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In the introduction I described my understanding that innovative forms of governing are an injection of deliberative governance discourse into dominant government discourse. These innovations provide the opportunity to study the credibility contest between the two discourses and the outcome of this struggle. It is obvious that one form, government discourse, is dominant and can draw on long routinized understandings of how institutions are supposed to function. This is a relatively frozen discourse. The other discourse is new and lacks such resources. I want to establish if change toward deliberative governance takes place, if it becomes more credible.

In chapter 1, I described how through boundary work I interpret these contests. I gave a theoretical explanation for the power of drawing and transcending boundaries around discourses. In this chapter, I will describe the choices I made for specific experiments with innovative forms of governing in the practice of policy and public administration. Questions that will be answered are: What shape do these experiments, institutions for deliberation, have in public administration? Why did I select three different experiments, one in an urban area and two in rural areas? Why one foreign case? Were these experiments in the past or ongoing, and why did I make this selection? How did I interpret the observations, documents and interviews, and construct boundary work in these? In short, this chapter presents the research design, the methods by which I collected, constructed and interpreted the data.

2. Reflective research design, data generation, construction and analysis

2.1. REFLECTIVE RESEARCH DESIGN

“Tell me, and I will forget. Show me, and I may remember. Involve me, and I will understand” (Confucius, 450 B.C.).

Just as the turn to practice in the study of policy deliberations in experiments with deliberative governance, my reflective research design fits into the emerging strand of deliberative policy analysis. In this tradition, a mutual inquiry and phronesis — practical wisdom — are the target. In deliberative policy analysis it is argued that phronesis should be established in interactions with policy practice. This practical wisdom can “inform us on what to do” (Loebert, 2004, p. 21) and “must be up to the task of understanding and furthering the interests of real world, conflict-ridden, living communities” (Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003, p. 21). Phronesis goes beyond scientific and technical knowledge. It is a “true state, reasoned, and capable of action with regard to things that are good or bad for man” (Aristotle, 1976, chapter 5).

The co-production of practical wisdom is very different from mainstream policy analysis that attempts to “speak truth to power” (Wildavsky 1979) and that considers close interactions between policy and analysis as a danger to production of “pure” scientific knowledge. In contrast, in this case I aim at the production of practical wisdom that enables and includes judgment (Dewey, 1939; Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 2; Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003). Once I adopt the idea that policy analysis should contribute to practical judgment, I also commit to a “mutual inquiry” and “mutual discourse” (Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003, p. 23). It is in a mutual inquiry rather than in an ivory tower that policy analysts can produce practical wisdom. As
we saw in the introduction, this fits the view of deliberative policy analysis in which expert knowledge becomes part of deliberations and experts have to engage with practice.

Philosophically, a mutual inquiry may be considered inevitable and inseparable for the production of phronesis. As Hillary Putnam argued: in everyday situations, fact, value and theory are “interpenetrated” (Putnam, 1981;1995). When we take practice as a unit of analysis, policy analysis is necessarily deliberative and intertwines fact and value, and theory and practice (Hajer and Wagenaar 2003, p. 26–23). Indeed, philosophically this is true. However, the social realms and the procedures of policy analysis, politics and public administration are, to a certain extent, separated. This is empirically supported by research on institutionalized boundaries between policy and science (see chapter 1). Moreover, I can distinguish different types of knowledge, for example theoretical, empirical and experiential, within the social realm of policy sciences and in the realm of politics and public administration. Thus, even though philosophically it is understood that fact and value and theory and practice feed into each other in the policy practice, the scientific and political realms can be distinguished socially as well as by their different types of knowledge produced in and for these realms. These distinctions enable me to design a research process in which types of knowledge “talk back” to each other and induce reflectivity, and at the same time produce phronesis.

In this dissertation, I aim to engage in a mutual inquiry to produce phronesis. The reflective research design not only presupposes but also organizes the iterations between types of knowledge and social realms. In other words, I deliberately went back and forth between the concept of boundary work and theories in policy analysis on one hand, and on the other hand the practice of experiments with deliberative governance. This type of iteration between practice and theory is described in Kolb’s learning cycle. It assumes that different types of knowledge can feed into each other to create a learning process that leads to experiential knowledge which is similar to phronesis. Kolb starts the cycle with immediate or concrete experiences that can be observed and reflected upon. These reflections can be assimilated and distilled into abstract concepts which produce new implications for action. These actions in their turn can be actively tested (Kolb, 1984, p. 21).

