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Abstract

The once dominant view of planning as the discovery of an objective 'public good' has been challenged over the last several decades. Radical uncertainty, social diversity, technological change and popular mistrust of traditional government underlie growing calls for more open and flexible governance processes. In order to reclaim some public legitimacy for their actions, governments and public agencies have responded by creating spaces for stakeholder input to policy making.

This thesis is concerned with the often uneasy interaction between stakeholders and bureaucracies in these evolving spaces. Specifically, it focuses on one model of participation that has become fairly standard in Australian planning – the delegation of bureaucratic decisions to ‘community-based’ committees. The enquiry described in the thesis is grounded in case studies of two such committees, both charged with developing strategic responses to land use conflicts in regional (non-metropolitan) Australia.

The analysis proceeds from an institutionalist perspective, treating participatory processes not only as fora to resolve divergent opinions and values, but also as encounters between different ‘cultural’ frameworks, which continue to be actively constructed throughout. From this perspective, it examines the tensions arising within the case studies between cultural practices – especially between bureaucratic and other ways of working – and the discursive means through which such tensions are, or are not, resolved. It also asks whether these means might represent a form of institutional capacity building.

To these ends, the enquiry employs a combination of ethnographic, sociological and linguistic methods in an approach that can broadly be called ‘critical discourse analysis’. In particular, it focuses on spoken and written texts – meetings, minutes and planning reports – treating these as the realisation of institutional discourses, with potential to reproduce and/or to reconstruct established values, relations and practices.

There are three main findings. First, a traditional bureaucratic rationalism continues to permeate the performance of participatory planning, in constant tension with alternative practices brought to processes by ‘stakeholder’ participants, which can
lead to persistent miscommunication. Second, in spite of this tension, participants can find ways of working together, reaching agreement and making progress even without first resolving underlying differences. Third, committees' newly constructed 'ways of working' represent a very uneven form of institutional capacity building — they are highly context-sensitive and create their own tensions between the needs of the moment and the overall aims of the planning process. As such, they do not translate comfortably to general norms or repertoires for acting; moreover, they may not be reified in such a way as to allow their 'travel' to other planning or governance arenas.
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Part 1: The enquiry unfolding
1 Introduction: genesis

1.1 The age of participation: a brief personal account

You can have the choice, you can go back to the confrontationism of the past which have wrought such havoc and damage to the Australian political fabric, or you can have the approach which is based upon an attempt not to force some ideology down the throats of the people of Australia, but to recognize that the concepts of planning together and working together, the harnessing of shared experiences, that that is an alternative, and a better way.

(Robert Hawke, PM, Speech to Brisbane Press Club in Brisbane, 9 August 1983)

In the early 1980s, ‘consensus’ was adopted as a central policy aim of Australia’s Federal Labor government. Process-oriented approaches to policy development, emphasising communication and consultation with interest groups, became mainstream and widely expected.

It was shortly after this that I began my professional life. For several years from 1986, I worked for various locally managed organisations considered to represent one or another special interest in land. Consequently, I was occasionally invited by government agencies to participate in land use decisions either as a ‘stakeholder’ (defined as someone affected by the decision) or as an advocate for a ‘disadvantaged’ interest group. This turned out to be a rather disheartening experience for me and my colleagues. Bureaucrats often appeared to be ‘going through the consultative motions’, rather than genuinely interested in what we had to say. At other times – and especially when I was in the advocate role – they seemed sincere but clueless when it came to obtaining meaningful input from community members. For our part, we never doubted for a moment that meaningful consultation was important.

In the mid-1990s I took a job in the state public service. Suddenly, consultation no longer seemed as straightforward. The people in my office wanted it to work, and used many of the standard methods – consultative committees, public meetings, written invitations to comment, public notices, and surveys. But the number of stakeholders involved and their often irreconcilable differences meant that it was scarcely feasible to communicate with all the main players, let alone to please
everyone. Even of those stakeholders we managed to identify, some consistently failed to turn up for meetings and many tended to be defensive or hostile when we did get to see them. Further, the only practical way of achieving ‘consensus’ often seemed to be to remove all contentious content from policy documents and produce what are popularly known as ‘motherhood statements’ – ‘meaningful’ consultation seemed to lead to meaningless outcomes.

While the above representation is overstated, the point is that my experience of the consultation process was bound to the particular role I played in it, apparently more than to either the methods used or to any imagined ‘independent’ subjectivity. This seemed to suggest that misunderstandings might be somehow intrinsic to the relationship between public servants and stakeholders, presenting a potentially formidable barrier to community participation. Even without significant disagreement on the issues, communication is likely to be problematic if participants give entirely different meanings to their interaction.

In the case of strategic land/water use planning, my most recent field of employment, participants are engaged in a rather special type of interaction with the bureaucracy. This is not the ‘coalface’, where citizens directly affected by bureaucratic decisions regarding their property, for example, communicate with decision makers about their personal issue(s) and experience. Rather, it is where such issues and experience are generalised and repackaged (paraphrasing Ledema 1999) in quasi-impersonal – that is, bureaucratic – terms: those involved are becoming one with the planning institution, not simply talking to it. Whether or not they share a frame of reference with that institution, therefore, may have profound consequences.

Such reflection led to the genesis of the present research, which aims to account for the type of ‘systematically distorted communication’ (Habermas 1970) that I had found so frustrating, by examining participatory planning not as simply the reconciliation of substantive values (Susskind et al. 1999), but as an encounter between bureaucratic and other cultural practices. The key question that motivated the enquiry is:

How might tensions in participatory planning be resolved?
This question, as I argue throughout this thesis, is not simply a procedural one about dispute resolution, but a cultural one, about situated social action. Such a perspective raises a number of associated ‘sub-issues’:

- the ‘culture’ (or cultures) of planning institutions themselves;
- the nature of the ‘tensions’ that subtle cultural difference can create;
- the meaning of ‘resolution’ in the cultural realm; and
- the likelihood that cultural difference can never, and perhaps should never, be finally ‘resolved’: how, then, should the ‘resolution’ of cultural tensions be understood and valued?

As a planning practitioner, I am also concerned with the ultimate influence that outcomes of participatory processes have: whether (and how) decisions are implemented; whether (and how) process innovations affect future planning exercises. This practical orientation, therefore, adds a fifth sub-issue to my motivating question:

- the processes through which the (substantive and institutional) outcomes of participatory processes gain power.

The enquiry detailed in this thesis explores these issues with reference to two case studies, placing these in the broader context of practice and theory in the still developing ‘age of participation’.

1.2 My enquiry

*Planning as discourse*

Australia’s adoption of ‘consensus’ in the 1980s was not an isolated phenomenon, but reflected an international trend. The once dominant view of planning as the scientific discovery of an objective ‘public good’, exemplified by the rational comprehensive approach (Faludi 1973), has been seriously challenged over the last several decades, popularly by the rise of ‘new social movements’ and in the academy by post-positivist critiques. These challenges have added weight to voices expressing concerns about the democratic accountability of policies developed by unelected public servants in the call for more open decision-making processes. In order to reclaim the legitimacy of their actions, governments and public agencies
have responded by creating spaces for 'community' and 'stakeholder' input to policy making.

Such practices are supported by an extensive and growing body of theory that has emerged from a commitment to participatory, deliberative democracy. Strongly influenced by Jürgen Habermas' theory of communicative action (1984, 1987), this body of theory provides normative models of decision making that privilege procedural ethics and consensus over an assumed best technical outcome. Within planning theory, this trend has become known as the 'communicative turn' (Innes 1995; Healey 1996). It aims to account for the highly politicised 'real-life' experiences of planners by recasting them as subjective mediators between conflicting interests, rather than as objective synthesisers of information, and treating planning as deliberative discourse—a language-based practice—rather than as science. Hence, Habermasian communicative rationality, at the micro level, is seen to be an important framework for procedural quality (for example, Forester 1985; Renn et al. 1995b). This procedural orientation resonates with my own perceptions as an advocate: meaningful stakeholder input is not only critically important, but also accessible to bureaucrats who take the trouble to communicate well and get the process right.

However, I also perceived, as a dissatisfied stakeholder, that bureaucracies (if not the officers with whom I was dealing directly) employed a range of strategies to ensure that our input remained marginalised. That is, I saw the legislative and policy matters to which bureaucrats constantly referred as strategically placed barriers to community-driven change. This perception is supported by a number of theorists who consider that such structural constraints discriminate against community discourses regardless of the 'communicative rationality' of individual planners (Marris 1982; Tewdwr-Jones and Thomas 1998) and that, consequently, attention to the surface features of communication is inadequate in an environment of social inequality. Planners must also attend to the power structures and relational capacity of their institutions.

Further, a number of case studies, particularly in the field of anthropology, have shown that participatory processes can 'accidentally' disadvantage local participants by imposing hegemonic procedural norms, such as deliberation and persuasion,
different from those on which local styles of negotiation and decision making are based. This suggests that there is more than one dimension to the values at stake in participatory planning, and that consensus procedures which concentrate only on the substantive may be ignoring critical sources of conflict in the cultural realm of interpersonal and procedural norms. This may help to explain the systemic misunderstandings that I felt I faced as a public servant; it constitutes the basis of my theoretical assumptions. In spite of the strong normative orientation of communicative planning theory to process, little attention has so far been paid to the contentiousness of favoured procedural norms themselves, or to how differing practices are reconciled as agreements are constructed. These issues are central concerns of my enquiry.

**Discourse as text**

The interpersonal and procedural dimensions of planning raise questions regarding the production of social relations, ideology, and organisation. Patsy Healey (1999) proposes that such questions might be addressed via the analysis of planning discourse. Such an analysis can expose strengths and weaknesses of policy and procedure, presenting opportunities for reflexivity and improvement. However, few planning researchers have applied any detailed analysis to the language that constitutes that discourse. A secondary aim of this research is to demonstrate the value of such an analysis. Before I became a planner, I trained as a linguist, and had a particular interest in the social aspects of language, as instantiated in spoken and written texts. Texts are the realisation of the meanings built and exchanged in discourse (Halliday 1978). They are key intermediaries in the ‘chains of translation’ (Callon and Law 1995) that enable interests to be represented in negotiation. Thus, texts represent a primary source of evidence for how communication and power are managed.

This enquiry adopts a methodology known as ‘critical discourse analysis’, or CDA (Fairclough 1995): the investigation of texts beyond their surface features, to uncover ‘deeper levels of discourse framing’ (Healey 1999: 28) through which ideas/knowledge, social/political relations and conventional modes of information exchange are (re)produced. The theoretical tools used are aligned with Michael Halliday’s (1985) systemic functional grammar (SFG), which describes discourse in
relation to three ‘metafunctions’: the development of ideational meaning (meanings about the world; what planning theorists traditionally regard as the ‘substantive’), interpersonal meaning (relations between participants, orientation towards their subject), and textual meaning (organisation of information). This approach is particularly well suited to showing how non-substantive values (that is, non-ideational meanings) contribute to the dynamics of discourse, and thus to construction of substantive agreements through debate, a central aim of participatory planning.

I use CDA and SFG to focus on the realisation of non-ideational meanings in spoken and written texts, as evidence of culture, tension and resolution in participatory planning. I do not, as the label ‘critical’ might suggest, particularly target the power strategies of the state in my analysis (Agger 1991). Rather, I acknowledge that interpersonal and organisational dynamics are made in specific contexts, and that those contexts include the strategic motivations and inclinations of all parties to the exchanges. My own varied history with participation exercises leads me both to sympathise with and to confer responsibility upon bureaucrats and stakeholders alike. I still believe that the public service is important, that the state’s role includes representing a ‘public interest’, and that – at least at the project management level – this is what most public servants, most of the time, imagine that they are doing. However, I also believe that there is a need to question how the ‘public interest’ is constructed and legitimised: to make explicit and open to critique the values and practices underlying the selection, interpretation and translation of various contributions to its meaning. I see these contributions as intertextual (Kristeva 1986): the ‘public interest’ draws its meaning from discourses – largely realised by texts – circulating in society at the time. Consequently, I see the practices through which public meanings are built and sustained as largely textual practices.

**Text in context**

CDA is an approach which can combine with a range of data-collection methods. For this enquiry, which is exploratory and focuses on dynamic interaction, I adopted a longitudinal ethnographic case study methodology. Two case studies were observed and recorded in ‘real time’, rather than retrospectively, to enable access to ‘hidden data’ (Hillier 2002a: 149) such as spoken texts in their original context, as
well as to the relatively undistorted memories of participants. This was crucial because non-ideational elements of spoken discourse are rarely recorded during a planning exercise – retrospective reporting tends to eliminate them – and are therefore not usually available for direct analysis.

The case studies themselves, two strategic spatial planning committees in non-metropolitan Australia, are kept anonymous at the request of the participants. Both represent attempts by the respective authorities to involve a group of major stakeholders in developing a plan in the face of hitherto intractable land/water use conflicts. They thus exemplify the problem that generates my research question: tension between stakeholders and bureaucracies, and between stakeholders themselves. Moreover, the tensions reflect not only a range of different desired outcomes from the process, but also different underlying values and modes of practice. Both committees managed to negotiate strategies for resolving their disagreements, allowing them to make decisions and move on. Yet, after six years, neither has reached an ‘outcome’ satisfactory to all the players.

