion on which geographical level?' and 'Does

territorial cohesion imply spatial planning?' respectively (see Book II). Still, also this research itself carries its preconceptions with it to perform its "meta-interpretation" – as laid out in Chapters 2 and 3 on the analytical framework and Chapter 4 which situates the methodological framework. Thus, insofar this research interprets texts, both the interpretations of territorial cohesion shown by texts and the interpretation written down by this research are formed through the hermeneutic circle. This means a 'tacking back and forth between our evolving contextual preconceptions of the text and the text itself, and between individual parts of the text and the text as a whole' (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 23). The hermeneutic circle of interpretation has major epistemological consequences though.

The main dilemma of hermeneutics is that it cannot provide a basis to distinguish good from bad readings (e.g. in ac-/concordance with the text's original meaning) (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 33). In large part this is a consequence of the hermeneutic tradition itself, as it considers the distinction between fact and fiction to be problematic (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 24-25). Meanings clarified through the hermeneutic circle of interpretation are, namely, not found but "fictions" ''in the sense that they are "something made", "something fashioned" – the original meaning of *fictio* – not that they are false, unfactual, or merely "as if" thought experiments' with no reference to the material world to which they refer and represent' (Geertz, 1973/1975: 15; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 24-25). To make all meanings interpreted out of texts fiction, seems to leave researchers nothing but shaky ground to analyse texts – no matter that many methods of textual analysis can be used for this interpretative understanding (e.g. semiotics of structuralism, deconstruction or discourse analysis of post-structuralism), all since long in usage to explore social and cultural meaning (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 155). However, from the hermeneutic perspective the argument runs that 'the active involvement of the researcher in the fashioning of interpretation, far from invalidating the resulting representations, is the precondition for true understanding, which is imagined as the outcome of an ongoing dialogue and engagement between the researcher and the meaningful objects he or she studies' (Geertz, 1973/1975: 15; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 24-25). Making the meanings conveyed by texts "merely fictions" is thus a primary result of such a textual analysis – e.g. taking away the ground underneath those believing a text harbours one meaning only or even represents facts. Still, the tension for the researcher, also in this research on territorial cohesion, becomes: he is necessary for understanding, but may not interpret his own preconceptions into the text. How to deal herewith?

The obvious preconceptions of this research were mentioned in the previous chapter and based on an ontological understanding of the world as meaningful and therefore "text-like" (i.e. not only text) and a constructionist epistemology whereby structure and agency dwell in discourse. Without much (positive) theoretical preconceptions from this methodological framework to guide interpretation, every reading of a text might appear to be a good one. Hence, to not read and let interpretation run wild, the interpretation of a text must match, in line with the hermeneutic circle, the interpretation of its various contexts and *vice versa* – i.e. to understand text without interpreting own preconceptions into it, the researcher must place the text and its rhetorical organisation in its discursive and social contexts and practices. The sections below treat these issues in this order: A.1.2 on text and intertextuality, A.1.3 on the social context and practices beyond but related to text, A.1.4 on which kinds of texts to analyse, and A.1.5 on Foucault's crux.

A.1.2 Passing through the intertextual territorial cohesion text

When an interpretation results from looking at how text and practice interconnect, the way to understand such interconnections becomes an important preconception and must be made explicit too. The Foucaultian approach taken, however, also leaves it open how text and

practices interconnect recursively, because an account of how they do should result from a particular analysis (see §4.5.2 on Foucaultian discourse analysis). The contextual preconceptions of text then thus evolve during the analysis – a way of understanding text surely in need of a researcher. Besides, this approach does not analyse text as a discourse analysis informed by political economy, as it does not study 'the structure of text, vocabulary and grammar cohesion' (Jacobs, 2006: 42), but a system of knowledge and its associated practices. Language is instrumental to create and reproduce this system and in the form of texts represents a body of statements which performs, for instance, rhetorical, legitimising, and/or synthesising activities (Jacobs, 2006: 44). When a text is not the research object itself this could make the context of a text even more important and lets us wonder what a Foucaultian research studies when it analyses territorial cohesion text. This context and research object are outlined below.

The discourse analysis chosen by this Foucaultian research to study the concept of territorial cohesion examines the rhetorical organisation of discourse, that is: 'the argumentative schemes that organize a text and establish its authority' (Tonkiss, 1998: 249-250; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164). Territorial cohesion statements were above already discussed as intellectual and strategic positions lacking (proper) argumentation, leaving us here with pro/positions (e.g. see §4.5.3 on argumentation). What is more, hereby it does not revolve around text in the sense of documents, but only text related to the signifier 'territorial cohesion', which is scattered over documents. The method used to analyse – not one document, but – the "territorial cohesion text" formed by documents leans against textual analysis insofar the latter deals with intertextuality. Namely, although texts often refer to other texts, especially government and legal documents (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 159), the "text" formed by interrelations of texts takes centre stage in this research on the concept of territorial cohesion – i.e. the "territorial cohesion text" intertextuality constructs. When intertextuality 'alerts us to the fact that organisational and official documents are part of wider systems of distribution and exchange' (Atkinson&Coffey, 1997: 57; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 159), this research looks at such texts from the angle of territorial cohesion as such a wider system. A consequence hereof is that the important contrast between intertextuality and assumption should be seen with a different light. The contrast would be that the former opens up 'difference by bringing other 'voices' into a text' and the latter reduces 'difference by assuming common ground' (Fairclough, 2003: 41). This research, on the other hand, through an interpretative step reconstructs the common intertextual ground of territorial cohesion pro/positions on which argumentations can be built (see Chapters 5 and 6 on mapping the concept's meanings and usages, and Book II which maps them).

Considering text in an "intertextual way" does not only take us beyond a text in the plain and individual sense to the consequential need of cutting across documents for its analysis, but also towards discursive practice – a step which overlaps with discourse analyses informed by political economy. That is to say, studying discursive practice entails 'the analysis of the processes in which texts are framed, that is, the context in which statements are made and feed into other debates' (Jacobs, 2006: 42). An analysis of the concept of territorial cohesion should thereby distinguish between the discursive practices of the intertextual territorial cohesion text and the context hereof, its ground and situation of debates in which the concept is positioned (e.g. formed by Cohesion Policy, European spatial planning). The understanding of territorial cohesion argumentations as pro/positions can for this be extended to this discursive context while intertextually forms both. The involved discourse analysis tries, then, to demarcate the field where in uniform diversity the concept of territorial cohesion functions as tactical element. This study therefore differs from more common discussions of intertextuality which would begin with the question of which relevant

'external' texts and voices are (recognisably) included in a text and which (significantly) excluded (Fairclough, 2003: 61). It, namely, does not divide texts up according to their in-/exclusion and/or strength, but maps the distribution of the multiplicity of the discursive elements of 'territorial cohesion' over and through texts, texts which might either explicitly refer to each other or implicitly through the territorial cohesion sign. Yet, to discipline interpretation of text without bringing in own preconceptions, text must certainly be placed in its social contexts and practices – i.e. beyond territorial cohesion text in all senses and into the "text-like" world.

A.1.3 Go beyond text by reconstructing the social context and practices from text

To restrain interpretation of (intertextual) text, this research should with its discourse analytical method foremost highlight the social relations external to text, that is, the social setting as interpretative context in which text is located (Tonkiss, 1998: 249-250; Flyvbjerg, 2001: 115; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164); the more so, because not only the intertextual ground of the concept forms the territorial cohesion discourse, but also the practices in which the concept is used do. A Foucaultian approach thereby looks at the practices of power relations (see Chapter 2 on the analytical framework) and relates the discourse to wider power structures; also this is similar to how a discourse analysis informed by political economy considers social practice, but without the consideration of ideology (Jacobs, 2006: 42). Hence, the discourse analysis of this research is 'concerned with the relationship between language and other elements and aspects of social life' (Fairclough, 2003: 5). That is why it may be compared to, for instance, a study of how documents circulate through the networks of restricted social spheres, as official documents often do (Atkinson&Coffey, 1997: 57; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 159). Again, the Foucaultian approach used is not oriented to the social character of texts though – e.g. as the linguistic theory and associated analytical methods of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) are (Fairclough, 2003: 5) –, but focuses on knowledge of the human world and power and discursive and meaning-making practices which also interconnect in the language of territorial cohesion texts.

   Still, this step of the Foucaultian discourse analytical method as main way out of the realm of text nonetheless implies interpretation. Similar to the precautions shown above for an interpretation of text (e.g. the making of "fiction" through the hermeneutic circle), an interpretation of the power relations in the "text-like" world outside text has to deal with some issues. A structuring of a political debate, namely, 'always incorporates certain assumptions about what politics is and how it works [and] the way one analyses discourses is very dependent on assumptions about structure and agency, as well as one's own discursive contexts and concerns' (Diez, 2001: 18). Of course, not all these assumptions for this research should be revisited here (see Chapters 2 and 3 for how this research understands politics from its discursive context formed by Foucault and spatial planning and §1.1.2 for its phronetic concerns and §1.2.2 and 1.5.2 for its (non-)treatment of structure and agency). It should be clear by now that it would make no sense, for instance, to use discourse analysis as method 'if one believes that politics is essentially about the realization of structurally determined economic interest' (Diez, 2001: 18) – i.e. why analyse discourse if it is an already identified structure which determines the political outcome anyways? The more striking might be, that to think differently outside the common ways to scrutinise instead of legitimate them, a Foucaultian questioning of events leads to the attempt to not refer to the consciousness, the will, or intention – i.e. in this removal of the doer from the deed own concerns and (lacking) preconceptions merge (Nietzsche, 1968: 356; Foucault, 1968, in Burchell&Gordon&Miller, 1991: 59; Foucault, 1985: 9; Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135). A weaker version of the argument is enough to make these removals make any sense though. That is, this research does not hold that there is no (thinkable) reality in which structure or agency

exist, merely that for this research these are not the determining forces at work in the making of the concept of territorial cohesion (e.g. its knowledges). The question then becomes how an analysis of territorial cohesion can demonstrate this last point, or even show which forces do shape the concept?