The learning cycle I created not only includes my observations of practice; it also involves a dialogue with people in practice. As such, I attempt to move “... from the role of controller to that of collaborator” (Guba, 1989; Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 260). I engage in a dialogue, a mutual inquiry, about the substance and the methodology of the analysis. With a reflective research design my ambition is to produce a learning stance with regard to:

"the substance of the subject; the normative position of the researcher; the research method and how it might be biased toward a certain normative position; the methodology, specifically how the analyst learned from and was of influence" (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

With this reflective research design, I presuppose that the actors in different realms of policy analysis and policy practice can act as parrhesiastes AND that different types of knowledge — not necessarily connected to one social realm — can create reflectivity in both researcher and practitioners when types of knowledge are crossed over. For this, I draw on Schön’s argument that situations “talk back” to practitioners (Schön, 1983, p. 135). This induces the “practitioner,” (in this story both the researcher (me) and participants in the experiments with deliberative governance), to reflect on this “talk-back” that might lead to a “new understanding” or “reframing” (Schön, 1983, p. 135). Thus, reflection comes from interactions between social realms (Schwartz-Shea, 2006 p. 102-103) as well as from interactions between types of knowledge. This can lead to a reframing of the problems and to “new understanding” and judgments by practitioners and analysts on how to solve policy problems. As such, I consider reflectivity a result of interactions between analysts and practitioners and as a condition to create phronesis in a mutual inquiry. This reflective design describes how I organized the interactions between conceptual knowledge, experiential knowledge and empirical knowledge, and how I organized the social interactions between researcher and practitioners.

This type of ethnomethodological reflexivity (Lynch, 2000, p. 33) should not be confused with standpoint reflexivity (Lynch, 2000, p. 31) of critical policy analysis that is closely related to deliberative policy analysis. Scholars in this tradition Fischer, Pung and Wright, and Dryzek, among others, argue that policy analysts should deliberately take a stand in democratic debate. They should be normative and support those who are not in power, for example environmental organizations or citizens’ groups, to stand side by side with and empower powerless citizens. Otherwise policy analysis is always at risk of reproducing the status quo. However, in this research I refrain from taking this normative stand. For example, I do not take the viewpoint that experiments with deliberative governance are a way to depoliticize conflict in order to benefit people in power. Instead, with the reflective research design, I attempt to be aware of and criticize my assumptions as a researcher by engaging in a dialogue with the research subject. Moreover, this type of ethnomethodological reflectivity can help awareness and correct for a bias in research toward, for example, a group or a discourse.

As described above, I developed a research design (see figure 2.1) that is inspired by the hermeneutic cycle proposed by Guba and Lincoln (1994) and Kolb’s learning cycle (Kolb 1984). The reflective research cycle describes how I iterated between different types of knowledge, as Kolb proposes. It also illustrates how I included interpretations of practitioners, as Guba and Lincoln propose. Moreover, in this research design I introduced a third way to create reflectivity: a comparative case study. Hence, three types of iterations were organized: first, between theory and practice to increase learning in both; next, between researcher and practitioner to increase reflectivity of both; and finally, between two cases to learn from different contexts.

The cycle I created started with the experiential knowledge that I gathered while organizing and advising in experiments with deliberative governance in the Dutch context, and with some theoretical notions on boundary work. Based on these I reconstructed boundary work in a pilot case at the local level in which I had been incidentally involved as a consultant. This case concerned an experiment with interactive citizens’ participation for the redevelopment of the Bijlmerpark in Amsterdam. In this pilot case I tested the theoretical approach to boundary work. The theoretical notion allowed me to study the case from a specific point of view, and to be held accountable both by practitioners and researchers for the way I analyzed it. This created reflectivity on my part, which was necessary since the pilot case had been facilitated by the company I was, and still am, working for. The theoretical approach allowed me to evaluate it differently than from the...
2. Reflective research design, data generation, construction and analysis

2.2. CASE SELECTION

The reflective research design enhanced my thinking in three ways: through iteration between theoretical and empirical knowledge; through iteration between the social realm of science and practice; and through iteration between two cases of which one was outside the Netherlands.