The use of two cases rather than one allows me to make some comparisons with respect to a number of contextual differences: state/local authority, multiple/single lay stakeholder groups, environmental/urban planning, scientific/humanist orientation, and outcomes/process focus. The point is not to generalise from the experience of the committees with respect to these ‘variables’, as it might be in a quantitative study, but rather to explore how significant and identifiable consequences of these differences provide insight into the dynamics and limitations of participatory planning practice.

The ‘age of participation’ is part of a more general shift in the public service away from a strictly rationalist, hierarchical and universalised structure, as exemplified by Max Weber’s (1947) ‘ideal type’ bureaucracy, towards a range of more fluid, interactive and context-dependent ‘post-bureaucratic’ (Heckscher and Donnellon 1994) practices. The differences exemplified by my case studies reflect two aspects of this shift: first, different ways in which various inherited institutional characteristics – scientism, hierarchy, and so on – continue partially to shape planning practice; second, the locally contingent nature of institutional solutions, which may be constructed in place and time by the participants.
These two themes represent the key findings of my enquiry. A kind of ideal-typical bureaucratic culture continues to influence Australian planning practice, in spite of significant movement towards participation and openness in both government discourse and formal procedures, but it does so in constant tension with alternative discourses and practices, and in unpredictable ways. And ‘solutions’ – substantive/ideational, procedural/textual and relational/interpersonal – can emerge at random, rather than by design or according to general principles, out of this tension. Contemporary planning practice is locally and temporally specific.

1.3 My thesis

Thesis terminology and style conventions

Humanities disciplines, since the advent of post-structuralism, are permeated with more or less naturalised linguistic metaphors: discourse, narrative, text, vocabulary, gender and so on. In particular, the sociological and sociolinguistic literatures upon which this research draws include many similar terms with somewhat different meanings. I have generally used such terms in their ‘everyday’ (or ‘dictionary’) meanings, or specified particular technical usages.

Because this thesis is cross-disciplinary, there are many points where the discussion could take several directions. In particular, there are times when my account of events or my claims from theory may require explanations that are tangential to the analysis I am presenting. For this reason, I make extensive use of endnotes: to pursue claims to their sources; to explain otherwise casual references to features of the case studies; and occasionally for personal reflection.

Most other conventions used in this thesis should be self-explanatory. However, a few matters require clarification:

- Because this thesis is concerned with language, it minimises insertions that interrupt the ‘voices’ of others. The use of ‘[sic]’, for example, is limited to cases where there appears to be a typographical error, rather than to mark the use of conventions that differ from my own. Other square-bracketed insertions are used to supply meanings elided from the original or to render quoted text from the case studies anonymous.
Generally, I use underlining for emphasis within sentences, reserving italics to highlight quotes from the case study data, to indicate the use of non-English words/phrases, or to emphasise key framing moments such as my motivating question above.

Much of the analysis presented in this thesis refers directly to textual data generated by the case studies, principally in the form of transcripts of committee meetings. To enable the reader to identify these references, I provide many fragments from the transcripts. These fragments are for ease of reference only, and need not be read *in toto*. They are presented 'outside' the thesis, on the (unnumbered) left-hand pages and, as far as possible, beside the text describing their analysis. Other illustrative devices, such as figures and tables, are similarly presented.

Citations and references are formatted based on Curtin University's adaptation of the Harvard system, which I have adapted slightly further for my own use. Spelling conventions are Australian, according to the Macquarie Dictionary.

Some participants in this research were concerned that they should remain anonymous and, in accordance with our agreements (Appendices A and B), I have catered for this desire. In the context of the relatively small towns from which the participants come, I found it almost impossible to maintain anonymity unless the cases themselves were not identified. Therefore, throughout this thesis the following conventions are used.

- The case study details are fictionalised, using invented names for groups/agencies, and coding conventions explained in Chapter 5 (5.1).
- Where the thesis quotes from documents associated with the two case studies (minutes, reports, newspaper coverage etc.), the in-text citations for these are also fictionalised, and the documents are not listed in the references.

*Thesis outline*

This thesis is in three parts. Part 1 explains the background to and unfolding of the enquiry itself. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 develops my motivating question and intuitions into a research proposal – including specific research questions and methodology – through a review of communicative planning theory and methodological literature. Chapter 3 then outlines the linguistic framework that provides the enquiry's text-analytic tools. The remainder of Part 1 describes the
enquiry as it unfolded, first the fieldwork (Chapter 4) and then the processes of analysis and writing (Chapter 5). This descriptive account sets the scene for the enquiry’s analysis and findings, which are reported in Parts 2 and 3 of the thesis.

Part 2 focuses on one part of my motivating question— the tensions in participatory planning. In Chapter 6, I reflect generally upon how participation puts traditional ‘cultural’ norms of planning at risk, drawing on various sociological theories to frame this issue, and integrating these into a discourse-analytical framework. Chapters 7 and 8 explore the realisation of tensions in each of the two case studies through detailed examination of several moments of disagreement and misunderstanding in the committee meetings. Part 1 concludes that many of the tensions that intermittently characterised the case studies arose from differences in how participants ‘framed’ their activities. Moreover, framing conflicts arose not only from structural constraints but also from deeply embedded cultural mores and habits.

Two further ‘passes’ through the data make up the bulk of Part 3, which is concerned with the other part of my motivating question— resolution. The first pass, detailed in Chapter 9, analyses the two agencies’ conscious responses to tension, comparing those responses to normative discourses of participation: first, I look at how the committees were set up; then how difference and uncertainty were managed as the case studies progressed; and, finally, how substantive and institutional outcomes were recorded and published. In Chapters 10 and 11, I approach the problem from a different angle and show how, in the face of difference and tension, each of the two committees developed its own strategies for making decisions— locally, temporally, and often non-consciously. Part 3’s analysis shows that groups can construct their own modes of practice even in the face of unacknowledged cultural difference, without necessarily first resolving that difference. However, those modes of practice are highly context-sensitive, relying not only on the studied actions of the executive but also on the contingent habits and inclinations of all participants, on random decisions and on external events. As such, appropriate procedural modes are likely to defy theoretical prescription.
Chapter 12 concludes the thesis by reflecting, first, on my research issues and, second, on the future of collaborative planning practice and research in the light of this enquiry's implications.
2 From problem to project: discourses on participation

As Chapter 1 indicated, my PhD project was motivated initially by personal experience, which led me to wonder how tensions and apparently systemic miscommunications between bureaucrats, advocates and stakeholders might be resolved for the purpose of enhancing community participation in planning decisions. This chapter develops that initial concern into a formal proposal for enquiry. It does not rehearse all of the theory used in the analysis; rather, it draws on planning theory and methodology literature to place the research within a general orientation and methodological framework. Further theory will be introduced in Chapter 3 and as it becomes relevant to the analysis in Parts 2 and 3 of the thesis.

In this chapter, I first briefly describe the political context in which mainstream planning has shifted towards greater participation, before outlining some of the theoretical responses to that context. Of these responses, the chapter narrows in on how contemporary debates about democracy and inclusion have influenced planning theory and research, particularly through the adoption of normative principles from Jürgen Habermas' *Theory of Communicative Action* (1984, 1987) by 'communicative' planning theorists, notably John Forester (1985, 1993). I then discuss the development of the planning academy's 'communicative turn' (Healey 1996), drawing upon some key characterisations of planning as consensus building, as persuasion, as framing and as translation. This section notes the influence of philosophical and sociological theories about power and discourse, arguing that the subject matter of planning theory has extended beyond its traditional concern with procedure to broader questions about the nature of planning as an open set of social and discursive practices, exemplified in particular by Patsy Healey's 'institutional' approach. I then identify specific research questions (flagged in Chapter 1, 1.1) for this enquiry, and propose a general approach to addressing them.

2.1 Participation in practice: a crisis of confidence

Over the last several decades, governance¹ in western democracies has been subject to two apparently contradictory trends. On one hand, there has been a breakdown of consensus about modernist values and methods. With the rise of 'new social
movements' (Touraine 1981; Eder 1993; Larana et al. 1994; Melucci 1996; Bagguley and Hearn 1999) since the 1960s, hitherto marginalised voices – of women and racial/ethnic minorities; of concern for the environment, the poor, the rights of consumers – have become loud and clear. The resulting polyphony casts doubt on the existence of a shared ‘public interest’ (Boyer 1983; Thomas and Healey 1991; Bollens 2002), on the reliability (and epistemological basis) of technical approaches to problem solving (Beauregard 1989; Fischer 2000; Marris 2001), and on the democratic legitimacy of government decisions (Nader 1973, 1976; Pusey 1991; Chomsky 1999). Postmodern society is seen not as ‘structured’ by one-dimensional class divisions, but as multiplex and fragmented, with a plurality of values and knowledge systems struggling for recognition (Gyford 1991; Cochrane 1996; Sandercock 1998b, 2003). In such a society, government is expected to cater for diversity – sensitising its services to cultural difference, creating spaces for divergent voices to be heard in its policy development, and introducing elements of reflexive critique to its administration. Around the issues raised by these trends, ‘scientists and scientifically trained professionals found themselves in the unfamiliar role of villain’ (Schön 1991: 10): the legitimacy of unelected public servants had been largely a function of the public’s trust in their expertise and commitment to the ‘public good’; that trust could no longer be assumed.

On the other hand, there has been a diminution of difference in the political sphere, as mainstream media and political parties since the late 1970s have increasingly accepted the neoliberal hegemony of macro-economic criteria as measures of societal well being (Fukuyama 1989; Pusey 1991; Walter 1996; Bourdie 1998a; Chomsky 1999). Initially associated with particular conservative leaders – UK’s Margaret Thatcher and USA’s Ronald Reagan – neoliberalism was embraced in the 1980s by labour governments in Australia and, even more so, in New Zealand. This trend has been accompanied by a ‘rush to the centre’ (to appeal to the same urban, middle-class voters) on the part of most major political parties and a consequent convergence of their platforms. In this environment, there has been a markedly increased reliance on technical and economic – rather than moral or social – arguments to justify major political decisions (Walter 1996; du Gay 2000), and a consequent reduction in the diversity of values contributing to ‘big-picture’ policy debate. This has resulted in a further undermining of public trust in government: in Australia, at least, many
important decisions that seem to privilege corporate interests are debated and reported in terms to which most people do not relate well (Pusey 1991).

The classical liberal philosophy underlying this political trend emphasises individual freedom and autonomy, interpreted as freedom from state regulation – principally for enterprise – and personal responsibility for one’s own welfare. The ‘Third Way’ politics (Giddens 1998) adopted by many labour governments in the late 1990s-early 2000s – a politics that attempts to reconcile traditional socialism with the parties’ acceptance of economic liberalisation – places particular emphasis on these themes. Such liberal ethics, whether ‘Third Way’ or not, have been used to justify significant redistributions of public resources away from enterprise regulation and welfare, and towards technology and the generation of private economic activity. Land use planning, in particular, was subject to this trend throughout the 1980s, as the Thatcher and Reagan governments increasingly redirected the efforts of planning agencies ‘from regulating urban growth, to encouraging it by any and every possible means’ (Hall 1988: 343; also Beauregard 1989). At the policy level, the new ideology is reflected in a gradual trend in the public service to a more flexible, ‘performance-based’ planning (for example, Western Australian Planning Commission 2004; Office of the Deputy Prime Minister 2005) which allows for interpretation to meet developers’ and other local needs.5

The second trend, in addition to the first, has resulted in tighter financial and policy constraints on individual governance agencies (Pusey 1991) just as demands for more flexible delivery were gaining legitimacy. For planners, the tension created by these apparently conflicting demands has been exacerbated by a growing recognition of the practical limitations of traditional modes of planning/policy making, whose viability had been strained by the realities of politics (Meyerson and Banfield 1955), complexity (Lindblom 1959) and unrealised predictions (Hall 1980). Added to the epistemological and social justice issues raised by the new social movements, and the overwhelming difficulty of comprehensive planning (at least in the public service) in a neoliberal political environment, then, is a third set of doubts about the practicality of achieving major policy aims at all (Wildavsky 1973). This crisis of confidence, at a time when the public’s trust in government is very low, has led a number of planners to seek alternative norms that could help them to address planning issues at
the local level, taking into account the specific conditions and cultural values of each case.

The most enduring of the traditions resulting from this search, at least in mainstream practice, has been a focus on creating opportunities and means for those affected by policy decisions to participate in them. Public participation in planning was already being institutionalised in Anglophone jurisdictions by the late 1960s. For example, the UK’s *Town and Country Planning Act 1968* required local authorities to publicise proposed development plans and enable the public to raise matters in their formative stages (Committee on Public Participation in Planning 1969). Also at this time, in the USA, the enactment of Federal agencies’ citizen participation requirements became the subject of analysis and debate within the planning academy (Burke 1968; Arnstein 1969). By the mid-1970s, public participation had been thoroughly assimilated into political discourse, including that in Australia: that participation in policy making was the solution to the problems of modern administration had become the ‘the new conventional wisdom’ (Sandercock 1978: 119). In Murray Edelman’s words, ‘liberal radicals and authoritarians all favour participation, a tribute to the term’s symbolic potency and semantic hollowness’ (1977, quoted in Bishop and Davis 2002: 14). In Australia, as noted in Chapter 1, participation became mainstream planning practice during the 1980s and 1990s; state governments adopted it as policy during this time.

