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“We bring to the table this notion of relationship and partnership, and that really changes the dynamics in how the [government] is working with individuals or a group of companies working together. We are not a regulator. We do not come in and say: you are going to do it this way or you are going to face the consequences. We come in and say: we are interested in securing the environmental performance” Governmental actor at (Kewaunee-Pro-Ag/Pro-Environment, 2004).

“Why doesn’t government take care of that?” or “Why does government interfere with this?” are two sentences that I often heard in discussions with citizens, local businesses, and governmental actors in the neighbourhoods where I took part as a community worker. Businesses asked for cost-sharing, grants, and subsidies as easily as they asked for regulatory relief and tax-breaks. Non-governmental organizations and citizens fought for individual freedom and choice as easily as they fought for more rules and regulations that limit these rights. Moreover, governmental actors ruled and regulated societal actors and at the same time needed to cooperate with them.

Working in communities and later on for regional and national governments, I also observed that governmental actors and scholars in public administration and politics are trying to formulate answers to these double demands on government. In policy practice they experiment with innovative forms of governing that in theory are referred to as governance. In this type of governing, the formation of networks between governmental and non-governmental actors, or between other forms of public and private cooperation are tested. This network formation enables government, together with citizens and non-governmental organizations, businesses included, to reach binding collective decisions in an ever more complex society in which government depends on other actors. Governmental actors acknowledge that they are depending on other actors for decision making and implementation. Moreover, theories on governance promise that new ways of government steering enhance the efficiency and effect of policies, and through that the legitimacy of governmental decisions (Rhodes, 1990; Klijn and Teisman, 1991; Thompson et al., 1991; Waarden, 1992; Kickert, 1993; Rhodes, 1996; Kickert et al., 1997; Hodges, 2005; Laws, 1998; Laws, 2001 et al.; Rhodes, 2003b; Serenson and Torfing, 2007; Teisman et al., 2000).

In this thesis, I further develop one strand of governance, deliberative governance (Hajer, 2003a; Hajer et al., 2004). In this strand it is argued that democratic decision making can be improved through network cooperation that pays attention to the ways in which network partners interact and to the quality of these interactions. In deliberative governance as developed here, at least two of the ideals of deliberative democracy theory (Bessette, 1994; Elster, 1998; Gutmann and Thompson, 1996; Cohen, 1997; Young, 1997, Dryzek, 2000b) are combined with insights from theories on network governance (Hajer, 2009).

First, as with deliberative democracy theory, deliberative governance theory promises an improvement of democratic decision making when actors in a network or in other forms of...
public/private cooperation engage in conversations of a deliberative quality. This means that they are inclusive, decisive, reciprocal, and that actors have equal speaking time and equal enforcement power (Gutmann and Thompson, 1996). Deliberations that fit these criteria induce open, reasonable, and reflective interactions (Dryzek, 2000a, p. 2 and 78–9). More reasonable decision making and more representative decision making are the result. Moreover, these types of conversations encourage and empower all sorts of actors to participate in decision making, and enable them to be actively involved, responsible participants in society (Warren, 1992, p.8). All this leads to enhanced legitimacy of decision making.

Second, in deliberative governance, the role of government, as well as that of experts and other participants, changes. As is the case in governance theories, these actors are understood to be interdependent in decision making. Moreover, in deliberative governance theory, government should encourage cooperation and learning among actors in a network. Expert knowledge is no longer a given nor authoritative per se (Parkinson 2003) but rather part of the deliberations. The role of experts varies: their role is to facilitate public learning in deliberations (Fischer, 2000; Fischer, 2003, p. 224–5). Subsequently, deliberative governance promises that through deliberation the expertise, experience, interpretations and interests of other societal actors are better represented and included in decision making (Fischer, 1999; Dryzek, 1982). In deliberative governance theory, experts and governmental actors — or in more general terms, people in power — can encourage learning and the inclusion of minorities, local expertise, experience, interpretations and interests only if these minority views are included in the deliberation.

However, in my experience as a community worker and as a consultant, actors in policy practice do not necessarily accept these promises of a shift to deliberative governance. What I saw and still see happening in innovative participatory planning, interactive policy formation, scenario building, or projects of public/private cooperation is that many of the participants continue to maintain, in short, government discourse. They do not want to give up their formal powerful positions, nor share experiences, exchange knowledge, or engage in collaborative inquiries. Even though they agree to organize or participate in experiments with deliberative governance, many of the actors still want government or experts to maintain their authority, for example as the commander and controller, the prosecutor or the regulator who sets environmental standards. NGO’s want to keep their role as watchdogs, and businesses want to do business.