I started with an exploratory single case study (Yin 1994, p. 4): Creative Competition in the Bijlmerpark, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. This was a project of citizens’ participation in which they drew up plans for the park and competed to be selected by the district council.

The results from the analysis of the pilot case led me to fine-tune the theory and shaped how I analyzed the data in the comparison between two ongoing experiments with consensus-building and “visioning” on the regional level. In this comparison I introduced a case of consensus building: the Dairy Gateway project in Wisconsin, USA. This international dimension caused me to reflect on a possible bias in my thinking on the Dutch planning practice. Moreover, it helped me to explore whether change of dominant discourse takes place through boundary work in different contexts and if so, how. The results of this comparison fed back into theories on boundary work and governance. This helped me to formulate recommendations to intervene in a learning network on redevelopment of old industrial sites. However, some results of the application of recommendations in this policy practice can be accessed through the following publications: Metze 2009 and Metze 2010.

This case was explored to understand its complexities (Stake, 2005, p. 444) and to use that understanding in a reflective way, that is, to “challenge, confirm, or extend the theory” (Yin 1994, p. 38).

The second stage was concerned with innovative forms of governing in regional planning that included farmers’ and environmental issues in rural areas. In the A1 Protein Highway project in the Netherlands a vision for the region had to be developed in deliberation with businesses, non-governmental organizations and citizens.60 In the Dairy Gateway project consensus building took place in deliberation with farmers, farmers’ representatives, the dairy industry, environmental organizations, and citizens. These cases were both operational experiments with deliberative governance. By choosing a foreign case, I introduced a comparative component that first and foremost provided an opportunity for me as a researcher, but also for the people in policy practice, to reflect on the specificities of the Dutch cases and that of the Wisconsin case. The Wisconsin case is an instrumental “control” or “reference case” (Stake 2005, p. 458) and provides valuable insights on its own terms.64

I selected the three innovative forms of governing based on criteria that I developed from the theoretical definition of experiments with deliberative governance from the introduction. I analyzed the project descriptions, minutes of meetings and interviews about the start of the project, which enabled me to conclude that these projects can indeed be understood as operational experiments with deliberative governance.

**OPERATIONAL EXPERIMENTS WITH DELIBERATIVE GOVERNANCE**

In the introduction, I positioned experiments with deliberative governance in a theoretical debate; in this section I will answer the question: what do these experiments look like in practice? In the introduction, I defined these experiments as settings that are temporarily erected, organized around a problem or a conflict, and involve at least one governmental and one non-governmental actor to resolve the problem or conflict with help of a deliberative design that addresses the rules of conduct and strategies.

This definition was translated into three criteria that I applied in order to select typical cases of deliberative governance that were as homogeneous as possible.63 As we saw in the introduction, I expect that participants in experiments with deliberative governance conduct boundary work on these two discourses as the experiments “inject” deliberative governance discourse into a government discourse. Hence, the deliberative governance discourse is easier to identify in these experiments than in other types of policy discourse. In this research I selected in an “information-oriented” way cases that I understood to be the “most likely” (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 78-79) to include boundary work on government and deliberative governance discourse. The three cases I selected all represent the best example, synecdoches (Becker, 1998, p. 67; Stone, 2002, p. 137, 138)64 of the theoretically-defined experiment with deliberative governance. I selected three very similar cases to be able to understand how through boundary work dominant government discourse might or might not be disrupted in these cases. The three criteria were: cases were experimental and temporarily erected; there were both governmental and non-governmental interactions; and projects had a deliberative design.
First, I selected projects based on the criterion that they had to be part of the policy practice but not part of normal decision making.66 The projects were experimental and temporarily erected. The governmental actors and others involved defined the projects as, for example, “different” in the Bijlmerpark (Stad bv, 1998, bijeenkomst 1, V1 3); “innovative” in the case of the Protein Highway: Make it Happen project (Bunt and Rijnconsult 2003), or as something “beyond command and control,” as was the case in the Dairy Gateway project (DNR, 2003, Grant application Joyce foundation). Hence, “experimental” does not mean that I designed a scientific experiment, but rather that the projects are not part of normal and formal policy-making practices. To be able to judge if these projects fit this criterion, I conducted exploratory research in which I reconstructed what governmental actors and consultants considered “normal” vs. “experimental.” This analysis also provided the contextually defined elements of government discourse and deliberative governance discourse. From this analysis, I concluded that all three projects were temporarily erected, experimental and situated in a real-time political context:

- **The redevelopment of the Bijlmerpark in Amsterdam.** In this project the district council wanted to organize a participatory process in which citizens were more actively involved in policymaking. The local government financed the project in which citizens drew up plans for the park and competed for a winning design.

- **The scenario development for the ‘Protein Highway: Make it Happen.’** Here scenario development about an area around the A1, a main artery in the Netherlands, was initiated by Oost NV, a development agency, and financed by two provinces to stimulate entrepreneurship in the region. These scenarios were to be built by stakeholders, entrepreneurs, environmental- and animal-welfare organizations and citizens and had to result in an appealing and viable vision for the region that might enhance its economic and environmental quality.

- **The consensus building in the Dairy Gateway project.** This was facilitated by the Bureau of Cooperative Agreement of the state Department of Natural Resources (DNR). In this project, consensus building for better relationships between entrepreneurs, environmental organizations and citizens, as well as better and more sustainable environmental and business results were the intended result.

A second criterion to determine if the cases were experiments with deliberative governance was that both governmental and non-governmental actors had to participate in the projects. As we saw in the introduction, it is in this institutional ambiguity (Hajer, 2003) and in a network of interdependent actors (Tatenhove, 1995; Teisman, 1992; 1998) that the shift from government to governance takes place. The three projects were all situated in this institutional ambiguity:

- Creative competition in the Bijlmerpark was initiated by the district government when an impasse occurred in decision-making over the redevelopment of the park. In addition to the district council, the central government of the city of Amsterdam and the province of Noord Holland were involved. The park was part of the Dutch “ecological main structure” (ecologische hoofdstructuur). Policy domains that were included were economic affairs, housing, traffic, as well as natural resources. Moreover, citizens living near the park were involved, as were local environmental organizations, social workers, schools, urban and landscape planners, and physical education coaches.

- The A1 Protein Highway: Make it Happen project focused on regional development of an area around the A1 artery. The regional focus facilitated cooperation between two provinces; a Dutch bank, the Rabobank; the national Platform Agrologistics and a national Innovation Network for the agricultural sector. Policy domains involved were urban and rural planning and land use, environment, animal welfare, agriculture, traffic and transport. Land use conflicts had to be resolved in the region. Moreover, environmental organizations, animal welfare organizations, agrobusinesses, farmers’ representatives, tourist industry representatives and citizens of the region were to be involved.

- The Dairy Gateway project was initiated to improve the environmental quality, the economic viability, and the communities of a region that included three counties (Manitowoc, Kewaunee and Door). The regional focus brought together these three counties, the state’s Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP). The regional focus not only linked the policy domains of natural resources and agriculture, but also environmental organizations and the agricultural and dairy sector in this area. State and local environmental organizations were involved, as were farmers, farmers’ representatives and citizens living in the three counties.

A third criterion was that the selected projects had to have a deliberative design that included rules of conduct and strategies for deliberation to convene and facilitate the deliberation between stakeholders. This criterion allowed ruling out beforehand projects that were developed to create support for policies, or to increase policy efficiency only. In this case, I was interested in projects that were also concerned with the deliberative quality of the conversations that they organized. A deliberative design indicates that the initiators aimed at an improvement of the deliberative quality of the conversations. Each of the three project proposals included a deliberative design based upon academic research and referred to the type of, or the quality of, the conversation that was the goal.