By most accounts, this rapid institutionalisation of participation was a response to demands from the citizenry, the public voicing of ‘democratic discontent’ (Bishop and Davis 2002: 14; also Gyford 1976, 1991; Sarkissian et al. 1986). The ‘people’, no longer satisfied with limiting their democratic involvement to electing representatives, asked for a direct say in matters that affect them; the system responded by providing it. As such, the widespread adoption of consultative and participatory techniques can be seen as a populist trend in itself, regardless of the outcomes. But herein lies an additional source of tension. The incorporation of political resistance into the system, as through participation, can be seen as a means of controlling it – of making it express its demands in the terms, under the constraints, and according to the values of the state (Collins 1999; Žižek 2000, 2001; Newman 2003): ‘An originally emancipatory institutional system may turn into its
own opposition and become repressive, precisely because it is a system and thereby totalizing’ (Flyvbjerg 2001: 127). In turn, this form of control generates its own resistance. Those invited to participate have continued to protest in a variety of ways: refusing to accept the terms of deliberation, rejecting outcomes of policy-making processes, undermining bureaucracies’ attempts to involve them, ‘maumauing the flak catchers’ (Wolfe 1970), and so on.7

Thus, the mere adoption – in rhetoric and in practice – of participatory practices by policy makers has generally failed to satisfy a disillusioned citizenry, and there has followed vigorous public and academic debate about whose interests these practices serve, the form(s) they should take, and the role/position of the bureaucrat or planner within them.

2.2 Participation in theory: from technique to cross-cultural practice

2.2.1 Democracy, power, knowledge

Early theoretical debates about participation in planning centred largely on two related concerns: democratic devolution and community empowerment. That is, participation could be seen either as an inclusionary complement to representative democracy, or as a way to give marginalised/disadvantaged groups more control over their futures. Both ideals were opposed to traditional, ‘paternalistic’ government in which elected politicians distributed resources upon the advice of disinterested ‘experts’; however they formed different kinds of critique.

The democratic devolution critique characterised the aims of participation as widespread involvement in deliberation and as an inclusionary means of legitimising the resulting policies (Cole 1974). It tended to focus on techniques and actions through which the involvement of potential participants could be encouraged,8 often matching these to the instrumental aims of the policy makers (Burke 1968; Sinclair 1986). The community empowerment model’s focus was more radical, emphasising that participatory processes should aim to redistribute resources and decision-making power to marginalised and disadvantaged groups in society (Arnstein 1969; Gans 1969). Programs that failed to achieve this aim – most programs, since most retained a bias towards middle-class and/or educated participants – were portrayed as worse than ineffective, as they added a gloss of democratic respectability to oppressive
practices and undermined planners’ ability to oppose those practices on technical or moral grounds (Sandercock 1978).

These two critiques, in spite of the challenge they expressed to traditional planning processes, were firmly grounded in modernist rationality. They did not deny the hegemony of technical expertise and empirical knowledge, but sought to alter the relations and practices through which planning’s guiding values were constructed. However, in 1973 John Friedmann’s Retracking America raised a third kind of critique, which challenged planning’s epistemological foundations by valorising alternative forms of knowledge. Friedmann suggested that, in order to bridge the gap between expert and personal knowledge (that is, between planner and planned-for), planning should be seen as a ‘transactive’ process, in which both parties learn from each other:

Basic to the transactive relationship between planner and client, which I now saw as crucial to establishing effective links between knowledge and organised action, was a process of mutual learning. (1973: 21)

Friedmann’s book anticipated by more than a decade what Patsy Healey has called the ‘interpretive, communicative turn in planning theory’ (1997: 28), referring to a dramatic increase in theorising that emphasises both the socially constructed nature of knowledge and interests, and the fundamentally interactive nature of planning as a practice. ‘Communicative planning’ theory tends to be normative, proceeding from an ideological commitment to participatory forms of democracy as well as a pragmatic recognition that the legitimacy of policies in a diverse society requires the resolution of conflicts. As such, it develops the ‘democratic devolution’ critique referred to above, but enriches its traditional focus on formal procedure with contemporary philosophical and sociological insights that enable attention to both the macro-structures of social institutions and the micro-processes of interaction.

2.2.2 Communicative Action

A primary influence on recent theories of democracy has been the critical theory of Jürgen Habermas, the most comprehensive exposition of which is The Theory of Communicative Action (1984, 1987). Habermas’ work is often described as dedicated to salvaging the emancipatory project of modernity in the face of
increasing criticism of its epistemological basis (Pusey 1987; Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998). It problematises rationality, proposing that the economic/administrative apparatus of modern society - the 'system' - is characterised by 'instrumental' forms of reason - expert-dominated, non-intuitive ways of processing knowledge. The dominance of instrumental rationality within the system has facilitated a separation of the public sphere from the 'lifeworld' of everyday experience and understanding, in spite of simultaneously allowing the system to colonise every aspect of people's lives. One of Habermas' aims is to promote an alternative form of reason that could support the revitalisation of a lifeworld-based public sphere of deliberation. To this end, he draws upon the speech act pragmatics of John Searle (1970) and John Austin (1975) to posit 'communicative action' as the site of normative rationality in the lifeworld. Communicative action contrasts with the 'strategic action' that characterises instrumental rationality, in that it is intersubjective and in that it is oriented towards understanding/consensus, rather than material results. Habermas suggests that discursive action can only fully meet these criteria if it complies with certain principles, thought to be universal norms. Neglect of these principles produces 'distorted' communication, which can lead to the systematic marginalisation (or privileging) of particular interests.

Two sets of Habermasian principles have been particularly important to theories of democracy (and planning). One of these is a set of 'validity claims' that, taken together, represent the 'ideal speech situation'. The validity claims are associated with four speech acts that, it is proposed, should be available to all participants in discourse (1998b): communicative (progressing the discourse); representative (expressing subjective points of view); regulative (modulating normative judgements - allowing, questioning, forbidding); and constative (interpreting or explaining external verities). Habermas suggests that these speech acts are meaningful only if judgements can be made about whether they are (respectively) comprehensible, sincere, legitimate and true. That is, these four claims underlie our ability to participate in meaningful discourse: even though the ideal speech situation may be rarely (if ever) achieved, it provides a normative basis for such participation. The second important set of Habermasian principles provides a moral/ethical basis for the problematisation and establishment of consensual norms (such as the above validity
claims) through discourse. Simplifying somewhat, his ‘discourse ethics’ states that a norm can be valid only if the knowable consequences of its general observance would be acceptable to all those affected, and that valid consensus regarding the acceptability of a norm can only be the result of practical (communicatively rational) discourse (1990: 121).

These two sets of ‘universal’ principles can be read as a prescription for gaining acceptance, by all those affected, of the outcomes of free discourse in the public sphere. This is a seductive proposition, particularly for those concerned for democratic justice in an environment of value pluralism and social/political inequality, and Habermasian norms have provided the basis for a number of proposals for alternative democratic forms that respond to the current representative system’s ‘crisis of legitimacy’. These include, for example, ‘strong democracy’ (Barber 1984), ‘discursive democracy’ (Dryzek 1990), ‘communicative democracy’ (Young 1990), and ‘deliberative democracy’ in many forms (Gutmann and Thompson 1990, 1996; Benhabib 1996a; Elster 1998a). Although these various proposals differ in their emphasis and specificity, they are all based on a decentralised political sphere, in which critical deliberation forms the basis of decisions, and in which power inequalities are minimised through a commitment to procedural ethics, including the acknowledgement of ‘non-expert’ reasoning.

In the planning field, Habermas’ thought has contributed to the development of models that privilege democratic norms and procedural ethics over an assumed ‘best outcome’ (Hillier 1998a). In the 1980s, John Forester applied Habermasian principles in his analysis of planning practice, an analysis based on observations of the day-to-day activities of working planners. Forester’s groundbreaking insight was that the work of planners can be understood not only as strategic action towards material ends, but as ‘attention-shaping’ (1980: 326; 1985: 203), that is, as communication. Habermas’s theory of communicative action, therefore, might provide a more useful normative basis for planning practice than the instrumentally rational procedural theories, such as the rational comprehensive approach (Faludi 1973), that had previously dominated the mainstream academy. From this position, Forester reimagined the role of, and skills required by, planners: planners have a duty to reflect on their own values and communicative acts, to check the latter against
validity claims, and to ensure that departures which 'distort' communication are morally justifiable. They also have a duty, where possible, to challenge or disable inequitable organisational or structural factors that result in 'systematically distorted communication' (for example, the marginalisation of non-technical discourses). This requires that planners complement technical knowledge with political and mediation skills, sensitivity to alternative values and modes of expression, awareness of social context, and capacity for reflexiveness (1989: 20-21).

Forester's work was a central part of a movement to bridge the 'long-bemoaned gap between theory and practice' (Innes 1995: 183) by grounding theory in 'real-world' ethnographic and/or experiential data. The publication of his Planning in the Face of Power (1989) was followed by a rapid transatlantic growth of interest in the political and discursive aspects of planning practice; in which planners' stories often played a central role in both the development and the exposition of theoretical perspectives (Krumholz and Forester 1990; Thomas and Healey 1991; Throgmorton 1991; Healey 1992; Innes 1992; Hoch 1994; Forester 1999b). This evolving tradition, communicative planning theory, has developed several strands, but these can be understood as linked by their treatment of planning as discourse.

2.2.3 Procedural approaches: planning as consensus building

One of these theoretical strands characterises planning as a process of joint meaning making between stakeholders: as consensus building. This approach extends the Habermasian ideal of normative consensus to substantive matters, suggesting that material disputes can be resolved through participatory deliberation, thereby establishing the legitimacy of the outcomes and avoiding future conflicts. In particular, the term 'consensus building' has come to refer to a type of group process in which representatives of all identifiable interests come together to find mutually agreeable solutions to problems through face-to-face discussion (Susskind and Cruikshank 1987; Innes 1992, 1996b). Consensus building theory is often closely associated with institutional attempts to put such processes into practice (Godschalk et al. 1994; Innes et al. 1994; Innes and Booher 1999a; Susskind et al. 1999; Susskind et al. 2000) and, therefore, tends to be pragmatically oriented to method. It explores, firstly, how to establish and manage consensus processes and, secondly, their implications for planning institutions.
In 1981, Roger Fisher and William Ury popularised a consensual approach to negotiation through their book *Getting to Yes*, proposing that negotiations could be successful for all participants if participants focussed on trying to meet everybody's core (that is, non-negotiable) interests, rather than on achieving previously decided outcomes (Fisher et al. 1999). Consensus building theory in planning draws strongly upon this idea of mutual gains (Susskind and Field 1996; Susskind et al. 2000), but recasts it from the perspective of the planner as facilitator or mediator (rather than from that of one of the interested parties). This perspective raises a range of additional questions: for instance, who to include; how to convince people that consensus-building is in their interests; how to ensure that legal and policy requirements are met; how to maintain participants' status as representatives; how to respond to their dissatisfactions during the process; and how to balance power relationships between participants (Susskind and Cruikshank 1987: 11, 24-25, 189-192; Godschalk et al 1994: 29). Nonetheless, two principles remain central: distinguishing between participants' negotiable and non-negotiable ideals (see also Forester 1999b on 'deep values'; Gutmann and Thompson 1990, 1996 on resolving moral disagreements); and seeking common ground in the face of specific disputes. Emery Roe suggests that policy analysts should adopt cultural critical techniques to identify common 'metanarratives' underlying participants' views, so that these deeply embedded assumptions can be used to 'underwrite and stabilise' problem solving methods (1994: 4).

This dispute resolution/negotiation approach to consensus building, however, confronts limitations when the planning task in question is broader or more anticipatory than a specific problem (Innes et al. 1994: 5): the issues at stake may be unknown, the need for future coordination precludes an obvious 'endpoint', and success is harder to measure in material terms. In the 1990s, academic interest grew in the extension of consensus building techniques to strategic planning. Judith Innes, in particular, began to focus on attempts to develop 'growth management' programs through consensual processes in the USA (1992), and led a landmark study for the California Policy Seminar (CPS, a partnership between the University of California and the state government) into the potential of such programs (Innes et al. 1994). These studies extended the conclusions of Innes' earlier research into the qualities of effective social indicators (de Neufville and Barton 1987; Innes 1994), to suggest
that the benefits of consensus building are not limited to resolving disputes – its
ability to do this comes from its role in constructing shared knowledge and problem-
solving methods. That is, part of the success of consensus building processes can
manifest as institutional enhancement, rather than as formal outcomes (Innes et al.
1994: 46). In particular, the CPS study concluded that consensus building creates or
enhances three types of ‘capital’, each of which contributes to personal and/or
organisational capacity for action. ‘Social capital’, in this context, refers to networks
of trust and communication that allow enhanced interaction between participants and
their organisations. ‘Intellectual capital’ means shared knowledge and understandings – facts, cultural narratives and perspectives – which are constructed
during the process, and which ‘become embedded in the understandings of the actors
in the community’ (Innes 1998: 53) to provide a common basis for discussion.
‘Political capital’ refers to power amassed through the formation of alliances and
agreements – the result of increased social and intellectual capital – which facilitates
future action (in particular, implementation of plans). This emphasis on institutional
capacity, rather than dispute resolution, is a central characteristic of what has since
become known as ‘collaborative planning’ (Healey 1997; also Innes 1998; Woltjer
2000; Booher and Innes 2002; Margerum 2002).