Therefore, I began to believe that it is in these experiments that actors accept, contest or reject the introduction of deliberative governance. It is in their conversations that are part of these experiments that they negotiate, test, reflect upon and accept a shift to deliberative governance. Hence, my thesis questions whether a shift from government to deliberative governance occurs in the policy practice and if actors in society, including government, accept the introduced alternative. Is deliberative governance a credible alternative to hierarchical government steering and is it gaining momentum and support in these experiments? This dissertation presents the results of a study of the credibility of deliberative governance. Credibility as a concept implies that in this analysis I assume that it is in deliberations that actors negotiate the authority and legitimacy of arguments and discourse that actors utter (see below). At the heart of this thesis lie the attempts of coalitions of governmental organizations, businesses, citizens, academic experts and non-governmental organizations to cooperate in networks and alter the quality of their conversations to improve land use and (urban) planning.

I have looked into three innovative policy projects that I identified as experiments with deliberative governance. I will discuss these experiments later. The conveners of these experiments — often governmental actors in cooperation with academics or consultants — introduced a new “deliberative governance” vocabulary and practice. They wanted actors to cooperate in networks; they wanted them to coproduce policy outcomes, and to engage in learning processes rather than negotiations. In other words, the experiments were attempts to have a broad range of actors engage in and enact what I would call deliberative governance discourse.

In this thesis I question whether these attempts succeed and if deliberative governance gains credibility in the discursive interactions of these innovative projects. This injection of an alternative discourse in the three projects leads to credibility contests (Gieryn, 1999, p. 24) between government discourse and deliberative governance discourse among participants in the projects. It is in these contests that are part of deliberations (Dryzek, 2000a, p. 77) that participants settle what they think is the most credible way to govern and to solve issues. Hence, I consider government, governance and deliberative governance to be discourses that can gain credibility in policy practice. The three innovative projects are part of a broader credibility contest between a dominant discourse on “government,” and an alternative, still recessive discourse on deliberative governance. The question in this study is:

Whether, and if so, how deliberative governance gains credibility in interactions between participants in experiments with it.

First, I will describe the theoretical discussion on a shift from government to deliberative governance. I will establish how the government, governance and deliberative governance models in the literature relate to our understanding of enactment of these models as discourses. Second, I will establish what deliberative governance is in light of the discussion of the shift from government to governance. In addition, the concepts “credibility” and “reflectivity” will be further defined.

THE SHIFT FROM GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNANCE

To some scholars in politics and public administration, the shift from government to governance is an empirical fact, to some it is an analytical construct or a descriptive model, and to others both “government” and “governance” indicate prescriptive models. I study this shift not as a fait accompli but as a credibility struggle between two discourses. I consider it an empirical phenomenon that coalitions of actors such as those in government, business and NGO’s as well as scholars in public administration seek to achieve in experimental settings in a variety of policy practices. These experiments are normative attempts to innovate and thus change the way government interacts with society.
THEORETICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNANCE

In general, in the theoretical debate on the shift from government to governance, “government” refers to specific models or theories of governing that have been dominant in most Western countries since the 1950’s-60’s. In almost all these Western countries it embodies the idea that government develops policies, sets standards, and regulates. Science provides information to government. Government can set standards and design rules based on this scientific knowledge. Citizens and the collective good are protected by government. Non-governmental organizations often function as watchdogs and are actively engaged in setting agendas. In government, businesses and other societal actors are both regulated and protected. In other words, government is:

“a collection of organizations run on hierarchical principles, funded through some form of taxation and whose authority is derived by the application of state-prescribed legislation” (Hodges, 2005, p. xi).