- In the redevelopment of the Bijlmerpark, the deliberative design was inspired by the method of creative competition that had been developed by Geert Teisman at the Erasmus University Rotterdam. A consultancy firm de Stad bv, hired by the district government, used this method to develop a deliberative design that decided how many meetings were to be convened, with what participants, and with what objectives. In three meetings, citizens were to draft landscape designs for the park. They were organized in consortia that had to gain support for their ideas and that had to make the plans more feasible with the help of experts. At the last meeting the district council had to choose one of the plans and develop this into a feasible project. Each meeting was facilitated by an external consultant.

- In the Dairy Gateway project, consensus building was applied as a method to organize interactions between government, citizens, environmental organizations, farming businesses and the dairy industry. This method was developed by Lawrence Susskind (among others) at the Consensus Building Institute in cooperation with the Harvard Program on Negotiation and MIT. The concept of Public Entrepreneurship Networks was also tried out (Laws, 1998; Laws et al. 2001). The DNR hired two local mediators who convened and facilitated the interactions, and two national mediators and one national policy advisor to construct a deliberative design.

- In the Protein Highway: Make it Happen project, scenario development in the
tradition of the oil-company Shell was applied. This type of scenario development started in the 1970’s. The Shell Oil Company wanted to cope with an uncertain future. Rather than predict the future, interactions with stakeholders and “remarkable” imaginative people were organized to “think out of the box.” Peter Schwartz, an independent consultant, further developed this method (Schwartz, 1996). Later on, scenario development was also utilized by Professor Kees van der Heijden as a means to facilitate strategic conversations for organizational learning (Heijden, 2005). In the case of the Protein Corridor Project, the two provinces and the Innovation Network hired two external consultants who constructed the deliberative design and facilitated the scenario sessions.

Hence, the three projects are synecdoches of experiments with deliberative governance. I selected these cases to explore boundary work in struggles between government and deliberative governance discourse, to investigate whether deliberative governance discourse gained credibility.

2.3. DATA GENERATION, DATA CONSTRUCTION AND DATA ANALYSIS

In this section I describe in detail how I generated, constructed and analyzed the data in each of the cases.

DATA GENERATION

I generated the data for the exploratory pilot case, Creative Competition in the Bijlmerpark, in a different way than I did for the comparison of the two cases in rural regions in the Netherlands and the United States. The pilot case was reconstructed in retrospect and I was not involved as a researcher when the project was ongoing. I was an “onlooker” (Patton, 1990, p. 206). Although at the time I was working for a consultancy firm, I only sat in on one internal evaluation session of this project, together with Professor Teisman. The data generated were (policy) documents from the archives of both the contracted consultancy firm, de Stad bv, and the local administration of the district. These documents included field notes of the project assistant who worked on the project at that time. Subsequently, I interviewed fifteen people (see attachment 3.2. for an overview). These interviewees included citizens and representatives of citizens’ groups, the two external project managers, two public administrators, the politically responsible alderwoman, spatial planners and landscape architects who were involved, and a student who was an intern in the administration of the district government.

I generated the data for the exploratory comparison between the A1 Protein Highway: Make it Happen project and the Dairy Gateway project in three ways. First, I engaged in a “naturalistic inquiry” (Patton, 1990, p. 203) that included participatory observations in the field while the two projects were ongoing. Second, I reconstructed boundary work in (policy) documents and third, I conducted interviews.

I engaged in a naturalistic inquiry and became an observing participant (Patton, 1990, p. 206) to be able to study boundary work that was conducted in conversations. All these participatory observations were overt (Patton, 1990, p. 209). However, some participants might not have been aware of my motives. Subsequently, sometimes participants “used” my participation to give the projects more credibility. On several occasions people introduced me in meetings as an expert from abroad. Some participants admitted in personal conversations that their efforts to create reform gained status by having me observing their attempts to innovate. This became particularly evident in the Wisconsin project when one of the farmers asked me as “a foreigner from the Netherlands” to make clear that similar things were going on at other places too (Pro-Ag and Environment meeting, 2004).