2.2.4 Debates

Consensus building theory, as indicated above, is oriented to method. This feature
exposes it – and the entire body of communicative planning theory – to the critique
that, in focussing almost entirely on procedure, it neglects the importance of planning
outcomes, which are likely to outlast the interests of particular stakeholders
(Campbell and Marshall 1999; Voogd and Woltjer 1999). Related to this critique are
claims that the theory fails to engage adequately with the problem of power. Oren
Yiftachel and Margo Huxley, for example, suggest that concentrating on the micro-
processes of interaction enables consensus building to ignore, and thus to reproduce,
power structures governing the state’s production and regulation of space (Yiftachel
and Huxley 2000: 910-11). Further, a number of researchers have identified the
potential for consensual agreements to be ‘thin’ – the result of processes that avoid
engaging with important, contentious issues that might bring power struggles to the
surface (Lapintie 1998; Neuman 2000; Gregory et al. 2001).
Even without invoking the substantive, the notion of power is problematic. Consensus models tend to treat power inequalities as the result of systematically distorted communication, and suggest that they can be ‘bracketed’ and managed by putting aside strategic action in favour of ‘authentic dialogue’ as part of the consensus building process (Hillier 1993; Innes 1995; Innes and Booher 1999a, 2002). However, there is abundant evidence that participants in such processes are often unwilling or unable to abandon either their strategic positions or the ‘background resources’ from which their power derives – institutional or personal networks, political influence, economic clout, and so on (Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998; Campbell and Marshall 2000; Hillier 2000b, 2002a; Phelps and Tewdwr-Jones 2000; McGuirk 2001). For some, this problem is not simply a matter of recalcitrance; it is inherent when there is a (perceived) need for participants to represent social groups or interests. A group representative may be authorised by their constituency to press for their position, but not to compromise or negotiate, nor to adopt a planning agency’s broader agenda. Thus, there may be a fundamental conflict between the legitimacy that representation gives a participant, and their ability to participate on the terms of the process (Abram 2000). Ironically, the costs of negotiation and compromise may be particularly heavy for participants representing constituencies which themselves reach positions by consensus, as is often the case in Indigenous Australia, for example (Williams 1985, 1987, 1994; Sutton 1990; Sullivan 1996). Moreover, ‘representation’ of constituencies that cannot speak for themselves, such as non-humans or past/future generations, is particularly problematic in the consensus building context, as the representatives’ power/authorisation must lie in epistemic claims that are in an important sense non-negotiable (O’Neill 2001).

Some theorists, drawing on the work of Michel Foucault, have further criticised consensus theory’s Habermasian framework as attentive only to the surface of power relations, stressing the need to acknowledge the position of planning in a dynamic network of discourses and practices that sustain certain kinds of control (Huxley 2000; Huxley and Yiftachel 2000; McGuirk 2001). Planners cannot disengage from these networks, which are embedded in the institutions that frame all their activities. Moreover, it has been shown in a number of anthropological case studies that procedural norms such as deliberation and persuasion can actually disadvantage
participants whose local cultural styles of negotiation and decision making are based on alternative values, such as family obligation, solidarity, or status maintenance (for example, Dillon 1991 in Indigenous Australia; Tauxe 1995 in rural USA; Gambetta 1998 in Latin America).

The Foucauldian conception of power as discourse has also been central to some recent developments of planning’s radical critique. Theorists such as Oren Yiftachel, Bent Flyvbjerg and Leonie Sandercock, challenging the ‘conventional wisdom’ that planning has been a reformist project directed towards improving people’s living conditions (Yiftachel 1996; Sandercock 1998a, 1998b, 2003), have, like the ‘democracy’ advocates, turned to discourse. They demonstrate convincingly that planning has a ‘dark side’ (Yiftachel 1994, 1998; Flyvbjerg 1996) that serves the interests of power elites both materially, by spatially controlling minorities (Yiftachel 1992, 1994; Sandercock 1998a), and discursively, by legitimising those interests as rational and universal (Mansbridge 1992, 1995; Flyvbjerg 1998; Sandercock 1998a, 1998b, 2003). These authors claim that planning theory, rather than seeking to bracket power inequalities, must acknowledge the conflicts of interest between powerful and powerless and support exposés of the ‘political violence’ routinely performed by planning institutions.

A final form of critique targets consensus building’s normative orientation to consensus itself, pointing out that in a culturally and socially diverse society, conflict may be not only inevitable, but desirable. According to this view, ‘consensus’ is an illusion – a ‘temporary result of a provisional hegemony’ (Mouffe 1996: 10) – which may even pose a danger to inclusive democracy. Habermasian ‘universal’ validity principles, therefore, are equally illusory and, as the anthropological studies cited above suggest, can be seen as an imposition of dominant cultural norms on others (see also the cases in Abram and Waldren 1998). Planning theory, then, should develop from an acceptance of ‘persistent agonism’ (McGuirk 2001: 214; Hillier 2002a: 146) and its expression in a range of formal and informal discursive spaces (Hillier 2002b). Instead of privileging agreement, planning processes should emphasise respect for difference (Young 1990, 2000; Sandercock 1998b) and allow for the influence not only of deliberative dialogue/negotiation, but also of alternative participatory modes – bargaining, lobbying, ‘going round the back’ (Hillier 2000b).
2.2.5 Analytical approaches: planning as rhetoric, framing, translation

As the above brief outline of critiques suggests, the procedural approach represented by consensus building is only one of several under the umbrella of communicative planning theory, albeit perhaps the most obviously useful to practitioners looking for applicable techniques. In addition, there is within the democratic critique a number of descriptive/analytical approaches that draw upon notions of discourse to explain participatory planning. Jim Throgmorton (1991, 1993, 1996, 2000), for example, has attempted to account for his experiences as both a planner and a city councillor by adopting a model of planning discourse – including ‘rational’ discourse such as survey instruments – as rhetoric, through which an imagined audience is constituted and, perhaps, persuaded. This view dispenses with any vestigial claims to neutrality on the part of planners or to universality on the part of the information they provide, instead acknowledging that planners seek to achieve value-laden goals and treating the production of information as action in the ‘flow’ of political argumentation (2000).\(^{15}\)

Another way of understanding the political element of planning is as a contest between alternative framings of problems and solutions. ‘Framing’, as I am using the term, is a metaphor for the cognitive and actional patterns through which actors experience and interpret the world, and through which they construct social meanings – patterns dependent on cultural and situational context (Malinowski 1946) as well as on actors’ idiosyncrasies (Bateson 1972; Goffman 1974; Rein 1989; Gamson 1992; Tannen 1993; MacLachlan and Reid 1994). These patterns are given expression through symbolic practices, taking the form of particular narratives (Frawley 1992) or ‘storylines’ (Hajer 1995, 2003) that construct relations between events and give them meaning. That is, framings are realised as discourses, in the Foucauldian sense: as ways of representing subjects in relation to specified or tacit norms. In any political debate, different understandings and representations of reality compete for the status of ‘masterframe’ (Eder 1996), and from this struggle new policy discourses emerge (Laws and Rein 2003). Researchers in the planning field have examined this process extensively: for example, with respect to globally circulating discourses surrounding policy issues (Hajer 1995; Myerson and Rydin 1996); struggles over particular land use and/or environmental policies at the national level (Whatmore and Boucher 1992; Myerson and Rydin 1994; Feitelson 1999;
Vigar et al. 2000); legitimisation of site-specific development or management activities (Beauregard 1995; Healey 1999; Hillier 2000a; Raco 2002); and popular national narratives/myths/images underlying day-to-day practice (de Neufville and Barton 1987; Lees and Demeritt 1998). The framing metaphor can provide planners with a way of thinking reflexively about their assumptions and procedures, adding value to planning processes (Schön 1991; Rein and Schön 1993).

Another useful characterisation of planning is as a process of translation. Not only do different discourses/representations meet in policy debate, so do different modes of expression. In participatory planning, this may include discourses and registers (contextually appropriate styles of discourse) that are not easily incorporated – fixed policy and legislation tends to place tight constraints on the content, structure and style of local plans (Marris 1982; Tewdwr-Jones and Thomas 1998). The planner’s role in such cases may be dominated by the need to mediate between local concerns and relevant legislative/policy requirements. This will usually involve a need to ‘translate’ those concerns into discourses that match the state’s rationality – in general, an instrumental form of rationality that assumes a utilitarian ‘public interest’ (Calvin and Nelson 1985; Howe 1992; for examples, Healey 1992; Ferraro 1996; Healey and Hillier 1996; Abram and Waldren 1998; Tewdwr-Jones and Thomas 1998). Further, diverse issues raised in participatory planning usually need to be synthesised as matters relevant to identifiable statutory responsibilities (that is, which some agency can legally pursue), a process involving not only translation, but also, often, significant transformation (Iedema 2001b).

There is another level at which the concept of translation is important to participatory planning. A number of theorists have drawn upon Actor-Network Theory (Chapter 6) to point out that all opinions, in order to be represented in the debate, must be mediated – synthesised, translated, and reproduced in some form. According to this view, translation becomes a form of power more easily appropriated by some actors than others (Murdoch and Marsden 1995; Thrift 1996; Hillier 2000b, 2002a; Bridge and Watson 2002). That is, it discriminates in favour of those able to articulate a point of view within the discursive arenas that influence planning and decision making, for example, bureaucracy, media, politics, commerce and law.
2.2.6 Synthesis: planning as a cultural institution

The previous subsection noted a number of approaches within communicative planning theory that supplement the process orientation of consensus-building with more critical/analytical orientations, as a counter to the accusation that ‘[l]eading communicative planning scholars conflate theorization with normative prescription’ (Huxley and Yiftachel 2000: 337). In this subsection, I concentrate on what I believe has been the most successful attempt to synthesise the two approaches and develop theory that addresses both practical and analytical concerns: the ‘institutionalist’ approach developed by Patsy Healey and expounded most fully in her book, Collaborative Planning (1997, 2005a).

Healey’s work represents a move beyond consensus theory’s focus on individual agency – an implicit assumption that procedural quality is largely a matter of decisions (such as the adoption of Habermasian communicative norms) taken by individuals or groups – to a concern with institutional transformation. Her research into the implementation of development plans in Thatcher’s Britain (1983; Healey et al. 1988) led her to the view that the planning system was not simply a site of rational deduction, but an arena in which complex networks of interests and practices were continually mediated. Further, the struggles between these interests and practices acted to alter the system itself – as local negotiations were being shaped by global and national planning goals, local resistances were transforming regional and national policies. The ‘institutionalist’ perspective on planning was developed, in part, to account for this dynamic reciprocal relationship between institutional environments and situated interactions.

Healey drew heavily upon the Habermas-inspired work of communicative planning theorists such as Forester (1989, 1999b) and Innes (1995, 1996), and added to this a sociological perspective, influenced especially by Anthony Giddens’ (1984) structuration theory. Giddens is one of a number of sociologists who has rejected the dualism between structure and agency – social life is determined neither by objective, pre-existing power structures, nor by the free choices of autonomous subjects. Rather, ‘structuration’ reframes social structure as a process:

The structural properties of social systems exist only in so far as forms of social conduct are reproduced chronically across time and space. The
structuration of institutions can be understood in terms of how it comes about that social activities become 'stretched' across wide spans of time-space. (1984: xxi)

That is, the 'structures' which shape and constrain social action – institutions – are themselves constituted and sustained by that action. The relationship between structure and agency is reciprocal. Moreover, these dynamic power structures are not limited to the spheres of economic and political relations, nor even to the mechanisms that ensure society's consent to be governed. They are embedded in the assumptions that guide every aspect of social life (Lukes 1974). As Foucault demonstrated in his studies of modern institutions (1965, 1970, 1973, 1976, 1977, 1985), power inheres in the discourses that constitute objects of knowledge – power relations are continually 'brought into being' as these discourses are invoked in everyday actions. And, consequently, resistance is not limited to the overtly political – it is 'a matter of daily confrontation' (Healey 1997: 46).

For me, the strength of Healey’s planning theory is its sociological perspective, which explicitly relates planning events to broader socio-cultural concerns – power relations, governance practices, and the construction of knowledge, for example – and to questions of societal change. By treating planning as a cultural institution – a set of tacit ‘rules’ governing practice – and conceptually opening that institution to the possibility of resistance and transformation through situated action, Healey provides an analytical framework that allows any aspect of planning practice to be examined as part of a greater whole not only for its immediate effects, but for its transformational potential. Throgmorton’s rhetorical tropes, for example, are cultural constructs whose efficacy depends on their embeddedness (or their ability to achieve embeddedness) in the understandings of their audience. Contestation between issue framings is precisely a process of institutional evolution – institutional knowledge and practices are constructed, in large part, as policy discourses. And the concept of translation is crucial not only to an understanding of participatory planning as taking place across cultures, but also to the institutionalisation of its products – their mobilisation across space and time. Further, treating the textual and material results of planning as historically situated cultural productions helps to overcome a common dualism between 'process' and 'outcome'. The products of
planning processes are not only spatial, but include discourses and relations that may profoundly affect the way social actors understand, interact with, and evaluate their spatio-material environment – ‘process and substance are co-constituted, not separate spheres’ (Healey 2003: 111).