For now I will define the government model as the common understanding of a political authority. It is a ruling power (in the form of an organization but also as structure or institution) in society, through which the citizens’ interests — security and public order — are cared for. National government is the highest entity in the hierarchy and all other organizations fall under its jurisdiction.19

The shift from government to governance in political science20, first of all, was a shift from the study of governmental institutions and organizations to the study of the process of governing (Marsh and Smith, 2001). Recently, in political science and public administration, “governance” is further developed as an analytical, descriptive or prescriptive model (Tatenhove and Leroy, 1995; Pierre, 2000; Rhodes 2007). It presents an alternative to the traditional model of the manner in which government governs. In addition to steering and regulating, in this model government interacts with societal actors in interdependent networks for more efficient, effective, or legitimate governance. Rhodes argued that changing the boundaries of the state meant the boundaries between public, private and voluntary sectors became shifting and opaque (Rhodes, 1996, p. 666). Governance has almost become synonymous with governing in a network society in which conditions for governmental steering have changed.22 Scholars argue that in a network society government can no longer steer by command and control but that it needs to cooperate.

The idea of a network society gained momentum in the 1990’s and built on analysis by Robert Reich, for example, who demonstrated how economies were loosely connected to nation-states (Reich, 1991), and at the end of the nineties Kevin Kelly introduced the “network economy” as a new economic order in which connectivity is the most important part of success of businesses (Kelly, 1998). Perhaps most influential in thinking about a network society was Manuel Castells’ trilogy (Castells, 1996). Here he demonstrated empirically that due to globalization of trade and culture, and due to information and communication technology, the spaces of flow in the modern world had become less important than the spaces of places. Hence, in a network society geographical, administrative, and organizational boundaries have decreased in weight, while the significance of flows and processes in networks has increased. The concept “governance,” or as some prefer, “network governance” (Hajer, 2009) signifies the changing role of government in this new type of society, a society that scholars argue government can no longer steer. Moreover, it implies that governmental actors are interdependent with others and need to collaborate in decision making for the common good.

In a network society, hierarchical relationships between government, businesses, science, citizens, and NGO’s are no longer considered a given (cf. Rhodes, 1990; Marsh, 1992; Rhodes, 2003a; Kickert, 1993; Kooiman, 1993; Teisman, 1997; Tatenhove and Leroy, 1995). Actors are understood to act interdependently and to operate in a complex, and to some extent, “unknown” world (cf. in Dutch Public administration: Gunsteren and Van Ruyven, 1993). In networks, knowledge is plural, and government can no longer impose its measures and standards. Other actors also mobilize knowledge that can contradict the knowledge that governmental rules and regulations are built on.23 Moreover, businesses and societal actors and their knowledge resources are of great influence both in formation and in implementation of these measures. The interdependence of actors in networks and the difficulties to generate or claim certitude in these situations cause problems when government tries to regulate or steer (cf. Scott, 1998; Hajer, 2009)24. Further, a “hollowing out of the state” through decentralization and privatization demands that government to be able to steer in networks (Rhodes, 1994; 1997; 2007).

From the 1990’s onward, innovative types of interactions between government and society were no longer studied only as empirical realities; today they are stimulated and proposed as answers to a crisis or as more efficient, effective, legitimate, and democratic means to solve problems in network types of government. Scholars in public administration and political science further developed an alternative or additional model of governing — network government, recently more often referred to as “governance” (Kickert, 1993; Rhodes, 1996, 2000, 2003b, 2007). A majority of these models of governance focuses on improvements of institutional interactions within governmental organizations, between governmental and non-governmental organizations (“good governance” and “new public management”), and between different levels of government (multi-level governance) (Rhodes, 1996). Or these models may suggest more transparent rules and regulations, better formal procedures, and improved formal divisions of labor. Governance is both a way to describe a shift to a network society and the changing role of governments in it. It is defined as “new processes and methods of governing, and changing conditions of the ordered rule” (Hodges, 2005, p. xi). Governance means governing by “self-organizing, inter-organizational networks characterized by interdependence, resource-exchange, rules of the game, and significant autonomy from the state” (Rhodes, 1997, p. 15). Moreover, governance, or network governance, is cooperation in networks for decision making for the common good (Hajer, 2009).25

In sum, in political science and public administration, the concept of governance first indicated a shift to the study of processes of governing, then became a model to describe and analyze the interactions of government with society. This was soon followed by the design of the ideal type of interactions of government with society that were needed to improve efficiency, effectiveness in the democratic legitimacy of decision making. In this thesis I will further elaborate on features of governance as network types of interactions between government and society. One ideal type of interaction is the subject of this dissertation, namely “deliberative governance.”
DELIBERATIVE GOVERNANCE

“Deliberative governance” is one of the ideal solutions that scholars in political science and public administration proposed to deal with a “crisis in steering,” among other reasons. Deliberative governance, as I will develop, is influenced by deliberative democracy theories in which government and other experts facilitate and mediate collaborative learning of citizens, NGO’s and businesses; also by theories from science and technology studies (STS) about more democratic and more inclusive problem solving and knowledge production, such as inclusive or participative science or appreciative inquiry in the Dewey tradition; and by theories about reframing from the field of organizational learning and change. Deliberative governance theory promises at least two democratic improvements: first, reflectivity in individuals, conversations and decision making for more informed and supported decision making, and then, more credible decision making.