In the Wisconsin project that was compared to a Dutch case, I observed and participated in five meetings, four in 2004 and one in 2005. I had access to minutes of all meetings in 2004 and 2005, to field-notes of the facilitator, to policy documents and other sources, and I created data in 48 interviews (see attachment 4.5, for an overview of the meetings and respondents). Thirty-one interviews were held in autumn 2004 and seventeen in autumn 2005. The latter included interviews with the consensus builders from MIT and Harvard, the Finance Officer at the Joyce Foundation, and the State governor, who was from the Democratic party. I did not attend meetings of the Investors Club nor the Design Team, nor did I attend meetings of the Bureau of Cooperative Agreement at the DNR, nor of the statewide convening. I organized four meetings with the project team in which we exchanged and discussed observations (in 2004) and discussed the preliminary results (in 2005). In addition to these exchanges, I had regular and informal exchanges with the project manager and the project’s caretaker in the United States.

In the Dutch case, “Protein Corridor: Make it Happen,” I attended one of what the organizers called “plenary meetings” (see attachment 5.5. for an overview of all meetings) at which project leaders of different projects exchanged their experiences. I participated in and observed a one-day scenario development session, and sat in at some presentations of individual projects that were part of the visioning project. In the Dutch case, I was not allowed to sit in at any of the steering group meetings, nor did I visit any of the project-group meetings. These meetings were held behind closed doors and I had to settle for drafts and final versions of the minutes. It was the consultants in particular who did not want me to participate. They were dealing with the two provinces that were on the edge of withdrawing from the project.7 This limited the conclusions I could draw on boundary work at these meetings. For the data generation I also conducted 14 interviews in 2004, and 16 in 2005 (see attachment 5.5.) among which were interviews with the project manager, the consultants, representatives of farmers, and representatives of environmental organizations and animal welfare organizations. Participatory exchange was possible to a certain extent in four ways: first, through formal and informal exchange with the project manager who kept me posted and who deliberated once with the project manager from the Dairy Gateway project; second, through my participation in two meetings with the Platform Agro-logistics; third, through a presentation and discussion at the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature, and Food Quality, with their Knowledge department (the former Expertise Centre), which was also
attended by the project manager of the Dairy Gateway project; and fourth, through a presentation I held where I discussed preliminary results at the Innovation Network.

Subsequently, I organized interactions between the two projects; the project manager of the Dairy Gateway project once visited the Netherlands to participate in one of the meetings with the Knowledge department at the Ministry of Agriculture, at which I presented preliminary results. In addition, the two project-managers also met outside this meeting to discuss the specifics of their projects.

DATA CONSTRUCTION

After generating the data, I organized them in a specific way. This is what I call data construction. As I am interested in the response to boundary work, the type of conversation that evolves, and the results of boundary work, I needed to maintain a chronological order in the data construction and I divided each case in two stages:

a. The first stage was the drafting of the proposal in which the advisors and government, and sometimes other societal actors were included and a change-leading coalition negotiated the objectives, the deliberative design, and the financing of the experiment.

b. The second stage was the deliberations between government and society. These included the meetings that had a deliberative governance design.

Next, I organized the data into research sites. These sites transcended the geographical encounters between actors, and transcend social groups or practices (Metcalf, 2001). In my capacity as a researcher, I created the coherence of a site. A site in this case is a unit of analysis that includes all types of interactions between specified actors and that transcends geographically-located and other types of real-time interactions. The site of interaction as a unit of analysis is not necessarily “a group of people with the same understanding, a community, or a discourse community” (Yanow, 2000, p. 27); neither is it shared “socially established human activity” (Macintyre, 1982, p. 187; cited in: Wagenaar and Cook 2003, p. 146). A site of interaction includes all types of interactions between specific types of actors. This type of ordering “has the advantage of leaving open the possibility that a variety of cultural practices may coexist there, any of which may or may not extend beyond the site” (Metcalf, 2001, p. 165). Hence, the interactions at these sites take place face to face, but also in documents, phone calls, emails, and recordings. They expand with the length of the time period. I distinguished three research sites:

1. Interactions between government and society, e.g. interactions that include at least three actors other than government (citizens, NGO’s, businesses, advisors). This site of interaction included the deliberative meetings and was analyzed in all cases.

2. Interactions between government and business; at this site of interaction no NGO’s or citizens participated. I was able to construct this site of analysis only in the Dutch and U.S. cases. The meetings that were part of this site of interaction did not have as a motive the improvement of the deliberative quality of the conversations.