‘Institutions’, in a sociological sense, may be defined as established norms or patterns of behaviour and relations associated with particular social contexts. Healey’s institutionalism bridges this sociological concept with the word’s more common ‘dictionary’ meaning – formal organisations with specific (usually public) functions – through two key ideas. Agencies of governance (such as planning departments) are formal organisations which carry power structures and behavioural norms into specific situations (Healey 2005a: 322-23). Their institutional design, therefore, has implications for the transformational potential of those situations. In recent publications, Healey posits three interacting levels of governance: specific episodes (or planning projects); institutional practices and processes more generally; and the ‘deeper’ governance cultures that lend legitimacy to such practices and processes (2004a, 2006; Coaffee and Healey 2003). Research suggests that, although significant rapid changes are afoot in British governance at both the ‘deeper culture’ and ‘specific episode’ levels, the level of institutional practice – the ‘mobilisation of bias’ (from Lukes 1974; Clay and Schaffer 1984) – is proving relatively static (Healey et al. 2002; Coaffee and Healey 2003). The idea of institutional capacity refers to the relational networks of a place (Healey 1997: 61), including in particular organisations as sites for social action. Through mobilisation of such networks, local institutional norms evolve and are sustained and/or transformed (Healey et al. 2002).

This concept of institutional capacity draws upon a relational view of space and place. It has become commonplace to assert that ‘community’ is a multifaceted concept, and that people take part in many different communities in the course of day to day life: communities of interest, of knowledge, of corporeal identity, of economic dependence, and so on. Communities are enabled by infrastructure networks that mediate flows of communication and contact (Graham and Healey 1999: 630; Thrift 1996; Castells 2000; Graham and Marvin 2001), networks that are rapidly expanding:
In these globalising days, when our relational webs connect us to a huge range of possible social relations and stores of knowledge and understanding, the notion of a place-based community falls apart and we are plunged into a multi-cultural world. (Healey 1997: 65-66)

Places, as social constructs with particular meanings for particular communities, are linked into these relational webs and, therefore, are similarly manifold, sustained by multiple superimposed social networks at different scales. And space, as a consequence, cannot be treated as ‘flat’. It is topographically complex and dynamic, continually constructed in socio-technical processes (Harvey 1996; Graham and Marvin 2001).

This aspect of Healey’s model, rather understated in the original Collaborative Planning (1997), has become prominent in some of her more recent writing (2004a, 2004b, 2006; Graham and Healey 1999; Healey et al. 2002), which uses the relational characterisation of space to support a ‘relational’ style of governance, attentive to the multiple social networks that give meaning to places and their resulting ‘power geometries’ (Graham and Healey 1999: 642), and cognisant of how the social processes of governance themselves add to and alter these layers of meaning. Normatively, she claims, these foci imply that planning practices require an emphasis on communication and interpretation in recognition of the many value systems and practices that contribute to place making. Discourse is central to building institutional capacity and to integrating planning’s spatial and procedural aspects.

In sum, planners work within cultural institutions characterised by certain power relations, and they make (often subconscious) daily choices about whether to reproduce or to resist those relations. Thus, they have the option of becoming ‘frame-reflective practitioners’ (Rein 1989; Schön 1991): to be sensitive to the cultural situatedness of discourses of governance and open to alternative framings that the participants in planning processes bring with them. Such heightened sensitivity, it is claimed, enriches the potential of participatory planning to be truly ‘collaborative’: to enhance institutional capacity as well as to jointly construct substantive/processual planning solutions across cultural difference.
2.3 *An institutionalist enquiry*

2.3.1 Emerging questions

The institutionalist perspective allows us to treat many of the tensions inherent in participatory planning as arising from the difficulty of interacting across cultural difference: the culture(s) of planning – the instituted beliefs, relations and practices shared by practitioners – may not be shared or understood by other participants. So the personal experiences outlined in Chapter 1 – the disorientation I felt when I moved from the community sector into the public service – may perhaps be understood as a form of ‘culture shock’. Successful collaborative planning is a cross-cultural practice (Baum 2000). Participants are engaged not only in resolving substantive land use issues or disputes, but also in reconciling different systems of knowledge, practices and power relations.

This perspective raises a number of questions. First, it problematises the cultural characteristics – the ‘institutional inheritance’ (Healey et al. 2002: 15) – of planning. What are these characteristics; and how might practitioners recognise and reflect upon them? Second, it recognises that in collaborative planning, deliberative procedures – how participants are authorised to speak, how reasoning is to be appraised, how decisions should be made, how related actions (such as deliberation, decision and implementation) are staged and combined – are culturally situated, and likely to be as contentious as the substantive issues they are meant to resolve. What kinds of tensions might this create? Third, these tensions are likely to create significant barriers to reaching consensus or even to reaching the kind of agonistic acceptance advocated by Hillier (2003). By what ‘metaprocesses’ might divergent norms and practices be reconciled? Fourth, cultural tensions and practice-reconciling ‘metaprocesses’ may effect the institutions of planning in both expected and unexpected ways. How might we recognise, understand and value such effects? Finally, the institutionalist perspective draws attention to the site at which the discursive process of planning and the implementation of decisions meet. If we continue to see planning as an ‘outcome-oriented’ practice, how might collaborative decisions and processes be ‘translated’ for the sake of those in different cultural realms who need to turn them into outcomes?
These questions form the central concerns of my enquiry. They are cultural concerns and, as such, deeply context-dependent (Geertz 1973, 1983). Therefore, this research explores them in specific contexts, seeking not to generalise from those contexts, but to gain from their detail some understanding about how the potential of collaborative planning to resolve those questions might be realised (Flyvbjerg 2001), as well as to develop research methods and ideas that might be applicable beyond this enquiry. In particular, I find this detail in case studies of participatory planning.

2.3.2 Case studies in planning research

The qualitative case study approach is perhaps the most widely used methodology in planning research, particularly within the communicative paradigm. It is appropriate in this context because my research questions are concerned with the relationship between situated social practices and instituted knowledge. As such, they are explicitly positioned within a ‘constructionist’ epistemology (Crotty 1998): they assume that knowledge does not directly reflect the reality it ‘knows’, but is produced in social institutions and practices. Michael Crotty (1998) claims that such a stance tends to lead researchers to qualitative methods (see also Lincoln and Guba 1985; Denzin and Lincoln 1994; Guba and Lincoln 1994; Sarantakos 1998; Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000; Blaikie 2000; Silverman 2000), which typically draw upon several points of view to assist in interpretation. Quantitative methods, in contrast, tend to be associated with the positivist view of knowledge as objective and discoverable only from the privileged position of impartiality, a view that most communicative planning theory explicitly rejects in favour of a constructionist stance (Healey 1997: 29).

However, the methodological issues for this enquiry are not only epistemological, but also practical. Quantitative methods explain complex phenomena by reducing them to discrete variables which can be controlled to test their relationships. The phenomena I wish to explore, however, are embedded in variables that cannot be controlled, nor easily understood in universal terms – for example, personal styles and choices. Such phenomena are best observed in a natural setting, and interpreted within their own social and historical context(s) (Lincoln and Guba 1985; Flyvbjerg 2001). Case studies provide such a setting: ‘[a] case study allows an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events’ (Yin 1984: 2).
This is a particularly important consideration for this project, in which the relationship between data (discourse realised in participatory planning) and its context (encounters between public-sector planning and other cultural institutions) is one of the principal objects of enquiry.

From a practical point of view, the case study also represents a more manageable framework than the general societal matrix in which all human action is embedded, and in which ethnographic study of distant cultures often takes place. In a case study, all purposeful action is associated with the particular practices under investigation, producing an enriched set of data and facilitating that data's 'strategic selection' (Stake 1994). Moreover, a case study enables the researcher to place actions and actors in (local) historical, as well as situational, contexts. Unlike observation of a wide set of isolated instances of the practice (David Silverman [2000] gives several examples of this sort of project), a case study places the action in a temporal stream of events, allowing a deeper understanding of actors' motivations and assisting in 'sorting out' what matters in the process (see Lincoln and Guba 1985 on 'persistent observation': 304).

The specific approach adopted for this enquiry is that of the 'instrumental' (Stake 1994) or 'descriptive' (Yin 2003) case study, which aims to build theoretical insights into the issue of lay-persons' participation in bureaucratic planning, as well as finding each case intrinsically interesting. I have chosen to examine more than one case study to better understand specific, identifiable contextual factors, and also to facilitate some distance from the 'normalising' effect of immersion in a single case. Participants embedded in particular institutional environments tend to accept the prevailing conditions as 'normal' and comfortable (Willey 2005: 310-11): it is often only possible to reflect critically on those conditions when confronted with an alternative.

My intentions are critical, albeit in the 'minimal' sense (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000: 128-29) of 'showing connections and causes which are hidden' (Fairclough 1992: 9), rather than that of seeking to expose repressive strategies on the part of the state and/or of capital. Hence, this research is informed by the 'dialectical logic' of critical theory (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999: 32), which views social experience as constituted in its historical-political context. Mats Alvesson and Kaj Sköldberg
note that 'critical theory is not primarily an empirically oriented approach' (2000: 130). However, it can provide a theoretical orientation for empirical studies, by informing consideration of the power structures underlying observable social phenomena, rather than accepting data at face value. Some such orientation is necessary, according to Pierre Bourdieu, who

maintains that every act of research is simultaneously empirical (it confronts the world of observable phenomena) and theoretical (it necessarily engages hypotheses about the underlying structure of relations that observations are designed to capture). (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 35)

Lilie Chouliaraki and Norman Fairclough propose that critical research needs to develop 'an epistemology which is a constructivist structuralism' (1999: 32, drawing on Bourdieu 1990a), which, akin to Giddens' 'structuration', rests upon the mutually constitutive relationship between societal structure and social action. This epistemology approximates Crotty's 'constructionism' – it acknowledges that structure is constituted in social action, but also perceives it as posing genuine constraints on such action. Such is the orientation of the present project: as an explicitly institutionalist enquiry, it assumes reflexive effects between communicative behaviours within a committee and their fields of production (Bourdieu 1991), planning and other cultural institutions. It assumes, moreover, that those effects can emerge in particular times and places in unplanned, unexpected ways; that they are not always intended or acknowledged by the participants.

Consequently, the focus of the enquiry is not on 'what people say' about collaborative planning, but on 'what people do' when they do it (Trigger 1997). I seek the points of view of the actors, not as explanations in themselves (Silverman 1993; Bourdieu 1999, also 1998b: 132 on 'the scholastic fallacy'), nor as moral guidance, but rather for two distinct purposes: as the realisation of intertexts that might help to place social action associated with the planning processes in a broader context; and as alternative interpretations through which to reflect on my own; that is, as additions to my 'interpretive repertoire' (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000: 250).

This empirical-ethnographic approach involves direct observation of the action. Furthermore, the enquiry's concern with changing perceptions, relations and practices requires a longitudinal study, in which both observation and participant
reporting take place in ‘real time’. Carl-Gunnar Janson (1981) cites several studies which suggest that people’s reporting of their own behaviour changes retrospectively, a finding that my own research tends to support. Logistically, moreover, the research questions themselves require a real-time study. Cultural differences, and the ‘metaprocesses’ by which divergent practices are resolved, are likely largely to be realised in spoken discourse, which is necessarily altered when reported retrospectively to a third party. To explore these issues, therefore, I need access to discourse in its original context.

2.3.3 A discourse approach

Although communicative planning theory is fundamentally concerned with discourse – as communication, as power, as *episteme* – few researchers have applied any detailed analysis to the texts that constitute and provide evidence of that discourse (however, see Tett and Wolf 1991; Whatmore and Boucher 1992; Fischler 1995; Iedema 1997a; Rydin 1998; Collins 1999; Feitelson 1999). The institutionalist framework, as I understand it, allows space for such an analysis; indeed, one of its strengths is that its broadly sociological orientation opens cases to alternative analytical approaches that connect the practice of planning with data that is otherwise difficult to describe. The analytical approach I have adopted for this research is a textual focus within a sociological framing. More specifically, the enquiry uses the methodology of critical discourse analysis (CDA).

The following chapter explains the CDA methodology, and details the theoretical framework used in this enquiry to analyse texts in context.
3 Analysing language: discourses on discourse

Chapter 2 drew on communicative planning theory to identify an institutionalist orientation for this enquiry and to develop my motivating question about resolving tensions into specific research questions about the cross-cultural nature of participatory planning, the metaprocesses through which cross-cultural tensions are reconciled, and the translation of substantive and institutional outcomes. It then outlined in general terms a proposed case study methodology through which to explore those issues, concluding that the marriage of textual and social analysis known as ‘critical discourse analysis’ (CDA) offers a useful approach: first, by looking beyond the substantive aspects of communicative events to the management of collaborative meaning making and, second, by linking the micro-processes of communication with the broader social practice of which it is part (in this case, the practice of participatory planning).

In this chapter, I outline the theoretical framework of systemic functional linguistics, which provides CDA with specific tools for textual analysis. The framework is based on a view of language as a ‘social semiotic’ (Halliday 1978) – a system for building and exchanging social meanings. It is thus suited to the socially motivated orientation of CDA, which itself forms part of a more general movement in linguistics towards a concern with social, rather than only formal, properties of language. Having briefly summarised this background in relation to the concerns of my enquiry, I explain some key features of the systemic functional model of language: stratification; multi-dimensionality; relationship to context, and systemic change. These features are central assumptions informing the enquiry’s analysis.