With decisions as, arguably, points where forces prove themselves, the balance in power relations can be determined by analysing decision-making, whose specific outcomes should be studied by – as the pluralist approach to power teaches us – stressing concrete observable behaviour (Lukes, 1974: 12). Note thereby that 'nondecisions which confine the scope of decision-making are themselves (observable) *decisions*'; although these may not be overt, specific to a given issue, nor taken to exclude potential challenges, dominance can already defend its *status quo* by supporting the established political process (Bachrach&Baratz, 1970: 50; Lukes, 1974: 18). The researcher should study such behaviour 'either at first hand or by reconstructing behavior from documents, informants, newspapers, and other appropriate sources' (Polsby, 1963: 113, 121; Lukes, 1974: 12). Studying concrete behaviour at first hand is not an option for this research. It therefore places the reconstruction of concrete behaviour besides the one of the distribution of the multiplicity of discursive elements (see §A.1.4 on which kinds of text to analyse and §A.3.1 on gathering information for which sources this research uses). Both reconstructions thus start from text to go beyond text. Even though it does not necessarily has to be the same document, this does turn the difference of interpreting practices and discursive elements into just another way of looking to text. Hence, it becomes essential how this research can interpret practices laying outside the text they peek through.

To reconstruct concrete behaviour the Foucaultian researcher "simply" starts to record from text 'what happened on such a day, such a place, in such circumstances' (Foucault, 1971, in Miller, 1993: 191), and then presents the data, events, and phenomena 'together with their connections with other data, events, and phenomena' (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135). He hereby initially – in line with the concern of thinking outside common ways – 'takes no position regarding truth-value and significance ascribed by participants to the practices studied', moreover, he does not even preconceive one practice to be more valuable than another (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135). The interpretation of practices with the text they peek through thus brings us to the relationship between practices and meaning.

The second step of this Foucaultian approach links practices and discursive elements. What particularly suits a discourse analytical research on the concept of territorial cohesion thereby, is that the recording and presentation involved in the first step leads to the documenting of the '[d]iscontinuities and changes in the meaning of concepts and discourses' (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135). A Foucaultian research should, namely, as its key task 'identify how discourses exemplify conflicts over meaning that are linked to power' (Jacobs, 2006: 44). Hereby the concern is not merely to isolate the hermeneutic horizon of meaning of the individual practice – i.e. demarcate the field of both meaning and concrete behaviour wherein the concept functions as tactical element –, but to elaborate its arbitrariness as well, notwithstanding its self-understanding as rational (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135). It are, then, the various kinds of practices which give the methodological ground to link the reconstructions of concrete behaviour and distribution of discursive elements, because practices are ways of acting and thinking at once and a discourse's complex set of competing ideas actualises itself in our everyday practices (Jacobs, 2006: 44). Daily discursive practices thus link power practices to meaning and discourse.

With this Foucaultian approach, the last step tallies the concerns of isolating and relativising the reconstructed horizon of meaning (note that this research calls for this step to be taken). It namely relates the discourse to wider power structures, whereby the researcher would try to understand the role these studied practices played in the total system of relations,

albeit *via* other horizons of meaning and/or historical or political contexts (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 134-135) (see Chapter 2 on governmentality). Understanding the discourse's role in the total system of relations therefore implies a placing of it which underlines the discourse's own limits and a comparison with other rational grounds of practices (see possible future research). However, these three simple steps and their required stances beg the question: how to connect data, events, and phenomena with other data, events, and phenomena, document changes in meaning, identify links between meaning and power relations, isolate and question the hermeneutic horizon, have practices interpreted through text as ground and understand the role of them in multiple contexts? These questions will be answered below in section 2.2. Here another question remains, especially when text plays such a central role for the reconstruction of both discursive elements and power practices, that is: which texts to apply this generally stated mission to when studying the concept of territorial cohesion?

A.1.4 The kinds of texts to analyse

What does the above entail for the selection of texts to discourse analytically study the concept of territorial cohesion? To interpret the intertextual territorial cohesion ground of pro/positions on which argumentations can be build, this research of course analyses texts which mention 'territorial cohesion' (see §A.3.1 on which data to collect). Yet, because this discourse analysis considers the discursive elements of the concept tactically in force relations whose concrete observable behaviour of/in power practices are interpreted through text, some analytical separations lead to a selection of territorial cohesion texts (i.e. to not include every utterance of 'territorial cohesion'). Namely, in accordance with the four kinds of power distinguished for this research (i.e. *auctoritas*, *potestas*, *pecunia*, *politique spirituelle*; see Chapter 3 on power) different kinds of texts can be identified through which power practices peek: texts about official competencies (e.g. Treaties, position papers), policy (e.g. Cohesion Reports, documents from the Ministers responsible for spatial development), funding (e.g. Financial Perspectives, EP reports on funding, interviews), and those that shape the debates (e.g. ESPON Reports, research articles). It are these kinds of texts mentioning territorial cohesion which form the intertextual text to interpret and analyse practices.

Then again, a discourse does not consist of text and practices, but of a system of knowledge and its associated practices. For texts to point to territorial cohesion knowledges an extra step of selection needs to be taken: here the policy texts and those that shape thought are especially important due to their stronger relationship to knowledge (see Chapter 9 on the meanings of the concept for a demonstration hereof and Chapter 2 on governmentality). The exploration of how the concept of territorial cohesion represents particular ideas, actions, institutions, physical artefacts, attributes or relations in the language of policy documents (Jensen&Richardson, 2003) thus fits the approach to discourse analysis of the above mentioned framework particularly well (see §4.4 on policy analysis). Hence, in its reconstruction of the distribution of the discursive elements of the concept this research's discourse analysis selects territorial cohesion texts. To be precise, it selects texts concerned with official competencies, policy, funding, and shaping the debate to reconstruct the concrete behaviour of power practices concerned with territorial cohesion, while it focuses on the policy texts and those shaping the debate to reconstruct the rhetorical organisation instrumental for the creation and reproduction of the concept's system of knowledge (see §4.5.2 on Foucaultian discourse analysis).

A.1.5 Thoroughly applying Foucault's crux: include science

This Foucault-based research on the concept of territorial cohesion should thus provide a sufficient description of the intertextual text which forms the ground of territorial cohesion pro/positions, 'provide sufficient social and political context to explain changes in policy',

and explore power relations (Jacobs, 2006: 45). Less common for scientific research hereby is to grasp Flyvbjerg (2001: 62), who holds that also social science itself can contribute to social development as know-how (*techne*)[a] by 'grappling with social, cultural, demographic, and administrative problems'. The same could be said of analytical scientific knowledge (*episteme*) or social science as *phronesis* – e.g. as policy science shaping the debate. With each of these tasks the social sciences can play an emancipatory role or control, repress, and legitimate (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 62). Which role social science – and possibly "spatial science" – plays when it concerns territorial cohesion is therefore worth closer analysis and depends on the specific interests and purposes science serves with the concept and in its specific context (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 62).

Moreover, this research is particularly interested in the scientific part of the territorial cohesion discourse situated on both the knowledge as practice side (e.g. the scientific analysis of territorial cohesion as a policy discourse), especially how the scientific part (e.g. scientific knowledge, discursive practices, meaning-making practices) relates to power practices (e.g. in policy-making) and wider power structures and *vice versa*. This involves a thorough application of the Foucaultian crux to territorial cohesion: study discourses on the level of their tactical productivity with the question 'What reciprocal effects of power and knowledge [do] they ensure?' (Foucault, 1980b: 102; Flyvbjerg, 2001: 124). Thereby looking at, for instance, how scientific knowledges solidify power relations by representing a part of the world as having social, political, or economic structures and actors (e.g. the same in the "territorial cohesion world" as elsewhere), and how power relations make it possible for certain knowledges to appear instead of others (e.g. through their influence on scientific practices concerned with territorial cohesion). Furthermore, a thorough application of the Foucaultian crux to territorial cohesion should, besides studying the tactical productivity of its discourse, account for the level of strategic integration (see Chapter 2 on govermentality). This with the question: What conjunction and what force relationships make it necessary to utilise the demarcated territorial cohesion discourse in a given episode of the various confrontations that occur? (Foucault, 1980b: 102; Flyvbjerg, 2001: 124). An understanding of the role of the territorial cohesion discourse in the total system of relations would therefore not only underline its limits and compare it to other rational grounds, but this post also makes it possible to see the discourse's strategic value.

To summarise what is said above: this research's Foucaultian approach to discourse analysis uses texts concerned with official competencies, policy, funding, and shaping the debate to form (*via* intertextually) the territorial cohesion text to analyse. It analyses the system of territorial cohesion knowledge and its associated practices through this text. This by reconstructing, on the one hand, the rhetorical organisation of territorial cohesion propositions to get to the common ground for territorial cohesion arguments and, on the other hand, the positions taken in the concrete behaviour of the concept's power practices, while discursive practices relate both. Hereby this analysis goes through the hermeneutic circle and understands the concept of territorial cohesion as tactical element in a context of other (also intertextual) debates and hermeneutic horizons and a social setting of power relations and wider power structures. In order to fully elaborate the arbitrariness of the territorial cohesion discourse this discourse analysis is especially interested in the role of this discourse's scientific part and, finally, a survey of its strategic value in general confrontations.

Such an analysis thus implies lots of interpretative steps taken by the researcher to fashion an insight in the concept of territorial cohesion. Section A.2 on how to do discourse analysis deals herewith, and §2.3 on how to gather information discusses, amongst others, how to get the text to interpret. For now though, with what this Foucaultian discourse

---

[a] *Techne* can be characterised as 'Craft/art. Pragmatic, variable, context-dependent. Oriented toward production. Based on practical instrumental rationality governed by a conscious goal. The original concept appears today in terms such as "technique," "technical," and "technology." (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 57)

analysis is concerned *qua* text, can, in short, be put in a simple manner: what experts say when they talk as experts (Dreyfus&Rabinow, 1982: xxiv, 53), and therefore with what politicians, policy-makers, administrators, scientists and other researchers say when they talk about territorial cohesion.