IMPROVEMENTS: LEARNING AND CHANGE

In the footsteps of deliberative democracy theory, deliberative governance theory argues that the quality of interactions in a network that includes both governmental and non-governmental actors can be improved (Bessette, 1994; Elster, 1998; Gutmann and Thompson, 1996; Cohen, 1997; Dryzek, 2000b; Fung, 2005). Interactions should be open, reciprocal, and aimed at learning for better decision making. Deliberative democracy theory claims that participants exchange arguments and/or reflect on different interpretations or frames. An exchange of arguments and reflectivity enable better informed decision making and collaborative learning and change (Dryzek, 2003a, p.78-79). It is the communicative style in interactions that needs to be improved to facilitate learning and change.

In deliberative democracy theory, scholars define criteria that should stimulate the deliberative quality of conversations, that is, exchange of arguments and reflectivity. They argue, for example, that these conversations need to be inclusive, transparent, and accessible, and actors need to have equal speaking time. Most of these theories also argue that they are less concerned with the facilitation of an exchange of arguments rather than with an exchange of interpretations, and as a result, learning. For example, Hajer, inspired by Gutmann and Thompson, defined the deliberative quality as “inclusive, open, accountable, reciprocal” and upright, “and when the participants learn through an iterative dialogue” (Gutmann and Thompson, 1996; Hajer and Versteegh, 2005b, p. 176). Participants should have equal speaking time and equal enforcement power (Gutmann and Thompson, 1996). Or as Hendriks summarized, deliberation is “a social communicative process in which free, equal, and relatively impartial participants consider arguments on issues in view of the collective good” (Hendriks, 2006, p. 571 and 572).

In chapter 1, I will develop the notion of reflectivity as a way in which learning and change take place in settings that meet these criteria of deliberations. These procedural changes might facilitate reflectivity for learning and change.

IMPROVEMENTS: CREDIBILITY

This thesis argues that more credible decisions will be the outcome of deliberations, as it is in deliberations that participants enact the legitimacy and authority of discourses and the actors and decisions that belong to it. There are several reasons for this.

First, in network governance, decisions can no longer derive legitimacy and authority from actors’ formal decision-making power, tradition, outside expertise, or the law only. The political setting is no longer a given but takes place in an “institutional void” (Hajer, 2003a; Hajer, 2009, p. 34) where there is a legitimacy deficit (Hajer 2009, p. 30). From deliberative democracy theory we learn that this is true for governmental actors and for academic experts (Torgerson, 1986; Parkinson, 2003). For example, Parkinson argued that “the legitimacy of expertise is derived from the discursively determined ends of the people at large, and is not internal to expertise itself” (Parkinson, 2003). This is even stronger in situations of policy crisis; otherwise authoritative standards no longer apply. It is these very standards and arguments that are being contested. It is “the appropriate classification itself [that] becomes the very stake of politics” (Hajer and Uitermark 2008, p. 6).

Second, scholars in science and technology studies (STS) have reasoned along similar lines and proposed ‘deliberative forums’ (Collins and Evans, 2002). In line with governance theory they argue that actors no longer take for granted scientific authority in decision making as it takes place in a network of interdependent actors that all have a share of knowledge. This is especially true for public issues that have inconclusive scientific consensus and where there is great social controversy. In these situations of ‘post-normal’ science (Funtowicz and Ravets, 1992), deliberations are necessary to come to some conclusions for that moment. These scholars argued that scientific controversies might be resolved through public debate (Funtowicz and Ravetz, 1993; Shackley and Wynne, 1995; Shackley and Wynne, 1996; Bijker et al. 2009) or the public as end users should be included in technological discussions (Hisschemöller and Hoppe, 2001; Cozzens and Woodhouse, 1995; Bijker 1995) to achieve socially robust knowledge through mode 2 science (Nowotny, 2003). Participatory fact finding might lead to better knowledge through the inclusion of lay or local insights (Gibbons et al., 1994; Nowotny, 2003; Funtowicz and Liberatore, 2003; Fischer, 1990; Shackley and Wynne, 1995; Rip et al., 1995; Andersen and Jaeger, 1999; Guston, 1999a; Bijker et al. 2009). In all kinds of policy deliberations classifications are redefined. In this thesis the significance is that government discourse is no longer hegemonic and there are actors who attempt to disrupt it.