3.1 The social turn in linguistics

Chapter 2 outlined a movement in planning theory away from a concern with modernist-rationalist procedure, first, to a concern with democratic legitimacy; consequently to an interest in alternative forms of rationality on which to base formal processes; and, from there, to critical-analytical concerns about the nature of planning as a social practice that expresses power relations and culturally situated beliefs and values. I noted that this movement is often called the ‘communicative turn’ in planning theory, corresponding to the ‘linguistic turn’ in philosophy and
other humanities disciplines (Rorty 1967). Its characteristic features are a focus on the interactive nature of planning and particular attention to discourse.

In parallel to this communicative/linguistic turn, there has been a growing interest within the discipline of linguistics in social aspects of language, representing a break from the mainstream structuralist concern with *langue* (Saussure 1966), or the competence of the 'ideal speaker-listener' (Chomsky 1965: 3). This interest, which can broadly be called 'social linguistics', has taken a number of forms, the common threads of which are an analytical focus on actual speech in context, or what Ferdinand de Saussure (1966) called *parole*, and an emphasis on social (or societal) interpretations, rather than cognitive ones. Early sociolinguistic studies (Labov 1966, 1970; Bernstein 1971) described social stratification of languages, usually using quantitative methods, and often aimed to promote a measure of respect for those dialects and registers stigmatised by mainstream education and media in what Pierre Bourdieu later termed 'a symbolic violence' (1991: 51). Another stream has focussed on cultural and sub-cultural differences in communicative behaviour, drawing attention to the potential misunderstandings implied (Gumperz 1982; Garcia and Otheguy 1989).¹ Such work draws upon disciplines other than linguistics – especially anthropology, psychology and sociology – for its understandings of culture and context. Social linguistics, like communicative planning, is an interdisciplinary endeavour.

What I am interested in for this enquiry, however, is not making general claims about socio-economic and cultural differences in language use (although such differences inevitably affect my data), but rather examining specifically what it is that people are doing (intentionally or otherwise) when they communicate through spoken or written texts, and how this relates to institutional context. It is generally accepted that communication is not the simple transfer of messages (Schirato and Yell 2000). Communication also builds and maintains social and personal relationships, reproduces epistemologies, organises and stores information, and pursues strategic (as well as communicative) goals. Moreover, just as action and social structure are mutually productive, so are context and communication, a dialectical relationship that has long been acknowledged (Volosinov 1973; Fairclough 1989, 1992). This
complexity has, over the last twenty years, engaged a rich cross-disciplinary field of discourse analysis (van Dijk 1985, 1997; Gee 1999).

3.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

The term ‘critical discourse analysis’ (Fairclough 1995; Fairclough and Wodak 1997), has come to describe the investigation of the relationship between language use, power and ideology. ‘Critical’, in this context, explicitly evokes the Marxist critical theory of the Frankfurt School (Fairclough and Wodak 1997) to suggest a particular moral and political motivation: to question the ‘hidden causes’ (Fairclough 1992: 9) of unequal power relations, and to open possibilities for emancipatory social change (Fairclough 1989: 233). This motivation was evident in the ‘critical linguistics’ developed at the University of East Anglia in the 1970s (Fowler et al. 1979; Kress and Hodge 1979), which drew on Michael Halliday’s (1978) socially-oriented grammar (3.3) to analyse the ways that texts ‘work’ ideologically – for example, to (re)produce political bias, to naturalise social structure, to disguise uncertainty, and so on.

CDA, as developed principally by Norman Fairclough, extends this approach in two significant ways. First, it finds its justification in social questions, treating textual analysis not as an end in itself, but as a social research strategy: it does not ask ‘what is [this] text doing?’ but ‘how are [these] social processes present in discourse?’ It therefore engages heavily with social theory, not simply as an interdisciplinary source of concept definitions, but to frame its own logic. That is, it develops a ‘transdisciplinary’ approach, in which ‘the logic of one theory is put to work in the elaboration of another without the latter being simply reduced to the former’ (Fairclough 2000a: 163) in an attempt to address the weaknesses of each. Specifically, it seeks to connect the linguistic analysis of texts with social theoretical issues, and to ‘operationalise’ social theories on discourse (such as those of Foucault and Habermas) by providing them with text-analytical tools.

Second, and as a consequence, CDA broadens the conceptual links between language and the social. Its object of analysis is not language, but discourse, a social practice: ‘an irreducible part of social life’ (Fairclough 2003: 2) that (in accordance with the critical-institutional perspective) both shapes and is shaped by social institutions.
Thus, texts provide evidence not only of ideology at work, but of discourse as itself a domain of social struggle (Fairclough 1992: 28). However, they do not do so transparently, and CDA demands explicit attention beyond the text to the social practices and institutions in which it plays a part. Fairclough has developed techniques to meet this demand (1992, 2003; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999: 59-68), using ‘orders of discourse’ (Foucault 1971) as a mediating concept between texts and institutions. An order of discourse is the discursive aspect of an institution: a historically situated set of discursive conventions (genres, discourses and styles) with which the institution is associated (Fairclough 1989: 17, 1992: 68, 1995: 188, 2003: 24; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999: 58). Texts may draw selectively on a range of orders of discourse, reflecting — and creating — flows and boundaries between institutions. Textual analysis in CDA, then, includes interdiscursive and intertextual analysis to locate the text within a network of orders of discourse and, drawing on the dialectical relationship between practice and institution, to identify how these orders of discourse are sustained or transformed by networking processes.

Thus, CDA marries sociological and linguistic theory to produce a framework, ‘both theory and method’ (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999: 16), that is particularly suited to the investigation of social change. Its techniques provide an opportunity to extend the insights of communicative planning theorists by paying closer attention to language, the principal medium of communication, in its social context.

3.3 **Systemic Functional Linguistics**

3.3.1 **A stratified, multi-dimensional model of discourse**

CDA makes use of both sociological and linguistic analysis. The linguistics used and promoted by Fairclough is based on Michael Halliday’s (1978) model of language as a ‘social semiotic’: that is, as a system for building and exchanging social meanings. Halliday’s systemic functional grammar (1985) provides conceptual tools for linking text to context, and for unpacking discursive strategies that contribute to the (re)production of cultural institutions.\(^4\)

Systemic functional linguistics (SFL) sees language (more broadly, semiosis) as a system mediating between the meanings produced in social life and their expression through bodily processes such as talking/listening and writing/reading. As such, the
system itself is stratified (Figure 3.1), with a layer of semantics linked to meaning, and a layer of phonology/graphology linked to expression. Between these strata is a layer of ‘wording’ resources: lexicogrammar, including both lexis (vocabulary) and grammar (syntax and morphology). The dotted arrows in Figure 3.1 indicate a relationship of realisation: the potential defined by higher levels is realised in the terms, and within the constraints, of those below.5

This stratified model gives SFL scope to describe language use at various levels of detail. At the expression level, the linguistic ‘unit’ is the phoneme (sound) or grapheme (character); at the lexicogrammatical level, it is the clause or sentence. By extending the notion of linguistic system to include a semantic level — a level at which meanings are produced — SFL also treats the text as a linguistic unit, as ‘the locus of choices in … meaning’ (Eggins 1994: 307). These choices are realised at the lexicogrammatical level in the ways in which resources are integrated — textured — to ‘form a unified whole’ (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 2). Jim Martin (1992: 1) suggests that this meaning stratum should be called ‘discourse semantics’ (rather than simply ‘semantics’), a term that expressly relates the notion of cohesive texture to that of meaning at the level of text.

Because the social world is complex and multi-dimensional, language performs a complex, multi-dimensional task. In Halliday’s model, it simultaneously construes three different kinds of meaning:

- ideational meanings, which represent the world of ‘real’ things, people, experiences, thoughts, actions and connections;
- interpersonal meanings, which (re)produce relations between participants in the discourse; and
- textual meanings, which organise information.

The three types of meaning are evident throughout a language, being realised in various forms at the lexicogrammar and expression levels as well as at the discourse-semantic level. SFL treats them as functions of a language, fundamental to determining its structure. The term ‘metafunctions’ describes the linguistic (semantic, lexicogrammatical and expressive) resources that perform each function (Halliday and Hasan 1985: 44). Jay Lemke (1992, 1995) further suggests that the consistent reappearance of the three metafunctions in all areas of the linguistic
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Figure 3.1: Language strata mediating between meaning and expression
system may indicate that they represent a set of functions that transcends language and appears in all meaningful action. At this broader level, Lemke’s ‘eco-social semiotics’ describes the three functions as:

- presentational (‘what’) – what it is, what is going on (Halliday’s ideational);
- orientational (‘who’) – how it looks to whom (Halliday’s interpersonal); and
- organisational (‘how’) – how it hangs together (Halliday’s textual).

Lemke also reframes the metafunctions’ ‘simultaneous operation’ as mutually determining – that is, as dialectically related.

Halliday’s three-dimensional model of language, extended by Lemke to all semiosis, provides a powerful lens through which to examine relational/interpersonal and procedural/organisational (as well as substantive/ideational) aspects of discourse. Distinct metafunctions allow analytical attention to focus on the way in which relationships and organisation are constructed in the moment. Further, as the following section outlines, SFL also provides a framework for understanding the relationship between text and context, and the ways in which these instantiate discourse and social institutions.

3.3.2 Discourse and the social: text and context

Register and genre

Halliday’s functional approach to language has its roots in functional anthropology, which also sought to ‘bring function and structure into a common framework’ (Firth 1955: 237), that is, to assign functional meaning to the principles structuring social life. Halliday draws on the anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski (1946) in positing two interacting levels of context that frame social activities (including discourse): context of situation, and context of culture. Halliday describes the former in terms of three variables:

- field: what is going on; what is the discourse about?
- tenor: who is participating in this discourse; what are their relationships?
- mode: what medium is channelling the discourse; what role does language play in the activity?
These three variables are projections of the linguistic metafunctions, rather than an attempt to specify the context fully: they are intended to describe those contextual elements that are construed in the discourse. In Halliday’s early model, a covariance relation between context of situation (field, tenor and mode) and language (ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions) was mediated at the semantic level by register, a ‘configuration of meanings that are typically associated with a particular situational configuration’ (Halliday and Hasan 1985: 38-39). More recently, following Martin (1992: 502), ‘register’ has been generally used to refer to the semiotic system constituted by the contextual variables themselves, a ‘situational potential’ (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999: 140) that makes certain kinds of meaning-making resources more likely than others to be useful in a particular context. According to this view, the constituent variables of register redound with linguistic metafunctions (Figure 3.2).

In addition, following work undertaken by Ruqaiya Hasan (Halliday and Hasan 1985) and extended by Martin (1992), an SFL conception of genre has been developed to account for context at a higher level of abstraction, approximating Malinowski’s context of culture (Martin 1992: 495; Eggins 1994: 25-35). Genre, in SFL, describes language (semiosis) as purposeful activity aimed at achieving certain goals – ‘genre is how things get done, when language is used to do them’ (Martin 1985: 248). A genre is recognisable because of our cultural knowledge – common understandings of how we use language in social life. A genre creates expectations and determines certain systemic choices in field, tenor and mode: thus, context is itself stratified. Figure 3.3 shows this stratification, extending the metaredundancy relationship (represented by cotangential circles) between language and register. The slope of the arrows indicates a difference in abstraction between strata.

As the arrows in Figure 3.3 indicate, the relationship between strata is not considered to be unidirectional. As social action and structure are mutually constitutive, language realises but also creates context, construing the context of situation and reproducing the context of culture:

the relation of language to the social system is not simply one of expression, but a more complex natural dialectic in which language actively symbolizes
Figure 3.2: Functional diversification of language and social context (adapted from Martin et al. 1997: 5)

Figure 3.3: Stratification of language and context (adapted from Martin 1992: 8)
the social system, thus creating as well as being created by it. (Halliday 1978: 182)

This systemic model of context is useful insofar as it provides categories of analysis, but it sits awkwardly with contemporary understandings of the social world as complex and contingent. There have recently emerged some important challenges to Martin’s rendering of context, according to which genre can be seen not as a semiotic system realised by register, but as a more dynamic aspect of intertextuality: genre construes one kind of relation (among others) between texts. This view draws upon the work of cultural theorists Mikhail Bakhtin and Julia Kristeva.

**Intertextuality**

According to Bakhtin (1981), all discourse derives meaning from relations (of similarity and difference) with other discourse. There are two aspects to this phenomenon. Firstly, all instances of language use (‘utterances’, or texts) are dialogic – they ‘respond’ to previous utterances, and they anticipate a response from their audience, ‘structur[ing] itself in the answer’s direction’ (1981: 280). Fairclough (1992: 103) follows Kristeva (1986) in framing dialogicity as the ‘horizontal’ (syntagmatic) dimension of intertextuality: texts are framed by their relationships with other texts before and after them in time. Secondly, there is a ‘vertical’ (paradigmatic) dimension of heteroglossia – in Bakhtin’s terms, language is not ‘unitary’ in its use, but ‘stratified’ into various different forms: linguistic dialects, socio-ideological forms such as genres, ‘professional’ languages, period- or generation-bound languages, and so on (1981: 271-72). Texts are framed by the characteristics they share with other, parallel texts. Heteroglossia is seen as a general ‘centrifugal’ tendency for language and meanings to diversify, acting against the ‘centripetal’ (or monoglossic) forces of linguistic abstraction (such as grammatical descriptions of languages) and standardisation (such as state-authorised national languages and orthographies) (1981: 271). Thus, although heteroglossia can be seen to represent the synchronic aspect of intertextuality, it simultaneously implies that linguistic forms are constantly changing as these forces interact (Volosinov 1973).