A.1.6 *Addendum*: genealogy against the forgetfulness of newest history

When this discourse analytical research is concerned with what experts say when they talk as experts, a major question becomes: what makes a text expertise? From the above, the rhetorical organisation of the intertextual territorial cohesion text comes to mind as what defines the concept's realm of expertise. However, hereby the argumentative schemes cannot be studied as what fits a text inside the realm of expertise as they do when you analyse what establishes the authority of one text (Tonkiss, 1998: 249-250; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164). There are three reasons for this. The first one comes forth out of the research object: although this research reconstructs the rhetorical organisation of the concept's system of knowledge, the involved statements lack (proper) argumentation and the mapped territorial cohesion propositions therefore do not give enough information to clarify what establishes the authority of a text. The second reason is logical, in that the authority of a text is just not the same as a realm of expertise expressed by texts. More methodologically though, thirdly, this discourse analysis goes beyond text, and therefore what establishes the realm of expertise in which texts may fit should, arguably, also lie outside text, just as the reconstructed practices and distribution of discursive elements do. The question of what makes territorial cohesion text expertise thus remains.

From the Foucaultian discursive context of this research comes the claim that discourse constructs the realm of expertise. Discourses namely play a pivotal role in the establishment of 'regimes of truth', that is, 'the grounds from which we assert understandings about the social world' (Jacobs, 2006: 44). Because these regimes 'to a large extent determine the acceptable formulations of problems and their solution' (Jacobs, 2006: 44), texts are inside the realm of expertise when they express these accepted formulations. The domain in which texts can be taken as expertise is, then, a rule-governed system (Dreyfus&Rabinow, 1982: xxiv, 53): rules deny/accept texts inside the realm of territorial cohesion expertise (see Chapter 7 on the demarcation of a discourse). The task for a Foucaultian discourse analyst thereby is to analyse the language of these expert texts to set out 'how regimes of truth are articulated and reveal evidence of contradictions or ruptures in the text which may be evident, albeit less explicitly' (Lees, 2004; Jacobs, 2006: 41); such contradictions and ruptures come forward in the mapping of territorial cohesion pro/positions (see Chapters 5 and 6 on the mapping of the meanings and usages of the concept). This research thus analyses how the intertextual territorial cohesion text follows its rules of expertise while articulating the regime of truth (partly) established by the territorial cohesion discourse as a system of knowledge and its associated practices. So far so good.

Yet, the Foucaultian approach also is a historical one (see §4.6.1 on *Geschichte*). That is to say, Nietzsche's method of genealogy Foucault further developed entails the tracing of 'a pattern backward in time until some striking difference between current and historical practices is located' (Poster, 1984: 89; Emigh, 1997: 657-658). Because such a tracing analyses text to interpret beyond it, these striking differences come up as ruptures in the analysed expert text, as 'our understandings of politics are subject to historical shifts that are contingent on the diffuse ways that power is exercised' (Jacobs, 2006: 44). The aim hereby is to use the difference between these practices 'to undermine commonly held notions about the rationality of the current ones' (Poster, 1984: 89; Emigh, 1997: 657-658). A Foucaultian discourse analysis thus tries to demonstrate the historicity of a regime of truth articulated by the texts of a realm of expertise.

To analyse understandings and associated practices that existed in history (of thought) and are still influencing statements and power relations of today (e.g. by still existing) is, however, something else then, as this research does, analysing a discourse that will be history but is momentarily in the making. How, then, to undermine the notions of the rationality of territorial cohesion practices with the historicity of its regime of truth by looking for the pattern under construction today instead of historically tracing it backwards? When this research namely looks at the developing pro/positions of the territorial cohesion discourse, the researcher's sight is not one of historical hindsight, the historical distance does not provide a birds-eye view, and the practices and knowledges that might eventually lead to the actual territorial cohesion discourse can still have different effects (e.g. see §4.2.2 on the difference between texts construing and constructing social reality). It should thus be understood that the possible visions of a territorial cohesion discourse are multiple and one of them is its non-existence – making the attempt to determine the territorial cohesion discourse sound more heroic than it is.

Still, notwithstanding the major consequences for how this research analyses discourse (see §A.2 on how to do discourse analysis), also its description of a developing pattern through recent time can show the historicity of a regime of truth. That is, by illustrating that the ground from which we assert understandings about territorial cohesion is time-bound. This research therefore does not so much undermine commonly held notions by showing how they differ from older ones, but undermines the notions which are under construction today because they show that they are new and, perhaps, have no ground (yet) at all. To do this the genealogy of an existing pattern is not traced far backwards through history, but with a historical eye the recent though already covered traces are laid bare that can develop into the pattern of the territorial cohesion discourse – i.e. this research uses genealogical methods to not forget the history of the newest. Hence, even if the concept of territorial cohesion would imply a historical shift in our understanding and exercise of power, this research attempts to reveal our shaky regime of truth by undermining the expertise of the expert texts articulating the territorial cohesion discourse.

A.2 How to do (this) discourse analysis?

A.2.1 Traces of artisan activity

This research's methodological framework delivers some questions for a more detailed methodical level than the one explaining what a discourse analysis actually does. Questions, that is, on how to study the concept of territorial cohesion in a discourse analytical way. To recuperate them: how to i) connect data, events, and phenomena with other data, events, and phenomena, ii) document changes in meaning, iii) identify links between meaning and power relations, iv) isolate and question the hermeneutic horizon, v) have practices interpreted through text as methodological ground and understand the role of them in their discursive and social contexts, and how to vi) use Foucault's historical approach to the present? Partly, a general answer can be given here; and §A.2.2 to A.2.5 on guidelines treat specific answers. That is to say, besides particular instructions, two lines of reasoning hold for the interpretations in every analytical step of this research. Firstly, after personal experience this research poses that Hoggart&Lees&Davies (2002: 158, 165) are right in holding that discourse analysis, and the textual analysis involved, 'is a craft skill [which] is not easy to render or describe in an explicit manner'. Hence, the main answer to the general question of 'How to do discourse analysis?' is that it appears more as an artisan activity than as an activity which can be grasped and executed by following certain methodical rules.

This striking unmethodological ground from which to work (meta-)scientifically could be less arbitrary when Flyvbjerg (2001: 20) tells us, after Dreyfus&Dreyfus (1986),

that many of our human undertakings, and especially those complex ones done by the more advanced (e.g. experts), are not so much done by following rules for it, but more on intuition. Even so, for a social scientist, admitting that he knows what he does but not how he does it (e.g. when interpreting), seems to be too honest. For discourse analysis honesty does not need to stop here though. This research, namely, also acknowledges that, as the making of "fictions" through the hermeneutic circle of interpretation already suggested (see §A.1.1 on textual analysis), if language constructs, any account hereof through research and writing is a construction itself (Potter&Wetherall, 1987; Hastings, 1996: 196). A technique in use by discourse analysts can thereby signalise the researcher's awareness of both his intuitive way of interpreting and analysing and the re/constructive nature of his activity: 'present the data, analysis and conclusions in such a way that the reader is able to assess the researcher's interpretations and claims' (Hastings, 1996: 196). Although the discourse analytical method of this research thus does not (consciously) follow rules in its conduct, some particular considerations can lead the way too.

A.2.2 Considerations which guide what to look for and how to look

Some considerations guide this study of the territorial cohesion sign in text. This section straightforwardly puts them forward as five guidelines. To start with, you simply look for 'that which is said and that which is hidden, the necessary articulations, and the forbidden ones, and relations between these' (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 123). When reconstructing the distribution of territorial cohesion's discursive elements, such a phronetical study of rationality and power should thus prevent that an own substantive infilling of the concept enters its interpretation of territorial cohesion text and thereby the research results (e.g. by not posing but looking for interpretations); this is obviously in line with the Foucaultian textual analysis: bring as few a priori ideas as possible with us when interpreting (see §A.1.1). Hence, this discourse analysis looks at what is said, hidden, forbidden, and necessary without an assumed idea of the concept.

 Four other considerations do not so much guide what this discourse analysis looks for, but more how to look at text. The primary analytical guideline thereby is to use variation as a lever, that is: attend to differences in text, even minor variation, because the documents are oriented towards action (Potter&Wetherell, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 55; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165). Because in practice variation between texts is more common than unevenness within texts (Potter&Wetherell, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 55; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165), an analysis of the intertextual territorial cohesion text thus grasps the uniform diversity of the concept. The third guideline relates hereto: read the fine detail, as the analysis cannot identify what is a big or trivial issue from the outset (Potter&Wetherell, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 55; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165). It is certainly not known which practice is more valuable than another one before the territorial cohesion pro/positions are totally mapped out. The fourth guideline is central to the discourse analytical approach and entails an orientation built into the analytical mentality by way of analysing rhetorical organisation: focus on rhetoric to draw how texts do not relate to some putative 'reality' but to competing alternatives (Potter&Wetherell, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 59; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165). Finally, here, to analyse the concept of territorial cohesion other discourse studies should be used as an analytic resource. This entails cross-reference 'to examine whether features of discourse construction in other investigations can inform analysis' (Potter&Wetherell, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 55; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165). The territorial cohesion discourse under construction might, namely, have something in common with other discourses. Hence, to describe what is said, hidden, forbidden or necessary without an assumed idea of territorial cohesion when the concept appears, one should attend to

differences in and read the detail of text and cross-refer to other discourse studies, while always looking for competing alternatives in the rhetorical organisation.