Third, there is a normative concern. In deliberative democracy theory as well as in STS there are traditions that discuss the democratic quality of decision making and knowledge production and the authority of experts in them. In deliberative democracy theory as well as the tradition in STS that wants to democratize science it is argued that experts have too much authority and this should be counterbalanced by public involvement (Dryzek, 1990; Fischler, 1999, 2000); Woodhouse and Nieuwma, 2001). The enhancement of citizens’ and other participants’ civic skills such as their reasoning can counterbalance bureaucratic, scientific, and political power (see also Fung and Wright, 2003a; Fischer, 1999; Fung, 2005). Scholars in deliberative democracy theory and in the third wave of STS (Collins and Evans, 2002) have argued that in decision making, expertise is taken for granted too easily. Politicians, administrators, citizens, and NGO’s should deliberate and counterbalance academic expertise. In the third wave of STS it is argued and empirically demonstrated that academic expertise is intrinsically political (Jasanoff, 2004; Hisschemöller et al, 2001; Petersen 1984, p. 6 and 7; Rip et al., 1995; Weale, 2001, and for an overview, see Collins and Evans, 2002). As Sheila Jasanoff put it, “The expert’s political power to define the issues and select the very terms of a deliberation has received too little notice” (Jasanoff, 2004, p.162). As we will see in chapter 1, Thomas Gieryn's
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work is part of this strand and he empirically demonstrates that through boundary work in interactions with other actors, experts as well as other actors attempt to protect the authority and interests of science (Gieryn, 1983), and it is through boundary work that they seek to gain “credibility, legitimacy and authority” for their arguments and practice (Gieryn, 1999). These scholars in deliberative democracy theory and in STS argue that a more democratic kind of science and policy should be sought on moral grounds: the public has to be included in technical decisions to counterbalance the power of science in public decision making.

These three lines of reasoning start from two premises; in one it is argued that academic expertise and government have lost their automatic authority in a network society while the second argues that academic expertise and government are still powerful, even in the seamless web of science and politics (Halfman, 2003). Both lines of reasoning lead scholars in deliberative democracy theory and in the third wave of STS to the same solution. To be able to construct socially robust and more democratic decisions and knowledge deliberation is necessary. This means policy or science deliberation in the broad sense, that is, in all kinds of interactions between government, science and the public in which new classifications and procedures are defined (Hajer 2003, p.189-190; Hajer 2009, p. 181). Deliberation is also necessary in innovative forms of cooperation. This is especially true in created settings to which actors of all sorts have access and in which they can contribute to improve the policy oriented conversations.

Hence, deliberation can be a way to redefine relationships and restore or alter credibility of arguments, positions and decisions in situations in which these no longer are taken for granted. Deliberation can also be a response to unbalanced power relations. For example, Dryzek argued that “outcomes receive reflective assent through participation in authentic deliberation by all those subject to the decision in question” (Dryzek, 1990, p. 126–32; Dryzek, 2001, p. 651; Parkinson, 2003). In 1996 James Bohman put it as follows: “Without this dialogue [between the deliberating public and the institutions] democracy loses its capacity to generate legitimate political power” (Bohman, 1996, p. 238-239). The promise of deliberation is that through this type of conversation credibility can be enacted, and thereby the authority and legitimacy of discourses can be produced.

Deliberative governance theory suggests that discourse — and the decisions and the actors that are part of it — need to gain credibility in interactions. Participants no longer immediately accept authority and legitimacy of actors and arguments based on (formal) arrangements and procedures. Participants have to become convinced in order to believe decisions. This is necessary from a democratic point of view, to counterbalance powerful authorities and discourses. And from the governance point of view that authority is no longer taken for granted and needs to gain credibility (cf. Hajer 2009, p. 182). It is in deliberations that participants have to consider actors’ arguments and knowledge-credible. In a network society or in times of crisis and change this is true for experts, government and other participants as well. It is in interactions with governmental actors and experts that participants can become convinced. The conditions for deliberative governance facilitate this enactment and through that they stimulate an enhanced quality of decision making and legitimacy.