3. Interactions between government and advisors. This site of interaction was studied in all cases, as it was mostly the two actors who negotiated the proposal for the project in the first stage. Again, at this site of interaction no deliberative quality was intended.71
In the analysis of boundary work in conversations, documents and interviews, first and foremost I looked for the “heightening of contrast” and “exclusion” in utterances. “Blaming” as a literary device required more interpretation than the two other devices but I also looked for those types of demarcations.73

These three literary devices served as an “entrance” into the data and enabled me to interpret which discourse was demarcated from which discourse.76 Each time I came across one of these three types of utterances in the text, I interpreted them in at least one of the ways that follow.77

First, I interpreted whether the demarcations “stood alone,” which means that they are not contrasted to other discourses. I interpreted these types of demarcations so as to provide me with a definition of an element of a specific discourse. For example, an actor might claim that “this command and control is part of governments’ responsibility,” without further defining what is not. However, often demarcations are contrasted to “something that it is not.” In discourse theoretic terms, demarcations not only define what are elements of one discourse, they also exclude elements of the “other” discourse. Therefore, a demarcation simultaneously defines what the other discourse is. Hence, every time I came across an utterance that stated that something is “different” or excluded or blamed, I questioned and necessarily interpreted what it was contrasted to, excluded from or blamed. Second, I interpreted these utterances and used them to indicate the moments at which participants demarcated a discourse. This enabled me to construct patterns of boundary work. Third, I also interpreted and judged whether these demarcations concerned dominant government discourse, deliberative governance discourse or perhaps did not address these discourses at all. Subsequently, when I came across these demarcations, I interpreted the responses to the demarcations. A section below will address how I interpreted the responses to demarcations and to boundary objects. First I will describe how I searched for boundary concepts.

**Boundary concepts**

In order to establish whether boundaries between discourses were transcended in boundary concepts, I could lean less on detailed conversation analysis. I had to interpret if stretching of a boundary, as Gieryn referred to it, took place. To be able to construct and interpret concepts as boundary concepts, I first looked for a device that is almost opposite to the device of the foil, that is, the rhetorical figure of a mixed metaphor or a “catachresis.”74 Catachresis means to use a word to signify something different from its normal meaning. It is a word used out of context in a paradoxical way or with contradictory logic. Catachresis is an illogical mixed metaphor.75 For example: “Honey, you are a regular nuclear meltdown. You’d better cool off.” -- Susan Sarandon in the movie Bull Durham.78 Next to this rhetorical figure, in the analysis I searched for concepts or short sentences that included elements of discourse. For example, the statement “this is

**Demarcations and boundary concepts**

As we saw in chapter 1, participants in projects can demarcate boundary concepts to gain credibility for them. This creates an extra layer in the analysis, that of alignment of subdiscourses in deliberative governance discourse. Boundary concepts can transcend boundaries between subdiscourses and at the same time participants can demarcate these concepts to gain credibility for them. For example, entrepreneurship as an element of deliberative governance discourse can be a boundary concept that sits at the boundary between government subdiscourse and business subdiscourse. Within the governance discourse the concept of entrepreneurship aligns businesses and government.

I also analyzed and interpreted actors’ responses to the boundary concepts. As we saw in chapter 1, participants in the projects could accept, contest or deliberate on the (inappropriate) inclusion of elements of discourse. When they accept a boundary concept this means that dominant discourse is changed. However, when participants contest the blurred boundary and, for example, people start to claim that the opposite is true, or that the idea is refutable, this may lead to severe demarcations of elements of one discourse from the other. When participants contest a boundary concept it may turn into a *fracture line* concept. A fracture line concept draws out the boundaries between discourses more clearly rather than it transcends or blurs them. The boundary concept no longer creates coherence and transcends the boundaries, but causes fracture lines to become more visible (see also chapter 1).
boundary work. These moments critiques (Boltanski and Thevenot, 1999) can refer to the "critical activity of persons" as well as to the "unusualness of the moment of crisis." At a critical moment “there is a realization that something has to change” (Boltanski and Thevenot 1999, p. 359). This can lead to a violent conflict but also (and more commonly) to a discussion. Boltanski and Thevenot speak of "moments of justification;" "moments that are transitory because they break the ordinary;" moments that "involve action too" (Boltanski and Thevenot, 1999, p. 360). Whereas Boltanski and Thevenot establish these moments with help from the participants and asked them to pinpoint what the critical moments were in a project or process, I constructed these moments in the interactions in hindsight. I established what responses occurred after boundaries were drawn or transcended. In chapter 1 I already introduced three possible types of reactions to demarcations and transcending of boundaries:

- Acceptation: the demarcation of discourse was already part of dominant discourse; an acceptance of the boundary concept leads to change of dominant discourse;
- Contestation-conflict: demarcation remains part of subordinate discourse or dominant discourse may be disrupted;
- Contestation-conversation with deliberative quality: demarcation or transcending is reflected upon and change of dominant discourse may be the result.

Each time I came across a demarcation or transcending event, I interpreted the response and categorized it in one of the previous three categories. Subsequently, based on these interpretations I was able to point out critical moments of boundary work. These were the moments at which change of dominant discourse became possible. Moreover, based on the content of the responses, I could interpret whether dominant discourse was indeed disrupted.

To summarize the research steps

1. I gathered (policy) documents, minutes of meetings, notes of facilitators, and I interviewed a broad range of actors involved. In the comparison I was also able to observe, participate, record and transcribe meetings and to interact with actors.
2. I ordered the documents and other data chronologically.
3. I divided them into two stages: (1) the formulation of the proposal for the project, and (2) meeting the stakeholders, that is, the deliberations.
4. I also divided the data into three types of interaction:
   a. interactions between government and society (the deliberative settings);
   b. interactions between government and business;
   c. interactions between government and advisors (scientific experts as well as consultants);

Data analysis

5. I looked for discursive demarcations and transcending of boundaries in the two stages and at these different sites of interactions.
6. I created several types of databases of boundary work. I created tables in Word in which I build a time line of events that was linked to documents that were created at or for those events. In this time line I also documented the most important boundary work at those events. For the detailed analysis of boundary work I used Nud-It (for analysis of the documents of Creative Competition) and Transana Software 2.21 (for analysis of the recordings of meetings in the comparison), and
data analysis.

7. For the analysis of the second stage in each project, “meeting the stakeholders,” I created transcripts of the conversations and meetings and for these conversations I was able to include the responses to the demarcations in the analysis.
8. For these conversations I was able to determine with hindsight what had been the critical moments in the deliberations and whether a conversation with a deliberative quality evolved (see previous chapter for criteria), whether the demarcations or transcending were accepted, or if conflict occurred.
9. For the comparison I compared the different sites of interactions, and especially the critical moments: was boundary work similar or different?
10. I analyzed the responses to boundary work and I determined what discourse the participants had enacted and whether a change of dominant discourse had occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Site 1, 2 and 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measuring actors</td>
<td>Demarcations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical moment: Accept</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative Conversation</td>
<td>Transcending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical moment: Accept</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective c.</td>
<td>Elements (un)changed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. Format for the analysis per case

2.4. TO CONCLUDE: ETHNOMETHODOLOGICAL REFLECTIVITY IN ITERATION

This chapter introduced the research design and the method for generating data, data construction and data analysis. To enhance ethnomethodological reflectivity in this research, I explicitly created an iteration between the theoretical concept boundary work and the empirics of experiments with deliberative governance. I designed an iteration both between theoretical and empirical knowledge and between the social realm of science and the social realm of politics and public administration. Moreover, this chapter explained how I selected three cases that I argued to be synecdoche of experiments with deliberative governance.
The first case, Creative Competition in the Bijlmerpark, Amsterdam, is a pilot case and helped me to reflect upon the concept of boundary work as I developed it in chapter 1. Chapter 3 describes this case and it includes a reflection on chapter 1. Subsequently, I introduced a comparison of a Dutch project and an American project that have a similar deliberative design, but that differed in their context. This difference can give some explanation for differences in patterns of boundary work in the two projects that go beyond features of the deliberative design. Chapter 4 and 5 will present the results of the study of boundary work in these two cases. Chapter 6 presents the conclusions.