A.2.3 Applying the guidelines to the detailed methodical questions

The considerations about what to look for in and how to look at territorial cohesion texts make it possible to answer the detailed methodical questions coming from §A.1 on what (this) discourse analysis does. Although this research criss-crosses multiple interpretive and analytical steps (see §A.2.4), for reasons of clarity this section treats its discourse analysis as if it follows a linear path. Logically wise the first step then becomes: connecting data, events, and phenomena with other data, events, and phenomena. It is difficult to explain how to do this. Simply put it appears an almost "positivist" affair for the interpretative researcher. That is to say, he should first straightforwardly document what is said and thereby attempt to preserve the unique representations of the collected data (Gioia&Pitre, 1990: 588; Flyvbjerg, 2001: 123). Secondly, when he has documented the data face value, the researcher should piece partial clues together – which is a general feature of documentary analysis (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137); leaving the issues of collecting data and distinguishing linguistic data and the information on events and phenomena it communicates to the side here (see §A.3 though). This research on territorial cohesion also pieces partial clues together in two steps, as it initially connects texts to form the intertextual territorial cohesion text, and then, in an analysis hereof, groups and connects the different data, events, and phenomena (e.g. different interpretations of territorial cohesion, separating the concept and its context). Of course, the interpretation should also use the guideline of attending to difference to distinguish the different groups before connecting them; whereby a disparate usage of words and phrases does not just reveal different meanings but dissimilar emphases for action too (Potter&Wetherell, 1994: 55; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 164-165). Coding procedures thereby help during the analysis 'to discern patterns in the (usually) qualitative data so that descriptive codes, categories, taxonomies, or interpretative schemes that are adequate at the level of meaning of the informants can be established' (Gioia&Pitre, 1990: 588). Note, however, that this research on territorial cohesion studies the interpretations given to the concept by experts, and therefore interprets beyond the level of meaning of the texts of these informants. Meaning: the descriptive codes, taxonomies, and interpretative schemes adequate at the level of territorial cohesion expertise are as what is said the intertextual starting point instead of the result of the analysis (see §A.1.6 for what constitutes expertise). At least superficially seen this shows how to connect data, events, and phenomena with other data, events, and phenomena: form the intertextual territorial cohesion text by documenting the unique representations of what is said while attending to difference, use descriptive codes and categories to group data, events, and phenomena, notice the patterns by piecing partial clues together, and order the findings with taxonomies and interpretative schemes for an overview. While this does pragmatically deal with the problem of interconnecting data, events, and phenomena, a problem might remain nonetheless: does it not merely imply the act of interconnecting without telling how to do this? Section A.2.4 also further discusses the issue by going beyond the simple and linear methodical solution offered here and towards the hermeneutic circle.

      After the data, events, and phenomena are interconnected, the practices can be traced out of the in taxonomies and interpretative schemes ordered text to form the research's ground for interpretation. The intertextual territorial cohesion text and the categorised definitions of course show the traces of linguistic and meaning-making practices. By using the guideline of focussing on rhetoric in the analytical mentality, the organisation of competing alternatives comes up as the trace of struggles of argumentation, that is: as discursive practices. Still, it is not clear how to interpret the linguistic, meaning-making, and

discursive practices from texts, whether these are practices in which the concept is used or those in its context. Even less clear is how this works when it concerns power practices, even after the argumentative turn in policy analysis (see §4.4.3 on policy discourse analysis). What are, for instance, traces of (non-)decisions in policy-making? This would thus lead to a very instable position for doing a research in which practices should discipline interpretation, because its methods cannot explain how it interprets practices out of text, not to mention the related harder question of how to have these practices as methodical ground for interpretation, that is: after they are interpreted. Hence, to pragmatically deal with the problem of tracing practices out of the ordered text to form the research's ground for interpretation, the researcher simply goes from text to linguistic practices, definitions to meaning-making practices, what is already said and hidden about concrete behaviour to power practices (see Chapter 6 on mapping usages for how this involves reinterpretation), and, by focussing on rhetoric, from organisations of argumentation to discursive practices. But, again, how to actually do this remains an unknown, one which §A.2.4 discusses with the hermeneutic circle as well.

With practices as ground for interpretation, this research on territorial cohesion can methodically both deal with how to document changes in meaning and understand the role of the practices in discursive and social contexts, as expressed in turn below. When a discourse analytical research documents changes in meaning, it cannot do this by preconceiving a meaning as given or even stable – such an idea would clearly contradict what it looks for. Besides, changes in meaning obviously implicate meaning-making practices; the meaning-making and discursive practices overlap when thinking practices are traceable by and through thoughts as crystallised thinking written down in texts as, for instance, definitions of territorial cohesion (Chapter 5 on mapping meanings further discusses meanings as a category of thoughts). The interpretative researcher should thus, on the contrary, directly follow the guideline of describing what is said, hidden, forbidden, and necessary when the words 'territorial cohesion' are mentioned without an assumed idea of the concept. What thus entails a looking for and documenting of explicit and implicit territorial cohesion meanings and an ordering of them as propositions (see §A.2.1); Chapter 7 shows how the forbidden and necessary articulations have to do with the territorial cohesion discourse. *Nota bene*, this research on territorial cohesion does not document changes in the meaning of territorial cohesion through time, but maps the different meanings which appear around now, that is, while the concept is under construction and (yet) without an once established "single meaning" which changed through time (again, see Chapter 5) – because all meanings are still there, the concept is perhaps not old enough for one of its meanings to decay or even to totally disappear (see Book II as demonstration hereof). In spite of this, documenting – not change in meaning, but – different meanings nonetheless follows the same guidelines: besides not filling the concept with an own idea of it, again use variation as lever to notice the different propositions of territorial cohesion definitions from what is said and hidden and pick them out of texts to put them in a taxonomy of the concept's meanings.

Not only the territorial cohesion definitions which form the concept's propositions can be fished out of text with practices as ground for interpretation, also territorial cohesion positions can. This is useful because they allow an understanding of the role of territorial cohesion practices in their discursive and social contexts. It are these positions, namely, which show for what the concept is used in (reconstructed) concrete behaviour, that is: as marks thereof. Here the guidelines of looking for what is said, focussing on rhetoric, and attending to difference help again: the interpretative researcher should look for what is competed when the words 'territorial cohesion' appear to get the concept's positions (e.g.

whereon text contradicts). However, note that, in contrast to documenting definitions,[a] positions do not appear in a void and can thus only be positioned in their discursive context and social context of power relations (see §A.1.3 on social context). These contexts should therefore be known to come up with the territorial cohesion positions in the first place. Moreover, because these positions mark contextual discursive and power practices in the form of usages of the concept, they lead to an understanding of the role of territorial cohesion practices in its discursive and social context (see Chapter 6 on mapping usages). Due to this, the guideline of reading the fine detail may be added to interpret positions, at least with more emphasis, to prevent to beforehand decide on which practice is more valuable than another one. Notwithstanding the use of these guidelines, a methodical situation comes into view which resembles the one of having practices interpreted out of text as ground for interpretation. That is, without the hermeneutic circle it is impossible to explain how positions of the concept's usage lead to an understanding of the role of its practices in discursive and social contexts while spotting these marks of concrete behaviour already implies a noticing of the role these discursive and power practices play in their contexts. That this methodical problem cannot be solved here seems very thorny, because getting these positions is essential as step in the analysis: only after describing them their rhetorical organisation can be interpreted besides the rhetorical organisation of the various territorial cohesion propositions (see §A.2.4 though). Still, for now it should be clear that to interpret territorial cohesion propositions on the one side and on the other positions of the concept's usages as marks of practices, which play certain roles in its discursive and social contexts, one should use variation as lever, focus on rhetoric, and read the fine detail to at least not logically speculate but interpretatively describe pro/positions out of what is said in the analysed intertextual text.

After the interpretative step beyond text *via* interconnecting data, events, and phenomena and practices as ground for interpretation to territorial cohesion definitions and contextual usages of the concept, the researcher can analyse these pro/positions to identify the links between meaning and power relations. This entails a linking of both rhetorical organisations by, again, piecing partial clues together. This time, however, it concerns clues constructed by this research's interpretation. Furthermore, especially in this step of the discourse analysis the researcher should use the guideline of focussing on rhetoric, as this shows how discursive practices (i.e. thinking) link meaning and power relations (see §A.1 on what (this) discourse analysis does and the Chapters 5, 6, and 7 for the operationalisation of how this research will use the associated methods). To draft the rhetorical organisation of this conflict over meaning linked to power, one should certainly look for places where territorial cohesion definitions and the concept's usages overlap and find – or, weaker put: suggest – correlations between meaning and power relations. A guideline which can be used to identify these links is related to the one of focussing on rhetoric competition: read the detail in order to (again) – not before, but – after the analysis decide what the scientific and/or political issues are, whether big or trivial; arguably, in the framing of these statements the power relations, or even the wider power structures, give issues their weight and the discursive context gives them their strategic/tactical value. Cross-referring also seems a sensible thing to do here, as other discourse studies might point to links between meaning and power relations which can also exist with the concept of territorial cohesion. To link meaning and power relations in this discourse analysis of the concept of territorial cohesion three guidelines thus need to be combined to piece the interpreted clues together: focussing on rhetoric, reading the detail, and cross-referring.

---

[a] To understand a definition one should understand the language with which the concept is defined. The hermeneutic circle of interpretation implied in the proficiency of a language, however, is not the one meant when discussing how to understand and position the concept of territorial cohesion here.

And so the above presented linear path for doing this discourse analytical research on the concept of territorial cohesion cumulatively follows the guidelines dealing with the detailed methodical questions in steps. First of all, the exact documentation of what is said, variation as lever, and the usage of descriptive codes and categories come up with interpretative schemes of interconnected data, events, and phenomena. With the addition of focussing on rhetoric these schemes lead to the practices, which as ground for interpretation form an important node to link the research steps. This also holds for the taxonomy of different territorial cohesion meanings, which is arrived at by, building forth on such a ground, also describing what is hidden besides what is said: the implicit and explicit definitions of the concept. It are these propositions, namely, which allow for the leap from the intertextual territorial cohesion text (i.e. data, events, and phenomena) to the identification of links between meaning and power relations. Of course, these links can only be identified after the interpretative description of the territorial cohesion positions. To take this step besides the one towards meaning, the researcher should also read the fine detail, especially due to the inherent connections of these positions with various discursive and social contexts whose tiny differences might have great impacts on the concept's usage. What is more, the interpretative steps towards territorial cohesion pro/positions thus not only structure meaning as node in this research, but by emphasising discursive and social practices focus on thinking and power as nodes as well. Namely, to link the interpreted territorial cohesion propositions and positions, one should, besides adding the guideline of cross-referring to other discourse analytical studies, be aware of how thinking as daily practice connects meaning and power relations; Chapter 5 on meaning, Chapter 6 on usages, and Chapter 7 on discourse elaborate on these steps towards, respectively, territorial cohesion propositions, the concept's positions, and their links to operationalise this research. However, as mentioned above, the usage of these guidelines through linear research steps leaves us with some problems and not yet treated detailed methodical questions.