Hence, in deliberative governance theory an improvement of the deliberative quality of interactions between government, experts and other non-governmental actors is a way to improve the credibility of deliberative governance discourse. Deliberative quality in this study is defined as conversations in which actors are simultaneously empathetic with and critical of interpretations other than their own. This kind of reflectivity allows for the introduction of new concepts that contributes to collaborative learning and changes dominant discourse.

In this thesis I study a particular kind of interaction, namely, deliberations that are part of innovative forms of governing in the practice of policy making. I want to find out what happens to the quality of the conversations at these real time policy settings. Moreover, I want to know if this quality leads to credible decisions.

Innovative Governing: Experiments with Deliberative Governance

The improvements of the deliberative quality of the interactions between government and others in the policy practice are often created in the erection of “institutions for deliberation” (Fung and Wright 2003b; Goodin, 2006). In the academic literature we see a range of such institutions. They vary from deliberative forums (Hendriks, 2005), citizens’ juries (Armour, 1995), and consensus conferences (Guston, 1999a; Carson, 2005; Gastil and Levine (eds.), 2005), to deliberative polling (Fishkin, 1991, 1995, 1996). These venues can improve the quality of interactions in “mini-publues” (Goodin and Dryzek, 2006) or at moments of “micro-deliberation” (Hendriks, 2006). I consider all these deliberative institutions as “interactive practices of deliberation” (Hajer 2003, p. 187-188). In this dissertation I will refer to those innovative forms of governing as experiments with deliberative governance in the policy practice. This is to distinguish them from the ideal type of deliberative institutions in the theory of deliberative governance, as well as from the broader concept of discursive politics as an alternative or additional site of politics.

These experiments with deliberative governance have at least three features that distinguish them from usual policy making; they are erected temporarily around a policy problem; both governmental and non-governmental actors participate; and the experiments have a deliberative design. In this study three of these deliberative institutions are analyzed: Creative competition in the Bijlmerpark, consensus building in the Dairy Gateway project and scenario development in the Protein Highway Project.

First of all, these experiments with deliberative governance consist of deliberative settings that are outside formal decision making, institutional arrangements, or procedures and have a specific policy problem or issue as their subject that needs to be solved in a network. These Unidentified Political Objects [UPO’s], as Dijstelbloem calls them, are policy problems that “manifest themselves at the boundaries of various domains” (Dijstelbloem, 2007, p. 28). They might not have been identified as political issues before, but they may have proved unsolvable. Governmental actors, policy analysts, and, most often, consultants hired by governmental actors erect informal but organized deliberative settings temporarily to convene cooperation in networks (Mak and Tatenhove, 2006). It is this temporary state
that enables a crossing of the organizational and institutional boundaries that is needed in network forms of decision making and problem solving. Hence, these deliberative spaces are like tents erected for a vacation, in this case from formal institutional arrangements and procedures.21

A second feature of these experiments is that both governmental and non-governmental actors participate. The governmental actors can include several strata (Hendriks and Tops, 2001) as well as several functional divisions of government: for example law enforcement, planning, and policy development (Lemstra, 1997). Sometimes these actors are organized in committees that sit between layers of government (the “institutional void” (Hajer, 2003). On the non-governmental side a broad variety of stakeholders can participate: advisors, planners, scientists, analysts, citizens, groups organized for this specific occasion, social movement organizations (environmental, animal welfare, women’s rights, human rights), and representatives of business interests. In the literature, there is a discussion about who should or should not be involved: there is a continuum with the inclusion of all stakeholders — everyone with an interest at one end (Edelenbos and Monnikhof, 1998a) — and at the other end the inclusion of those who can influence the success of the decision, that is, shareholders (see for example: Bruijn et al., p. 101). Choice for participation of stakeholders is usually made in the experiments that are more concerned with the democratic quality of the decision (both in deliberative democracy and in deliberative governance), while choice for influential participants is made in experiments that acknowledge an interdependence and aim at effective and efficient decision making (all types of experiments with governance).