The meaning context of a text, then, includes dialogic and heteroglossic relations with an indefinite number of other texts – how it draws upon, responds to and
anticipates them, and the more general features that it shares with them. These general features are meaningful to the text’s audience because, as they are reproduced in multiple settings, they become (structurated) cultural conventions. More specifically, they become aspects of one or more institutional orders of discourse (Fairclough 1992: 103). As indicated above, genre can be seen as a particular type of intertextual (heteroglossic) relation and, thus, as an aspect of the institutions upon which discourse participants draw.

Intertextuality is the basis of Fairclough’s (2003) alternative three-dimensional model of discourse in social life, which shifts from Halliday’s emphasis on the formal properties of the semiotic system (as metafunctions) to the more fluid ways in which discourse figures in social practices. In Fairclough’s model, the dimensions are orders of discourse – genres, discourses and styles – that directly link discourse to institutions. These intertextual relations are, nonetheless, largely identifiable by their systemic features; indeed, Fairclough draws heavily on Halliday’s metafunctional framework in describing genres, discourses and styles.

In their social aspect, then, texts realise orders of discourse through the medium of register. Systemically, the relationship is one of instantiation; texts are instantiations of language/semiosis (that is, of the linguistic/semiotic system). It is through the instantiation relation that SFL accounts for the dialectic between system and text, and thus for systemic and discursive change.

3.3.3 Language and change

If a system is conceived of as a set of potentials, with probabilities attached to particular choices, each instantiation slightly perturbs those probabilities – as Martin puts it, ‘just as a cricketer’s batting average fluctuates slightly with every run scored’ (1997: 9) – and thus contributes to changes in the system. Over time, these perturbations may become major enough to constitute a ‘change’ in meaning potential.

Levels of semiotic and discursive change (‘semogenesis’) are described in terms of the depths of time involved (Halliday and Mattiessen 1999):

- unfolding of meaning over the course of a text – logogenesis (for example, Halliday 1994; Martin 1999; Iedema 2001a);
language development over a person’s lifetime – \textit{ontogenesis} (Painter 1990, 1998; Halliday 1993);

language evolution over the history of a culture – \textit{phylogenesis} (Halliday and Martin 1993).

From this point of view, semiotic resources can be seen as contingent and dynamic:

it would be more natural to interpret language, register and genre as the projection of semohistory (across all three time frames) than as realizing an abstract and reified ideology …. (Martin 1997: 10)

Semogenesis, at all three levels, is conceived as an expansion of meaning potential in response to shifting contexts: logogenetic shifts in field; tenor and mode; ontogenetic learning and physical development in the speaker; phylogenetic shifts in the context of culture. This overall expansion in potential results, in part, from the adoption of strategies and technologies that allow for increasing abstraction (writing, for example). Because of the dialectic links between text and various levels of context, the study of semogenesis is able to provide useful insights into personal, cultural and institutional change. However, I believe that SFL’s three-layered model is limited in terms of accounting for what Chouliaraki and Fairclough call \textit{conjunctures} (1999: 22; drawing on Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Harvey 1996) – assemblages of people, practices and things for the purpose of particular projects, which may vary in scale and form (for example, building a house; the civil rights movement). Conjunctures seem to lie between logogenesis and phylogenesis, but somehow ‘beside’ ontogenesis. The lacuna could be seen as in part related to a general neglect within SFL of how sets of texts mobilise related meanings as part of particular projects (construction of community issues, group formation, and temporally-extended practices). In recent years, some linguists concerned with the development of political meanings have noted the need for a project-level ‘genesis’ (Macken-Horarik 2004). For the purpose of this thesis, I have coined the term \textit{ergogenesis} – from the Greek ‘ergo’ meaning ‘project’ – to describe discoursal change associated with conjunctures.

One exception to SFL’s neglect of ‘ergogenesis’ is Rick Iedema’s work on bureaucratic discourse, in particular his 1997 study of planning for the renovation/extension of a mental hospital (1997a). In this study, Iedema extended
the notion of logogenesis to show how, over a period of six months, this planning process discursively constructed ‘agreement’ between a set of interested/oriented actors. He showed how the project achieved material change in the social world through a process of semiotic morphogenesis (from Wilden 1980 – bringing together diverse meanings in new forms). Iedema called this process ‘resemiotisation’ – the gradual fixing (or, drawing on actor-network theory, ‘black-boxing’ [Callon and Latour 1981; see Chapter 6]) of hegemonic meanings in increasingly durable, authoritative and semantically dense texts, able to extend (spatially and temporally) their influence and to be ‘taken for granted’ in future events. Figure 3.4 illustrates the resemiotisation process with an example from planning, showing how the process translates ‘from knowledge to action’ (Friedmann 1987).

Iedema’s analysis of the discourse in his case study – meetings of the steering committee (talk), minutes, report/design brief and a floor plan – showed that, in translating according to the conventions of established genres, morphogenetic resemiotisation can naturalise meanings that were, in their original utterance, quite diffuse and even hesitant. Iedema represents this process as highly contingent, showing how naturalised semiotic relations can be constructed in the moment in quite unpredictable ways. Fairclough (2003) reinterprets this phenomenon, which he sees as particularly significant in the networking of social institutions. He uses the term ‘genre chain’ (2003: 32), a metaphor which confers a ‘real’ status on the concept of resemiotisation and suggests that translating across genres takes place in quite systematic ways. I will return to this discrepancy in Chapter 6 (6.2.3); however, in either its contingent or its teleological aspect, resemiotisation represents a crucial element of social/institutional networking. Meanings may translate across genres associated with different sets of institutions – from everyday talk to an ethnographic interview to a government report to an educational syllabus, for example – transforming both the meanings associated with the texts and, sometimes, the institutions into which they are being introduced.

More recently, Iedema’s concept of resemiotisation has been extended to include heteroglossic, as well as monoglossic, change: some textual meanings (such as those captured in mass media reports) can be thought of as inviting ever more voices into the ‘conversation’, centrifugally generating a proliferation of diverse texts (2003a,
Figure 3.4: Resemiotisation in planning
The tension between monoglossic and heteroglossic resemiotisation (or logogenesis/ergogenesis more generally) is, I argue, a key issue in participatory planning.

### 4.4 Language in my enquiry

Systemic functional linguistics provides a theoretical framework for thinking about linguistic texts in relation to social context, tension and institutional change. It thus lends itself well to critical discourse analysis, the general methodology for this enquiry. Several concepts are of particular importance to my analysis:

- discourse semantics and lexicogrammar as semiotic strata in the exchange of meanings;
- semiosis as simultaneously building meanings in the representational/ideational, orientational/interpersonal and organisational/textual dimensions;
- syntagmatic and paradigmatic intertextuality as a complex understanding of social context; and
- resemiotisation as a realisation of ergogenetic discoursal change and, thus, as a potential manifestation of and resource for institutional transformation.

Using these concepts, and associated analytical tools (Chapter 5, 5.3.2; Appendices D-H), I am able to look beyond the surface features of the discourse, such as the use of specialised vocabularies and metaphors (Tett and Wolf 1991; Whatmore and Boucher 1992; Hillier 1993; Throgmorton 1993; Myerson and Rydin 1994; Rydin 1998; Collins 1999; Hastings 1999; Marston 2002), to the underlying linguistic practices through which meanings are exchanged, agreed upon and transcribed. This type of analysis has a vital contribution to make in the area of participatory planning, because stakeholders often emerge from an ‘uneven playing field’ in terms of their resources, cultural assumptions, and control of hegemonic discourses (Marris 1996), and because participation may realise power and organisation in ways only accessible to analysis at the micro level (Forester 1999b). To better understand these issues is important, because ‘agreements’ reached in participatory procedures should, in an ideal world, lead to real actions with real consequences (Hillier 2000a).

The thesis has so far described the academic context, research questions, and methodology of my enquiry. In the remainder of Part 1, I describe the enquiry as it
unfolded. Chapter 4 provides an account of my experiences in the field, also giving overviews of the events of the case studies themselves.
Chapter 2 outlined the theoretical context, questions and approach of my enquiry, and Chapter 3 described a text-analytical framework for my chosen methodology of critical discourse analysis. In this chapter and the next, I present the enquiry as a reflective narrative, explaining various choices I made in terms of fieldwork, analysis and writing the thesis. The presentation is not strictly chronological: fieldwork, analysis and writing were in fact intertwined, each informing the development of the others (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000; Silverman 2000). Moreover, interruptions to the progress of the case studies caused the enquiry's actual chronology to be somewhat erratic. For the sake of clarity, I have reorganised my narrative into elements, rather than stages, of the research. Chapter 4 focuses on the fieldwork component – the collection of data and the stories of the two case studies – before I describe the analysis and writing in Chapter 5.

I begin by outlining the preparatory stages of the research, first positioning myself with respect to the data then detailing the reasons for selecting the two case studies, and the process of introducing myself into them. I then summarise my fieldwork in relation to each of my two case studies, outlining what I see as the key events and features characterising each one, as a framing for the analysis expounded in Parts 2 and 3 of the thesis (summaries are re-presented in table form as Appendix C).

4.1 Preliminaries

4.1.1 Positioning

Chapter 1 indicated that this research was largely motivated by a desire to make sense of my own rather disorienting experiences of consultation and participation in planning. It is against the background of these experiences that my engagement with the case studies should be understood. Chapter 2 explains that my interpretive position was critical, but in the sense of seeking 'hidden' connections, rather than that of aiming to expose deliberate conspiracies or tools of oppression on the part of the bureaucrats representing the state. I still maintain a belief in the value of the public service, and the enquiry's orientation reflects this belief. Its purpose is to problematise the micro-processes of selection, interpretation and translation through which certain cultural values and practices come to dominate planning discourse.
In the process of enquiry, I have been engaged in a practice of selection, interpretation and translation just as those involved in the case studies have. The discourse of academia is no less objectifying than that of bureaucracy (Smith 1990), and usually far less accountable to those it objectifies. In the spirit of ‘practising what one preaches’, it needs to be acknowledged that social research is never value-free, and that in spite of my agreement (4.1.3) to be passive in my observations, I was not able to be ‘impartial’, either with respect to the processes or regarding the substantive issues discussed. I admit, therefore, that I have serious personal concerns about the practice of participatory planning in late capitalism. I do not agree that principles such as nature conservation and social justice – socially constructed as these may be – should be given the same status as vested interests by requiring their ‘representation’ in the persons of ‘greenies’ and ‘advocates’ to argue in debate. Rather, I believe that they should act as explicit constraints to all deliberative decision making (Gutmann and Thompson 1990, 1996). One reason for this is that I believe participatory practice tends to be associated more with projects that challenge free-market capitalism than with those that support it, private development planning being protected in Australia by such tags as ‘commercial-in-confidence’:

During the 1950’s and 1960’s a significant change in the government’s objectives for public participation came about. Instead of promoting participation simply for reasons of protection of individual interests, some in the federal government suggested that participation was essential to good governance. ... Today, participation is still valued, but once again as a watchdog activity rather than a means to liberate citizens from poverty, exploitation and injustice. (Renn et al. 1995a: 19)

The framing of environmental and social justice principles as ‘stakeholders’, therefore, can be seen as a way of limiting, rather than increasing, their influence.

Moreover, I am uncomfortable with the apparent erosion of such principles by ‘the one big idea’ (Walter 1996) that the market is the answer, and I agree with James Walter that policy makers’ adoption of processes – such as consensus or economic growth – as goals in themselves can be seen as a sign that political leaders in Australia have (further?) relinquished their vision-making role in favour of that idea (1996: 57-58). I am aware that neither these opinions, nor my basic assumption that
most people – including public servants – mean well most of the time, are shared by all the participants in my case studies, and that, consequently, they might not agree with many of my interpretations.

4.1.2 Selecting the case studies

The two case studies were selected in consultation with various local and state government representatives. In seeking suitable cases, I focussed on one region in non-metropolitan Australia, and targeted public servants working in that region, for two main reasons. First, I had lived in that region for several years, including some as a public servant, and was familiar with some of the local issues and difficult surrounding participation in policy making. This ‘insider knowledge’ gave something of an advantage: ‘Knowledge of [social] reality is produced by “immersion” in it’ (Blaikie 2000: 120). It was my experience in the region, in fact, that led to the conception of this research project. Second, political discourse in regional Australia is permeated by a strong anti-centralist rhetoric which I believe reflects – and perhaps magnifies – broader trends associated with calls for increased participation: mistrust of traditional government, localism, fragmentation of interests and identities. The distance (cultural, as well as spatial) between state bureaucracies and local communities is perceived by many within those communities to be greater than in metropolitan areas. I was therefore confident that the stakeholder/bureaucratic tensions I was looking for would be evident in case studies from the region.