A.2.4 Tricky left over's and when to start: analytic retroduction in the hermeneutic circle

The guidelines introduced in §A.2.2 (i.e. describe what is said, not have an own idea of territorial cohesion, attend to differences, look for the rhetorical organisation, read the fine detail, cross-refer) and the use of coding procedures seem to solve the detailed methodical questions of how to document different meanings and to identify links between meaning and power relations. That is, respectively, taxonomise territorial cohesion meanings by using variation as lever to document the different propositions of definitions from what is said and hidden in the intertextual territorial cohesion text, and piece the territorial cohesion pro/positions together by focussing on rhetoric, reading the detail, and by cross-referring. However, in this research on the concept of territorial cohesion these steps towards meaning and links between meaning and power relations largely depend on the previous steps in the discourse analysis. Previous steps, moreover, which remain methodically problematic, even with the usage of the guidelines. The problems which rose in the application of the guidelines to the detailed methodical questions above can be put under the banner of two main questions: how to see patterns, and how to have practices as ground for interpretation? Below it will be shown how the method to cope with the former question leads to a practical tactic for the latter. What is more, this section corrects the linear path of how this research does its discourse analysis as presented above into a criss-cross way of doing turned by the hermeneutic circle. It thereby almost seems to provide the answer for the problems left by §A.2.3 and to lead to the not yet treated detailed methodical questions of how to isolate and question the hermeneutic horizon and to use Foucault's historical approach to the present as shown in §A.2.5. Before these issues can be treated, however, this discourse analysis of the concept of territorial cohesion is in need of another guideline.

When to start analysing the data in the detailed archival research for which the Foucaultian stand provides such a firm basis to engage in (Jacobs, 2005: 45)? In short the answer is: 'Analysis begins during data collection' (Gioia&Pitre, 1990: 588) (see section 2.3 for how this research collects data). On the other hand, this merely seems to complex the analysis. Namely, what you found therefore not only determines what you can analyse, but what you analyse then also structures what you look for in archival collections (Hill, 1993: 6; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137). 'This is blatantly circular – and points to the necessarily provisional and interactive essence of ongoing archival work' (Hill, 1993: 6; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137). What thus happens with the hermeneutic circle in this research due to the intertextuality of the territorial cohesion text, is that while going back and forth between the increasing understanding of the data – or at least the evolving contextual preconceptions of it – and the data itself, what is considered relevant for analysis changes due to the analysis (e.g. the intertextual territorial cohesion text, territorial cohesion pro/positions as interpretation of text), which changes the outcomes of the analysis, *et cetera* – thereby also creating the risk that you continue until you can only see confirming facts (i.e. the confirmation bias). Moreover, because this research consists of various steps of interpretative analysis (i.e. interpreting outcomes of the analysis of interpretations), these particular process issues raised by the method of documentary analysis multiply, and it becomes even harder to neatly package the investigation in 'methodological formulas that guarantee publishable results' (Hill, 1993: 6; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137). Hence, when the work of documentary analysis is 'iterative, requiring checking and cross-checking, viewing ideas from divergent angles', reliant as it is on piecing partial clues together (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137), then for this research this not only holds for the data and analysis thereof, but for the criss-crossing of interpretative and analytical steps as well. So, if this corrects the picture of the methodical path followed by this research, complexing it immensely with many points of hermeneutic iteration, the question becomes how this research's circular nature can solve the main two problems coming from §A.2.3.

The problems of how to see patterns and have practices as ground for interpretation can be dealt with one for one. The question of 'How to see patterns?' thereby came to us with the essential "first" interpretative step of the discourse analysis: interconnecting data, events, and phenomena from the intertextual territorial cohesion text by noticing the patterns in partial clues, grouping them in categories and interpretative schemes. That is, these means merely imply the act of interconnecting; moreover, actually the recognition of patterns permeates every step in the analysis to get the overall picture, whether it concerns an ordering of territorial cohesion definitions, the concept's usages, or their links. The crux lies in weighing up the salience and dynamics of issues instead of just harvesting a multiplicity of evidence (Ritchie&Spencer, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 186). Most difficult to describe hereby is the mechanical process of obvious connecting and conceptualisation, because every step requires leaps of intuition and imagination (Ritchie&Spencer, in Bryman&Burgess, 1994: 186). The question of how to see patterns thus essentially comes down to the (yet) incomprehensible "mystery of creation".

However, there is a practical way to scientifically deal with the, arguably, unsolvable methodical question on creativity: analytical retroduction. To begin with, analytic induction can be used as research strategy which goes against the confirmation bias, because it pays close attention to signals that challenge whatever images the researcher develops in a systematic examination of similarities (Ragin, 1994: 93). The deviant cases you find while tabulating instances of a pattern you think you identified in some data (e.g. with interpretative schemes) revise your understanding of this pattern (Silverman, 2006: 55). Applied to studying territorial cohesion this works as follows: i) during the accumulation of evidence, incidents of territorial cohesion text are compared which appear to be in a same category, ii)

the herewith established similarities and differences help to define categories (e.g. of territorial cohesion positions), and iii) the further exploration of relevant similarities among the instances of a category links these positions within the categories and refines the image (Ragin, 1994: 93-94). *Nota bene*, if relevant similarities cannot be identified, then either the group of positions is too wide and heterogeneous and a narrower category needed, or one should take another look at the evidence the intertextual territorial cohesion text offers and regroup possible similarities (Ragin, 1994: 94). The data procedure of analytic induction is therefore concerned 'with the degree to which the image of the research subject has been refined, sharpened, and elaborated in response to both confirming and disconfirming evidence', and thus both with constructing images of patterns and seeking challenges hereto (Ragin, 1994: 94). This working back and forth between evidence – or at least marks – and ideas befits the hermeneutic circle of data and contextual preconceptions in textual analysis and could be called retroduction, as it mimics 'the interplay of induction and deduction in the process of scientific discovery' (Ragin, 1994: 98). What is more, we can follow Popper's advice for science here: falsify (see §4.1.1 on science or discourse). The method of analytic retroduction namely sees marks that could refute 'as the best raw material for improving initial images': negative cases are excluded when the relevant category is narrowed or become the main focus when the commonalities are regrouped to reconcile contradictory data (Ragin, 1994: 93-94) – e.g. deviant texts on territorial cohesion can add a new category of positions, thereby modifying the discerned pattern and, consequentially, the research outcomes. Thus, to deal with the absence of rules for the creative activity of seeing patterns in the intertextual territorial cohesion text, this research uses the method of analytic retroduction in the hermeneutic circle while trying to find marks that indicate other patterns than already thought of.

Analytic retroduction also leads to a practical tactic to solve the other main question of 'How to have practices as ground for interpretation?'. The problem is that practices cannot discipline every interpretation, because they themselves need to be interpreted as patterns before they can form a ground for interpretation. Likewise, the positions of the concept's usage cannot lead to an understanding of the role of these practices in discursive and social contexts, because territorial cohesion positions are necessarily contextual and therefore already imply these contexts. Then again, this second problem concerns the ordering of already reconstructed practices (i.e. interpreted out of text), and therefore entails an interpretative step disciplined by these practices. The first noted problem remains though.

A practical tactic which can be used to get to the practices which discipline the interpreting could be called 'distinguishing interpretations'. Linguistic, meaning-making, power, and discursive practices cannot simply be traced from the intertextual territorial cohesion text. Analytic retroduction therefore has to deal with the hermeneutic circle involved in going back and forth between the text and the practices as created interpretations of text. Moreover, this step of the discourse analysis fundamentally changes in a circular research process, because now the step from the intertextual territorial cohesion text to an ordering of it in interpretative schemes helps to interpret the patterns of practices and *vice versa* – i.e. in the hermeneutic circle these steps can be taken "simultaneously". Obviously, the falsification analytic retroduction entails becomes crucial to form the practices into a solid ground for interpretation, while it cannot be based on another. Thus, because analytic retroduction deals with how to see patterns, the passage from text (*via* interpretative schemes) to practices is dealt with. The practices therefore provide a relatively save ground for further interpretation. The chaotic multitude of detailed practices thereby disciplines the categorising and ordering of later interpretations. Simply put: the simplifications must not harm the nitty-gritty too much. Hence, through analytic retroduction the ground for interpretation is drawn out during this discourse analytical research of the concept of territorial cohesion: practices

are not so much the methodical ground needed to stand on to interpret, but the practical tactic of distinguishing interpretations can be used to let practices function as the leading interpretation for the other analytical and interpretive steps.

Analysing the intertextual territorial cohesion text thus allows for a rather easy falsification of interpretations beyond the one of practices. With steps of interpretation following each other, the outcomes nonetheless quickly become more provisional due to the weaknesses of the method – i.e. the researcher's position is instable. The boundedness of this discourse analysis by interpreted practices instead of the practices themselves is an inevitable lack though: this researcher could not study the actual practices. Thus, to conclude, after this discourse analysis started during data collection and while the research continues circularly through data and analysis, it hermeneutically iterates the analytical and interpretive steps in search for structures in the intertextual territorial cohesion text by seeing patterns through intuition and imagination. These creative activities lack methodical rules and become increasingly instable. However, besides that the ways of interpretation can be traced, the creative activities are scientifically held in check by method of analytic retroduction to falsify and reconstructed practices as the – not only ordered, but also – leading interpretation to discipline them.

A.2.5 The conundrum: when to stop spiralling towards the hermeneutic horizon

It should be clear whether this discourse analysis' Foucaultian method endlessly continues to go back and forth hermeneutically. We thus have to deal with the conundrum for those engaged in documentary research: when to stop (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 136-137)? This relates to the left-over detailed methodical question of how to isolate and question the hermeneutic horizon, because the interpretive analytical part of the research stops when it arrives at its destination: the borderline of the organisations of territorial cohesion pro/positions as the concept's isolated hermeneutic horizon. The essential problem is, however, that the concept is still in its creative state of flux (e.g. §A.1.6 on the historicity of regimes of truth), and therefore new texts with new territorial cohesion pro/positions can appear, old ones decay, and emphases change. Hence, isolating the concept's hermeneutic horizon, in its turn, leads to the question on using Foucault's historical approach to the present. As a consequence, a key question then becomes: when to stop gathering data (see §A.3)?