Third, the experiments have their own specific deliberative design. A deliberative design consists of “conditions” and “standards of conduct” of a deliberation (Rosenberg, 2007b, p. 9).22 There is a broad variety of approaches in deliberative democracy theory such as organizational learning that define conditions for deliberation and propose techniques to enhance deliberation.23 For example, there is a group that is closest to Habermas’ ideal speech situations. The experiments in this approach attempt to organize more rational decision making and communicative rationality, for example in deliberative polls (Fishkin, 1995, 1996) or citizens’ juries (Crosby, 1995; Armour, 1995). The second cluster of approaches attempts to take into account the less cognitive parts of deliberation. These can be, for example:

1. The interpretations of problems through mapping of meanings and constructing frames (Rein and Schön, 1993). These interpretations are taken into account in, for example, collaborative planning (Healey, 1997b, p. 242), collaborative dialogue (Innis and Booher, 2003), stakeholder planning, interactive policy making, dispute resolution and consensus building (Susskind et al., 1999);
2. Creativity, uncertainty, and complexity, that can be dealt with (still cognitively) in scenario development in a Shell tradition (cf. Schwartz, 1996; Heijden, 2005); in gaming and simulations (Mayer et al., 2005, p. 403-423); and in interactive technology assessment (Grin and de Graaf, 1996a, p. 72-99; Asselt and Rijksen-Kloomp, 2002, p. 167-184);
3. Distrust and anger that can be addressed in conflict resolution and consensus building (Fischer and Ury, 1981; Fischer and Shapiro, 2005);
4. Dramaturgical aspects: “Governance is then seen as much more than a matter of cognitive persuasion. It is about enacted social interaction and focuses on

Each innovative form of governing in the policy practice has its own deliberative design that can build on one of these approaches. The criteria named in the literature, such as inclusion (equality), transparency, and impartiality are translated and contextualized in each experiment. The deliberative design includes the intensity and agenda of the deliberations, the settings, the participants, rules of entrance and exclusion. This design organizes the project, relates it to normal and formal decision making, problem solving or policy making procedures. Part of this design defines the meetings. The facilitation of the conversation at these meetings is another aspect of the process. A variety of techniques can be applied to facilitate communication between government and society. In experiments with deliberative governance, the deliberative design is the way to convene the process and organization of the experiment and it includes techniques to facilitate conversations at meetings.24

To conclude this section, I define experiments with deliberative governance as temporarily erected spaces that are organized around a policy problem or a policy conflict. These are settings in which governmental and non-governmental actors deliberate possible solutions. Each experiment has a deliberative design that addresses the conditions, rules and strategies for the interactions. This design needs to stimulate the deliberative quality of decision making so that both the decisions and the new way of decision making in deliberative governance are more credible.

**CREDIBLE DELIBERATIVE GOVERNANCE?**

The above sections defined government, governance and deliberative governance as three forms of governing. In “government,” governmental actors claim political authority and the right to make legitimate decisions based on (formal) arrangements and procedures. Governmental actors are a ruling power in society that can make decisions, and command and control to protect the common good. In governing through “governance,” decision making takes place in a network of interdependent actors that each have relevant knowledge and other resources to contribute to decisions for the common good. Deliberative governance builds on the idea of network governing through governance, but it pays attention to the quality of the interactions between interdependent governmental and non-governmental actors for two reasons: first, it is in deliberation that collaborative learning and change for better decision making can take place; and then, in network governance decisions can only become credible — and therefore authoritative and legitimate — through interactions with a deliberative quality.

In this thesis, I study whether deliberative governance indeed gains credibility in innovative forms of governing, the so-called experiments with deliberative governance. Do participants in these experiments start to believe in the discourse these experiments
inject, or do they prefer governmental actors as a ruling authority? I study the shift from
government to deliberative governance as a credibility contest between a predominantly
government discourse and a deliberative governance discourse. It is in the deliberations part
of experiments with deliberative governance that either discourse can gain credibility.

The rest of this thesis is in two parts. In Part I (chapters 1, 2 and 3) a theory of boundary
work is developed in order to study the credibility contests between government and
deliberative governance discourse in conversations of participants in experiments. This
is done in conjunction with a pilot case, Creative Competition in the Bijlmerpark (chapter
3). I will argue that it is through a transcending of discursive boundaries or a drawing
of boundaries that deliberative governance can gain credibility. Chapter 2 presents the
research design. Part II presents a comparison of boundary work in two countries: the Dairy
Gateway project in Wisconsin in the United States of America and the Protein Highway
Project in the middle-east of the Netherlands. Chapter 6 presents the conclusions.