This research intertwines the gathering with the analysing and interpreting of data, so it cannot stop analysing and interpreting before it stops gathering data. Yet, when you start gathering texts and instantly interpret them by grouping data according to what is said, the concept's pro/positions will in due course form a dense cloud of similarities. It is this interpreted density which guides when to stop gathering data: while looking for new – and preferably deviant – territorial cohesion statements around this cloud and making broader and broader circling movements through the concept's intertextual texts to map scattered dots of information, eventually, when it becomes unlikely to find another text which relates to the already identified pro/positions, you stop spiralling. Since the formation of the cloud of territorial cohesion pro/positions did not end yet, you should thereby gather data quicker than that new territorial cohesion texts surface. What makes this less stressing is that most of these new texts do not differ that drastically from the previously gathered ones. They thus often appear to signify an at least partial affirmation of the already interpreted and analysed territorial cohesion pro/positions – and analytic retroduction caters for the confirmation bias. Hence, in their reciprocal interdependence the analysing and interpreting of data continues during the gathering of it, but when the outcomes of the analyses and interpretations indicate that a further spiralling through the intertextual territorial cohesion text does not gather new insights, the gathering of data stops.

Knowing when to stop analysing and interpreting after you stopped gathering data is methodologically wise fundamental for this research. Another reason for why the hermeneutic horizon could better be isolated when the organisations of territorial cohesion pro/positions do not (rhetorically) compete anymore and crystallised into history is namely that the Foucaultian stand perhaps best suits more historical based analysis (Jacobs, 2005: 45). Yet, it is not the history of the present we are after, but actually the complex and not well-understood nexus of the history and future of the present denoted by the simple label of the "present". Notwithstanding the lack of historical distance, the historicity of territorial cohesion's regime of truth could still be shown by focussing on the newness of its notions and that they have no ground (yet) (see §A2.1.6 on newest history). The rules which deny/accept texts inside the realm of territorial cohesion expertise are, however, difficult to set up without the stability of such a ground made in history. This realm would be placed upon the ground formed by the regime of truth which the territorial cohesion discourse (partly) establishes. The concept's hermeneutic horizon may therefore only be possible to draw with enough historical hindsight to differentiate between, for instance, statements within the final realm of expertise and inconsequential utterances. The Foucaultian stand thus does not perfectly suit this research – as it neither does other Foucaultian research of today. The methodical repercussion hereof is that the historical part of the Foucaultian methods should be adjusted to fit a research on the current formation of the concept of territorial cohesion.

Without the advantage of the by history formed known, trained and accepted, that is: a constrained viewpoint, we cannot circumscribe the hermeneutic horizon within which we move today, unaware we are of the limits traced by these movements. The question thus becomes: how to look with a historical eye to present developments (in thought). The answer is: albeit that only (Foucaultian) historians can identify the time bound rules of knowledge, this research can look at present developments while being aware that they are time-bound and follow rules – even though these rules can better be identified in a later period. Furthermore, as befits the artisan nature of this research, an explorative attempt can nonetheless be made to try and grasp the rules which isolate the concept's hermeneutic horizon and thereby understand the "present" of territorial cohesion and the concept's contemporary history through reflection. But, it should be kept in mind hereby, that the effect of using a historical based approach to the newest, is that we are unable to set these rules with any certainty – not even by (again) using analytic retroduction. The setting of these rules is thus strictly hypothetical. As a consequence, the possible visions of a territorial cohesion discourse are multiple at this moment – which does not matter to reach the aims of the research though (see Chapter 8).

For now it can be concluded that for this discourse analysis archival scholarship and historical analysis as problems (i.e. timing the stopping without hindsight or inert research object) lead *qua* method to a provisional solution. That is, you stop analysing and interpreting when you criss-crossed through all discourse analytical steps and can set up whichever hypothetical rules isolating the concept's hermeneutic horizon. The only conditions here are that the interpreted practices also discipline this final discourse analytical step and no territorial cohesion text you gathered may falsify it. The same conditions hold for the steps leading hereto, this with the addition that they should lead to a following step, and their conclusion is thus in the end lead by the needs of the final step which circumscribes territorial cohesion's system of knowledge and associated practices; a circularity with which analytic retroduction deals. The step after the identification of territorial cohesion pro/positions is therefore only finished when it traced the links between meaning and power relations thoroughly enough to set up the rules of the whole domain. The next chapters then operationalise how to come up with the (meta-)similarties which construct the developing

territorial cohesion domain as single category of pro/positions and set up the hypothetical rules for its hermeneutic horizon.

This research thus deals with the conundrum of documentary research with two guidelines related by the limits of the hermeneutic horizon of the concept of territorial cohesion. The first focuses on the reciprocal interdependence between the gathering of data and the analysis and interpretation of it (i.e. continue with the latter when the former does, stop the former when the latter tells so): spiral through the intertextual territorial cohesion text to reach the limits of the whole field of identifiable territorial cohesion pro/positions. The fundamental second focuses on the adjustment of the historical part of the Foucaultian methods concerned with setting up the rules of a realm of expertise to fit this research which tries to understand what this engendering concept is about. Without certain knowledge of the regime of truth (partly) established by the territorial cohesion discourse, this hinges on reflecting with a historical eye: be aware that the present developments are time-bound and follow rules which now can only be set up in an explorative attempt. So, to conclude, this research stops spiralling analytically and interpretively when it criss-crossed all discourse analytical steps both disciplined by the interpreted practices and not falsified by territorial cohesion texts and lead to hypothetical rules which can be thought of today as isolating the concept's hermeneutic horizon.

A.2.6 To be explicit: an instable methodical ground

As could be expected with the methodology of this research on territorial cohesion, concerned as it is with the double hermeneutic and the essential instability involved in studying humans (see §4.6.1 which situates discourse analysis), it builds the study of the concept on methodical shakiness. That is to say, due to the artisan nature of discourse analysis, the research does not follow methodical rules but uses guidelines to direct its analysis while and after collecting data. Furthermore, it becomes increasingly instable, because its interpretive description of text in search for structures also follows a hermeneutic circle which iterates steps that cumulatively use the above-mentioned guidelines.

Roughly put the spiralling steps of the discourse analysis can be divided into three. The opening part forms the intertextual territorial cohesion text by documenting the unique representations from what is said and hidden with 'territorial cohesion' without an own idea of concept. This part simultaneously distinguishes practices from the texts as the leading interpretation: i) linguistic practices from the written texts themselves, ii) meaning-making practices from definitions, iii) power practices by reconstructing concrete behaviour, and iv) discursive practices from rhetoric organisations. The middle part then taxonomises the concept's different definitions as proposed range of meaning. In parallel herewith it uses descriptive codes to piece together the different territorial cohesion positions in schemes of interconnected data, events, and phenomena presenting the concept's usage field – the (contextual) fine details must be read, as these can define the concept's role. The closing part links these mapped meanings and power relations by looking for how the interpreted rhetorical and detailed clues of the territorial cohesion pro/positions demonstrate the various minute and obvious ways in which thinking daily connects meaning and social practice on topics of interest in both science and politics (e.g. as shown by other discourse studies cross-referred to). All of this to explore the hermeneutic horizon of the developing concept, as this discourse analysis ends when it sets up the purely hypothetical rules which the territorial cohesion discourse performs and follows – regularities to be reflected upon with a historical eye.

The crisscrossing of discourse analytical steps gives this research the more reason to amply check the interpreted ordinations through analytic retroduction and present the constructed outcomes for easy and meticulous verification. The actual point made here

however, is that when the above explicit elaboration on how to study the concept does not show methodical stability, then – if not much social scientific research, at least – every territorial cohesion research may very well inherently, though often implicitly, suffer from the same flaws, or worse. Hence, the need to operationalise how to go from the concept's meanings and usages to the system of territorial cohesion knowledge and its associated practices (e.g. how to connect meanings and power relations and the discourse's rules, where do necessary and forbidden articulations fit). Before the next chapters do that, a more mundane issue of this research should be treated first though: the data on which the exploration of the concept's hermeneutic horizon depends. As the discourse analysis spirals through the selection and processing of data, a central question herein namely is how to gather data in such a way to make significant information out of it.

A.3 How to gather information?

A.3.1 Which data to collect?

We should focus on the data of this research before the questions of how to collect a part hereof (i.e. interviews) and how to go from data to information can be answered in §A.3.2 and A.3.3 respectively. Important data issues are the criteria for selection, its sources, and the point to stop gathering data. First though, what are we talking about? A simple way to explain it is by following Ackoff (1989) on his path from data to wisdom. Here data is raw representation, whereof information can be made by understanding the relations of these representations, and likewise knowledge as patterns and wisdom as principles follow in turn (Ackoff, 1989). When you look at this research on territorial cohesion as such a path of abstraction, texts become the data (see §A.1.1 on linguistic representations), the territorial cohesion pro/positions information (see §A.2.3 on interpretatively describing), the order of these pro/positions knowledge (see §A.2.4 on structuring patterns), and the rules which isolate the concept's hermeneutic horizon become wisdom (see §A.2.5 on exploring with a historical eye). Note that a discourse analysis thereby does not lay down principles as universal laws, but principally argues that there are only conditional principles. What is more, in accordance with the ontological and epistemological stance of its methodology, this research does not pose that the knowledge created by its discourse analysis is based on facts, but should be understood as "fiction" in the sense of a meaningful interpretation of, with texts as data, other meaningful interpretations (see §A.1.1 on hermeneutics). Thus, in short, texts as raw representations are the data of the concept of territorial cohesion as research object, and this research makes information and meaningful interpretations thereof.

Having texts as data leads to methodical difficulties too though. In a research which makes knowledge about knowledge, a linguistic problem arises: the language on the higher level of abstraction is the same as the language of the linguistic data reflected upon. Thus also to distinguish the research object's data and the outcomes of the research's interpretation of it, the next chapters elaborate on the vocabulary needed to operationalise its discourse analysis of the concept of territorial cohesion. Another methodical problem concerns the interconnection of data, events, and phenomena (see §A.2.3 on the opening detailed methodical question). Where do events and phenomena fit in if they are neither data nor factual? Besides that text as raw representation of course represents events and phenomena, statements can be understood as the phenomena this research observes in the data (see §4.5.3 on θέσις), and when a statement is actually posed or held – whether observable or not – it is an event (in thought). There exist events and phenomena outside discourse, obviously, but the ones this research is concerned with do not, as this research investigates – not the linguistic features of texts, but – how data represents events and phenomena (see §4.2.1 on Foucaultian discourse analysis). The events thus take place in the practices indicated by the phenomena,

and this research tracks how they as territorial cohesion pro/positions turn into knowledge by solidifying into the strata which form a framework of linguistic and pictorial representations of the world (see §4.5.2 on what can be seen and said). The point for gathering information however, is that it should not only be clarified which vocabulary to use to reflect on text, but also how to sieve different information out of the same sets of data (see §A.1.4 for why this mostly holds for policy and research documents). The Chapters 5, 6, and 7 do just that.

Now it is overly clear how this research on the concept of territorial cohesion understands data, we can ask the question on selection: which data does it actually collect? Discourse analysis has been accused of selecting evidence to confirm the research arguments and of ignoring contrary data (Jacobs, 2006: 47). Even though this research has no idea what its argument is while it searches for data to map the whole field of statements, to make sure such bias and distortion are ruled out, still some measures should be taken. A practical way to overcome them 'is to be explicit about the criteria for selecting discursive evidence' (Jacobs, 2006: 47). A criterion to get an overview of the whole diversity of statements is that this research prefers those which are as contrary to each other as possible. To be included in this field, the data should obey two other criteria: that the text uses the words 'territorial cohesion' and has to do with the European Union. Because this research is concerned with the limits of the network formed by this particular territorial cohesion discourse, it thus collects data that are relevant to the members who experience these processes within the organisation (Gioia&Pitre, 1990: 588); note thereby that the discourse forms people as such members as well. This leads to the question of how to get these most contrary texts which both utter 'territorial cohesion' and are relevant for these European Union members.

Normally the ways to get data also depend on whether they are primary or secondary. Needless to say, due to the double hermeneutic this research on the concept of territorial cohesion always has interpretations as data, making the strict distinction between raw primary data and processed secondary data as artificial as can be. Nonetheless, a difference lies in that some texts meeting the selection criteria have other texts which also meet these criteria as topic, while other texts, such as the latter, simply have the topic of territorial cohesion. The more reflective texts could thus be categorised as "secondary data" (e.g. articles from scholars). Relatively seen, political, policy, lobby, funding, and research documents become the "primary data" in that case, as long they come up with own statements instead of (explicitly) reflecting upon others. Note thereby that both kinds of text are not only analysed in the same way (Roe, 1994: 158), but that this research also finds both while searching in the common sources of libraries and the internet, thereby lead by the intertextuality of the documents. It turns out that many of these texts are policy documents. A large part of this research on the concept of territorial cohesion therefore focuses on policy documents as mirrors of 'the changing balance of power between competing discourses' (Richardson&Jensen, 2003). Still, these are only one element of the policy process, and the same kind of detailed attention could be given to other kinds of texts produced herein, such as formal meetings, informal discussions, and talk behind the scenes (Hastings, 1996: 209). Moreover, Roe (1994: 158) even holds that those with sufficient resources should (also) collect and analyse these "other texts" of a controversy in particular. What this research did, then, to add to the large chunk of the political, policy, lobby, funding, and research data from documents, is taking interviews in Brussels.[a] Hence, the ways to get the "primary" territorial cohesion texts and the "secondary" ones reflecting thereon (i.e. mostly research documents) are the same: spiral through the common digital and paper archives. That is to say, except for the interviews taken to complement the written policy data with spoken texts of the policy process.

---

[a] I could not have done the interviews for my research as I did without the help of the staff (i.e. representatives and employees) of The House of the Dutch Provinces, particularly those from the Regio Randstad organisation in Brussels, especially ir. H. Pluckel, then heading this representation.

Besides the data sources and the criteria for its selection, the point where one stops gathering data also determines the collection of texts. Due to this research's methodology and methods, the guidance for pragmatic judgement hereon given by its empirical setting, researcher-subject relationship, and resource constraints merges with the one given by its themes and questions (Pettigrew, 1990: 272). When you interpret how discourse constructs social/spatial facts instead of empirically/positivisticly understand reality as an objective one "out there" to research, the empirical setting looses its straightforward empiric nature in the double hermeneutic; the research-subject relationship consequentially turns in the hermeneutic circle of interpretation. This results in having texts in documents as the principal "empirical" setting to research and an interpretative relationship between the researcher and the concept of territorial cohesion as "subject". The researcher-subject relationship therefore has more to do with when to stop interpreting than when to stop gathering data; note for the latter that it is already impossible to collect all territorial cohesion texts to spiral through due to time-bound reasons. More guidance for when to stop gathering data comes from the resource constraints. For instance, from that this research creates an overview with a decentred outsider perspective, follows the constraint that detailed data about one particular aspect of the developments cannot be collected, associated as this might be with a particular insider's perspective. Chiefly using documentary research relates hereto, save the interviews of course, as it does not get caught within one particular aspect and an insider perspective that easily. Therefore, although Roe (1994: 158) holds that those with sufficient resources should collect the other kinds of texts, for much of this research the limitation to documents follows from its aims. Where a resource constraint does come in though, is with time, and thus indirectly with funding. The question then becomes how these more specific data pointers from the research's empirical setting, researcher-subject relationship, and resource constraints merge with the one of the research's themes and questions to pragmatically judge when to stop gathering data.

The phase of data-gathering of the research on the concept of territorial cohesion ended in early 2006, since thereafter far less new data appeared to spiral through when seen from the territorial cohesion pro/positions. The guidance from the research's "empirical" setting and the resource constraint of time enforce this judgement lead by its themes and questions, because then also less documents appeared, especially less "secondary" data, which due to the reflections in research documents has more to do with a main concern of this research, that is, the system of territorial cohesion knowledge. On top of that, the approximately 30 interviews carried out to add more inside information and details from "Brussels" to the policy documents for this (significant) aspect of the research object were conducted in early 2006. Thereafter this research would not add such "other texts" to complement the overview of the concept of territorial cohesion. Hence, even though there are no simple and absolute answers here, all these pointers for a pragmatic judgement suggest early 2006 as a good moment to stop gathering data of the specific period researched for this PhD-thesis.

A.3.2 How to interview?

Because (policy) documents can be selective with information, going beyond them to probe whether actions follow written texts is a sensible thing to do. Why this research choose interviews to do this, will be clarified below by explaining which kind of interviewing this entails and who were interviewed in Brussels and how. Hereby an 'interview' is understood as 'an exchange of information between the researcher and the research participant' (Elwood&Martin, 2000: 650). Note that this information exchanged during the interview should not be confused with the information the research creates from the data also gathered by doing these interviews. By interviewing this research tries to get extra data on the research

object, and this needs more information to exchange besides the information interpreted in the data.

What suits this research is that interviews imply asking others about a case: how they define territorial cohesion as a specific (policy) problem, identify and assess alternative ways for action with the concept, and decide among them (Roe, 1994: 159). Intensive interviews are particularly useful herein, as the study of this case requires depth. When conducted sensitively, they namely help to explain complicated relationships and slowly evolving events in their complexity and potential contradictions (Bryman, 1988; Hogart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 205-206). Intensive interviews can unravel these relationships and events effectively because they can ask 'why a story was told 'that' way' (Bryman, 1988; Riessman, 1993: 2; Hogart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 205). Such interviews are, however, not only an exchange of information between the researcher and the research participant, but also a process whereby they jointly 'create knowledge' through the interaction of linguistic expression, mis/understanding, and societal positioning (Bryman, 1988; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 210). That is to say, the interviewer forms and asks questions the interviewee answers, they thereby interpret meaning and intent, this while the person who does the research places the person who participates in the role of research informant and the person interviewed perceives the person who interviews as 'researcher' (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 210). Although the intensive interview is thus a very appropriate way to get the data on the concept of territorial cohesion this research looks for beyond (policy) documents (i.e. different texts about the slow moving complexity of its policy process), the status of the joint knowledge intensive interviews create while they are conducted is not clear.

With interviewing as an extra way for this research to get data, the knowledge created during an intensive interview is instrumental: to know with certainty which "other texts" it gives for the research's analysis. The knowledge created during such an interview is therefore about the interviewee's story and reasoning. For instance, as the interviews are one of the last times this research gathers data, and the researcher thus already has some understanding of the concept of territorial cohesion, the interviewer should influence the account the interviewee gives as least as possible with what the researcher already knows about what the interviewee says. Especially then the interviewer must be ever aware that even with intensive interviews there is a gap between lived experience and communication – i.e. during the intensive interviews the double hermeneutic can cause misunderstanding (Giddens, 1987; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 210). Instead of asking whether the informants tell the truth, it is thus more fruitful to ask what their statements reveal about perceptions and, see the next section for this, what inferences can be drawn from them (Healey&Rawlinson, 1993; Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 211). It is thereby of course the interviewer who should ensure that the instrumental knowledge about what perceptions the interviewee communicated during the intensive interview is created jointly. Before going into the details of what this implies for how to interview, the ones whose perceptions this research infers from should be treated: the selection of interviewees.

Also in a research which maps the development of the concept of territorial cohesion interviewees 'are selected not because they represent some abstract statistical norm, but because they typify historical processes' (Greele, 1991: 131). What is more, because the interviews provide extra data, the interviewees do not even have to be representative of these processes in an all-encompassing manner. While the "other texts" from these interviews do not represent reality as fully as possible by giving a most elaborate and detailed picture, they do add to the one from the (policy) documents and can represent, or perhaps explain, a part of the practices in Brussels. The interviews are therefore conducted with people of organisations which have a European Union office in Brussels and could have something to do with

territorial cohesion (e.g. politicians, policy-makers, administrators).[a] Normally the starting point then becomes: interview the major actors in the controversy (Roe, 1994: 158). However, with territorial cohesion as a disputed battle ground in itself, it is also disputed who these major actors are (see Chapter 6 on usages). Hence, this research interviews people without branding actors as important, just as it maps the argumentative ground without a pre-existing idea of the argument. Still, because the interviews are one of the last times this research gathers data, some actors constructed as important do give a lead (e.g. DG Regio). Besides of course carrying out one's own search for organisations working with the concept, and thereby looking for the widest variety, this research uses the snowballing technique to get more interviews after the first one (Aaker&Day, 1990). This technique may give an idea of the circulation of territorial cohesion texts as if it were through the network of a restricted social sphere, because the existing research participants recruit future ones from among their acquaintances. Starting from the prior research outcomes on major territorial cohesion actors the inverse ways of snowballing and searching for variety thus select the interviewees from organisations in Brussels to get the extra data which typifies a (policy) part of the concept's disputed processes.

The details of how to interview the persons selected from organisations in Brussels pick up the above left task for the interviewer again: the creation of joint knowledge about the perceptions these interviewees communicate *via* these "other texts". To start with, the intensive interviews should be 'open-ended, geared to letting the interviewee tell her or his story' (Roe, 1994: 159). This can be done by in-depth semi-structured interviews which both have a frame of questions and give the freedom to divert (Valentine, 1997; Davies, 1999; Hogart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 205). Moreover, to not be locked into one set of questions for all interviews, you adjust the questions so that the research participants are asked about what with territorial cohesion is most relevant for them – which is also the most relevant to get from these interviews (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002: 236). The questioning should therefore not be used 'as a way of constructing a putative middle ground between the controversy's opposing parties' (Roe, 1994: 159), but as a way of gathering more data to reconstruct a part of the controversial ground of arguments.[b] Besides the interview questions, the interview site can influence the jointly created knowledge, this due to its link to societal positing (Elwood&Martin, 2000). As sources of differential power social identities (e.g. class) namely shape the relationships between researchers and participants (Gilbert, 1994; Katz, 1994; Elwood&Martin, 2000: 651). And participants may assert one identity (e.g. political official) in one location (Elwood&Martin, 2000: 652-653). This research should therefore have the working-place as interview site, unless this is impossible, because the data these interviews gather is what the interviewees have to say about territorial cohesion as a representative of the organisation for and in which they work. Obviously, also the recording of the interview can ensure that the knowledge about the interviewee's perceptions is created jointly. Because in this research the researcher already knew much of what the interviewees said, the interviews did not have to be taped and notes were taken during the interview instead. These help to recall themes and key "facts", but once an interview is completed the researcher should seek a quiet place as soon as possible to write up the relevant texts from the interview in as much detail as possible (Hoggart&Lees&Davies, 2002, 240). One can send the recorded texts back to the interviewees (per e-mail) to check whether the accounts of what they said

---

[a] The interviewees were: two members of the Cabinet of Commissioner Hübner (DG Regio), an official from DG Regio, an official from DG Employment and Social Affairs, four officers from DG Regio, two officers from DG Environment, two officers from/in DG Transport and Energy, an officer from DG Enterprise and Industry, an officer from DG Agriculture, a Member of European Parliament of the Committee of Regional policy, an administrator of the Committee of the Regions (CoR), representative of the Permanent Dutch Representation in Brussels, an officer from Dutch Ministry for Housing, Spatial Planning, and the Environment (VROM), an officer from the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions (CPMR), a Member of the Assembly of European Region's Committee on Regional policies, Territorial planning, Infrastructures, Environment, Tourism (AER), an officer from the network of major European cities(EUROCITIES), an officer of the Council of European Regions and Municipalities (CEMR), a staff member of the European Association of Development Agencies (EURADA), a representative of Nordrhein Westfalen, an officer from Flanders, a representative of Brussels Capital Region, two officers of the East of England's Brussels Office, and a representative of the North Netherlands Assembly.
[b] See Appendix B.

are correct; as this was carried out the research participants sometimes added more useful data. To create the joint knowledge about the perceptions of territorial cohesion the interviewees communicate as persons from and in organisations in Brussels the interviewer thus does three things: he uses in-depth semi-structured interviews with variable questions, has the interviewees' workplace as interview site, and with the interviewee checks his notes taking during the interview.

A.3.3 How to go from data to information?

So, this research gathers the most contrary texts as primary data by spiralling through the common digital and paper archives where the sign 'territorial cohesion' appears in the political, policy, lobby, funding, and research documents relevant for the European Union. Besides that the texts which reflect hereon form the secondary data, in-depth semi-structured interviews go beyond the documents to typify the slow moving complexity of the disputed concept's policy process with more inside information and details. A picture drawn by searching for variety in interviewees, snowballing them, and centring on their perceptions of territorial cohesion with variable questions. During these intensive interviews at the interviewees' organisations in Brussels, the interviewer is responsible for the joint creation of the knowledge instrumental to account for the interviewees' stories (e.g. interviewees confirm the notes of the data taking during the interview). Shortly after the interviews in early 2006, the research's stopped gathering data because then far fewer, especially secondary, data appeared in documents seen from the territorial cohesion's hermeneutic horizon and no other spoken texts would be added for this PhD-thesis. Yet, these primary, secondary, and interview data sets are not information.

This leaves us with the issue of gathering information from its data. As noted above, this entails turning data into territorial cohesion pro/positions (e.g. inferring from interviewees' perceptions). A process which revolves around first disaggregating and then re-aggregating the statements of the written and spoken texts. That is, all these texts should be disaggregated into discrete (problem) statements which assert relationships, thereby avoiding any attempt to determine whether what the texts say is related in fact (Roe, 1994: 159). Once these texts have been disaggregated into coded statements, one can re-aggregate them into interpretative schemes indicating dominances, such as the most commonly identified problems (Roe, 1994: 159). What can happen is that in this order no agreement appears over what the major issues are, but instead 'a massive amount of circular and opposing argumentation' (Roe, 1994: 160); that territorial cohesion, for instance, needs and causes policy coordination or has nothing to do with it respectively (see Book II). Processing data thus leads to a gathering of information because territorial cohesion pro/positions and their context give an understanding of the relations between representations in the sense of similarities and differences of data. Note that this step from data to information is an iterative one (e.g. coding already implies aggregation) and it is this iteration through which the territorial cohesion propositions and the concept's positions and context are distinguished. However, this already brings us to the analysis and of meaningful interpretations as explained in §A.2 insofar it directed us to Chapters 5, 6, and 7 for the operationalisation of this research's discourse analysis.

A.4 What you get

A.4.1 Method or artisanship: a psychological parallel

In an oddly honest fashion this chapter explicitly showed that studying the concept of territorial cohesion in a Foucaultian way rests on methodical shakiness: it is an artisan affair. To deal with the involved crisscrossing of discourse analytical steps in the hermeneutic circle

of interpretation while and after collecting texts as data, one wants the logical-linguistic left and creative-spatial right hemispheres to cooperate (e.g. Szirony&Burgin&Pearson, 2008: 177-178); note that actually the brain is far more complex than such a dichotomy (e.g. Hines, 1987: 601-603). In their division of labour the left side takes care of the parts and reasoning. This with the rule that you should without an own idea of concept document unique textual representations – and thus read the fine detail of the different things said, especially when it concerns the linguistic marks of practices –, and with analytic retroduction as method of falsification. In so doing the left side functions as gatekeeper of the right side which grasps the whole and sees patterns. Several guidelines are used to construct interpretations thereby: i) disaggregate the written and spoken texts in statements and re-aggregate them, ii) piece partial clues together, iii) distinguish practices as the leading interpretation, iv) iterate the discourse analytical steps (e.g. interpret analyses of interpretations), and v) cross-refer. Focussing thus on rhetoric competition you spiral through the intertextual territorial cohesion text, both to pragmatically judge when to stop gathering data and to interpret the concept's hermeneutic horizon. Although such cooperation runs through the intertwined circular processes of simultaneous analysis and data collection, evolving contextual preconceptions of the text and the text itself, and interpretation of the whole and its parts, why this research merely explores the rules demarcating the territorial cohesion discourse has yet another reason. The main methodical catch is, namely, that it looks to the present with a historical eye instead of being a historic study *a la* Foucault. To operationalise this discourse analysis of the concept of territorial cohesion, the next chapters therefore manoeuvre between its ontological and epistemological grounds and its technical means embedded therein.

A.4.2 Like cartography: detailed maps as outcomes

In what do the operationalised methodology and methods result? Instead of posing as omniscient narrator and summariser, researchers on the phronetic path stay closer to existence and gradually unfold the diverse, complex and conflicting stories, that is: they would present a rich problematic in a "thick" and hard-to-summarise narrative (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 84-86). Or better, in this research's case: detailed maps forming one picture. What hereby makes up the base geography is what experts say when they talk as (contradicting) experts about official competencies, policy, funding, and shaping the debate where the sign 'territorial cohesion' shows relevant for the European Union; to be exact, this are texts from political, policy, lobby, funding, and research documents and additional perceptions of a variety of snowballed interviewees from in-depth semi-structured interviews, which were gathered until less appeared in early 2006. The maps increasingly zoom out from this earth of primary, secondary, and extra data towards interpretations which just skim their surface with a large brush. Two of these maps can be constructed *via* the concept's intertextuality: the taxonomy of territorial cohesion definitions and the interpretative schemes of coded problem statements. Still, to get the picture of the territorial cohesion pro/positions' order, the links between these rhetorical organisations need to be mapped. It is on this picture of meanings and usages, namely, that the concept's hermeneutic horizon can be drawn by demarcating it with purely hypothetical rules. These detailed maps and the picture they form allow the reader to make different interpretations (Flyvbjerg, 2001: 86), as these outcomes are presented here for easy verification: he can "proof-read" them while zooming in.

With these mappings of the concept's arbitrary realm of expertise the question becomes whether their picture offers enough sight on the battles to be able to see how the territorial cohesion discourse needs to be used strategically in the confrontations that occur more in general. To try and peek beyond this discourse's tactical reciprocity, a two-sided exploration of its strategic integration is thus called for (see §18.6). On one side we have the practices in which the concept through usage plays roles in its discursive and social contexts.

A focus on power should thereby situate the reciprocal power-knowledge effects of this particular discourse into the general functioning of truth in wider power structures. The other side of this exploration should therefore set off from the viewpoint of the territorial cohesion meanings to seek our regime of truth. In so doing, these sides would theoretically compare the territorial cohesion discourse with theories which are – substantively related, but – not of territorial cohesion (i.e. cognate theories) and fit it in reflections on our time-bound understanding and exercise of power. The double result to expect from this is that: i) the distinction of this discourse coming from the research's discourse analysis becomes more marked (i.e. a specification, what cannot be generalised) and ii) that the outcomes of this research enter studies on the role and (strategic) value of social science in our contemporary society through its emphasis on the concept's relationship of power and scientific knowledge and practice (i.e. a generalisation). However, this PhD-thesis just carries out the mapping required for such explorations (see Book II).