My initial enquiries identified two soon-to-be-commenced case studies that exemplified the central problematic of this enquiry: the attempted resolution of land/water use issues by decision-making groups which include stakeholders from outside the bureaucratic sphere. In addition, both cases had a history of conflict between at least some of the stakeholders and government, and in one case there had also been considerable antagonism between different stakeholders. The case studies were:

- ‘Alpha’ – a committee established by the state ‘Department of Marine Management’ (‘DOMM’) to develop a management plan for a proposed marine reserve near a town that in this thesis I call ‘Scrubfield’; and
• ‘Beta’ – a committee initiated by the ‘Shire of Harbouurtown and Environrs’ ('SOHE') to identify land for industrial use within the municipality and to make decisions about the future of the existing industrial area, ‘Lumbervale’.

My original purpose in selecting two cases was to compare a state-led process with one managed locally, in order to explore the effects of the ‘distance’ between lay-stakeholders and the executive. While this remained an important issue, as the study progressed the cases demonstrated a number of additional relevant differences (4.3).

4.1.3 Negotiating a relationship

Having identified suitable case studies for my enquiry, I approached DOMM and SOHE to request access. Through several discussions with nominated officers, a proposed agreement (Appendix A), detailing ‘rights and obligations’ of each party (the researcher, the committee, and the executive) was drafted for each committee’s consideration. Apparently satisfied with these terms, both resolved by consensus at their first meetings to grant me access. The agreements gave me the status of ‘silent observer’ at the committee meetings, and sought to minimise my influence, rather than providing for my active participation. They required, for example, that I refrain from actively supporting any outcome and from advising members or executive staff about how to achieve their aims. I was, however, able to interact individually with participants.¹

The nature of these agreements raised a number of methodological and ethical issues. Due to the imposed ‘detached observer’ status, my project cannot be considered participatory or action research, which entails the researcher and other participants working towards common goals (Cameron et al. 1992; Stringer 1999; Reason and Bradbury 2001; Morris 2002). However, I felt it important to acknowledge that the participants in these committees did have reasons for allowing me to observe them, and that their reasons differed from my own. As I understand it, the executives in these cases hoped to receive some critical evaluation that might help them to improve the effectiveness (in terms of acceptance by the stakeholders) of their consultative/participatory processes. Others expressed various purposes, including a desire to have the process recorded and scrutinised by an outsider (owing to a lack of trust between participants), and a wish to forward anonymous or collective views about the process to the bureaucracy.² None of these reasons strictly accorded with
my own, which was to collect materials that would assist my attempts to address a set of esoteric research questions and to persuade my examiners that I am able to say something interesting.

Moreover, my evaluative positions, epistemological and towards the cases, were not shared by the majority of participants. These issues led to a 'paradigm/contract disjunction' (Lincoln and Guba 1985: 284; also Scheeres and Solomon 2000 on collaborative research; Strathem 1987 on auto-anthropology) which had the potential not only to lead to differing interpretations of the action, but also to render my final product – this thesis – useless for the participants’ purposes. In an attempt to respond to the case study participants’ wishes, my agreements with the committees included provision of case study reports,\(^3\) which reported the views of participants in accordance with a more straightforward phenomenological approach (Holstein and Gubrium 1994; Blaikie 2000). That is, the reports attend to the cases as isolated phenomena, rather than in relation to their broader societal fields of production, and derive themes, principles and conclusions from analysis of the interviews (rather than from my research questions) in an attempt to match participants' concerns. The provision of case study reports, which were subject to ‘member checking’ (Lincoln and Guba 1985), also provided an opportunity for participants to give me feedback on my research, without assuming editorial rights over my thesis.

Apart from the theoretical and personal issues discussed above, my agreements with Alpha and Beta raised practical problems. As important as our differing expectations was the question of observer influence. In spite of my agreement to minimise my influence on each of the case studies, I have no doubt that my involvement affected them in a number of ways. First, it is likely that the mere presence of an outsider – especially one with a tape recorder – led to some self-censorship and/or showing off on the part of meeting participants. In fact, it was commented to me following one early meeting that ‘we were on our best behaviour’. There were also times (although not during Alpha’s or Beta’s meetings) when I was the only woman in the room, which I am sure affected the men’s usual interactive style, although they never explicitly told me so.\(^4\) At most of the formal committee meetings, however, no such obvious effects were evident. I did not sit at the table with the committees, but separately (in the case of Alpha, with a number of other observers), and I believe that
my constant presence in the background meant that I became ‘part of the scenery’ and was generally ignored in this context. The tendency for this to occur is one of the principles that make naturalistic ethnography possible (Saville-Troike 1989).

There were other ways in which my role in the construction of meanings was not completely inactive. I had at least two, and usually three or four, conversations with each participant, during which they were asked to consider the process in novel aspects and/or additional detail. Frequently, although I feel that I succeeded in not ‘advising’ people or taking an obvious position on substantive issues, I did allow my own concerns about the process to show. It would have been impossible not to and still to address these concerns in the interviews. However, I felt that my need to obtain the perspectives of the participants outweighed any interpretive problems caused by this kind of involvement. The issue was discussed with the committees and executives at the start of the project, and a consensus formed that encouraging participants to think more deeply about the process was, on the whole, more likely to be a positive than a negative contribution.

Finally, participants’ understandings of my identity (as a student, planner, ex-public servant, partner of a public servant, woman, Anglo-Celtic Australian) and my role in their planning exercise (as an independent researcher, potential advocate, part of the institution, extra work, irrelevant presence) must have affected their communication with me during interviews. This was not something I could control, or even reliably identify. I can only reflect upon the effects it may have had, and treat these effects, where possible, as additional data about participants’ orientations (Silverman 2000: 206).

4.2 Sources

The data collection for this enquiry combined the four main qualitative methods outlined by David Silverman (2000: 90): ethnographic observation, analysis of texts and documents, interviews, and audio/video recording. The principal data were the spoken and written texts generated by the two planning processes – especially the audio-recorded committee meetings – and semi-structured interviews with the participants. The fieldwork took place from October 2000 to March 2005, mainly in
the region, though a few interviews and some documentary research were also conducted opportunistically in Perth, where I now live.

Meetings

During the committees' planning stages, I attended and observed all of Alpha's nine and seventeen of Beta's nineteen formal meetings. From the second meeting of Beta and the third of Alpha, the meetings were audio-taped. There was, however, no systematic recording of any extra-linguistic features of the discourse (facial/bodily expression, gestures, eye contact, visual aids and so on). This is not because I did not consider such features relevant, but because my agreements with the committees did not permit me to video-record the meetings. Such observations as I was able to note were *ad hoc* and intermittent.

Meetings were transcribed verbatim using consistent conventions to indicate pauses, intonation, interruptions and so on. The meeting transcripts form the central empirical data set for the research. I attempted to be thorough in the transcription; however, it is inevitable that transferring discourse from one mode (spoken) to another (written) involves some slippage. The omission of extra-linguistic features of discourse is just one way of missing nuances:

> As useful as they are, transcripts are not unbiased representations of the data. Far from being exhaustive and objective, they are inherently selective and interpretive. (Edwards 2001: 321)

To some extent, therefore, my analysis of the transcripts draws upon my own memories of events, which are not accessible to readers of the thesis. Whenever I felt there was ambiguity or uncertainty about speakers' intentions, I attempted to add their interpretation to mine by asking them what they meant. Of course, this introduces two levels of bias: my own, and that of the impression the speakers wished to give me; however comparing interpretations also provides opportunities for triangulation of the data or, in hermeneutic terms, for complementing bias with counter-bias to arrive at a more coherent whole (E. Betti, cited in Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000: 67, 72-73).
Committee meetings are situated within what Fairclough calls ‘intertextual chains’ (1992: 130-33) or ‘genre chains’ (2003: 216): particular networks of texts that articulate a social practice, in this case that of participatory planning. Data for my case studies included other texts within these networks, including: written material presented to the committees; draft and final minutes; media statements about the committees’ work; reports to governing bodies (SOHE Council, DOMM’s minister); correspondence; and the planning reports and maps through which the processes’ outcomes are presented to their implementers and to the public.

There were additional ‘internal’ texts to which I did not have access: private conversations and emails; private club meetings to which I was not invited; some relevant correspondence (in particular, ministerial correspondence); and, no doubt, other texts of which I could not be aware. It is not possible for me to establish how important these omissions may have been to my understanding of the processes as series of events. However, my primary purpose in including additional internal texts was not to produce an exhaustive narrative of everything that happened, but to interrogate processes of translation: to examine how, in these cases, the resemiotisation from one genre or semiotic system to another affected ideational, interpersonal and textual/organisational meanings, particularly within the planning institutions involved. The samples to which I had access, which included DOMM’s and SOHE’s entire project files, permitted such an analysis.

Participant interviews

Participant interviews complemented the meeting and other planning texts in several ways. First, they provided a ‘window’ into participants’ expectations, their values, their understanding of the process and their modes of expression. This was crucial to my purpose of identifying how tensions in participatory planning relate to ‘cultural’ framing differences, in particular between bureaucratic and other practices. Second, I wanted to explore how expectations and understandings changed over time, and whether such changes reflected the practice-reconciling ‘metaprocesses’ that I hoped to discover. It was important, therefore, to conduct more than one ‘round’ of interviews for comparison over time. I conducted three rounds for each case study: one close to the start, one at the end, and one in between. Third, participants’
perceptions of the processes provided a point of comparison to my own: an additional source for triangulation. Finally, the interviews provided an outlet for stakeholders to critique the processes — and the executive agencies and each other — anonymously. It was this aspect that was most important to them and, consequently, it is given prominence in the case study reports.

Interviews were held at times and venues nominated by the interviewees — in all but nine (out of a total 78) instances, during the day at their places of work. In all cases, I gave participants some warning regarding the form and purpose of the interview, and I asked for their personal views, rather than the position of their employer or constituency. Wherever possible, the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. In a few cases during the first and second round of interviews, circumstances such as background noise made it impossible to audio-tape, and I took detailed notes instead. In these cases, a ‘dot-point’ summary of the interview was forwarded to the interviewee for their confirmation before using the data. Copies of interview transcripts were also offered to interviewees, but refused in all but two cases.

The interviews took the form of informal one-to-one conversations ranging from twenty minutes to (in one case) three hours, during which I probed for certain points if these had not emerged ‘naturally’. In the first round these points concerned the establishment of the committee, and included the participant’s understanding of:

- the background to the establishment of the committee, including the relationship of the executive to the community;
- the task(s) of the committee;
- how ‘success’ in the task(s) might be defined;
- why a participatory planning approach was being taken;
- whether such an approach was appropriate in this case, and why;
- the roles of the interviewee and other members on the committee;
- the appropriateness of the committee’s membership;
- the nature of any problems that they were anticipating as the committee’s work progressed;
- how successful the committee had been so far, and reasons for this; and
the quality of the management of the process.

In the second round I probed for participants' views on progress, specifically:

- how the process was progressing towards its aims;
- whether there had been any problems;
- where it was headed at this stage;
- the end point of the committee's involvement;
- whether any events outside meetings had affected the process;
- any general concerns about the process or its management;
- what they hoped and expected to achieve at the next meeting and overall;
- who in the committee had power to influence outcomes, and why; and
- whether their hopes or feelings about the process had changed since they started.

The third round of interviews, which took place following each committee's adoption of their plan, took a different form. Before beginning any conversational exchange, participants were asked to produce an uninterrupted recount of the process, including as much detail as they could about their own experience of it. The purpose of this was to explore which aspects or moments of the process would emerge unprompted, how those aspects compared with those emphasised in earlier interviews, and the level of 'closure' evident in participants' accounts. This strategy met with varying levels of success: although about half the interviewees produced a recount, some were reluctant to 'tell me things' that they felt I already knew, and others appeared to feel threatened by the apparent 'test', continually restating that they could not remember everything. In these cases, I asked them instead to tell me what they thought were the major steps in, achievements of, and obstacles to the process. Additional probes focussed on:

- main achievements and/or obstacles;
- how they felt about their own role;
- what they thought the executive agency might have learnt from the process.

In all three rounds, the idea behind the probes was to focus discussion on relations and process, rather than the substantive planning issues. In addition, I used the interviews opportunistically to clarify points of fact or inference about which I was
uncertain, including participants’ motivations for actions observed within the meetings. I also asked each time whether any moments had stood out as important to the participant as part of my sampling strategy (Chapter 5, 5.3.1), and for general comments.

‘External’ sources

Fundamental to the theory and methodology of CDA is an acknowledgement that texts cannot be understood in isolation, but must be considered in a framework of intertextuality and interdiscursivity. Such a framework goes beyond the ‘intertextual/genre chains’ referred to above. The texts generated by the planning process are in dialogue with (Bakhtin 1981), and derive meaning from, the totality of texts and discourses circulating in the social field(s) in which the process takes place (see Myerson and Rydin 1996 on ‘networks of topicality’ and the ‘rhetorical web’).

In order to place my principal sources within their intertextual background, I referred to a number of secondary sources, including local and (to a lesser extent) statewide newspapers; newsletters and meetings of two community organisations (the Lumbervale residents’ action group [LAG] in Harbortown and a local naturalists’ club in Scrubfield); and governmental policy/planning documents. I also attended and received minutes of meetings of the SOHE Council and a number of public meetings held during the fieldwork period which appeared to bear some direct or indirect relation to the case studies (for example, concerning development proposals within or near the two towns).

To further enrich my understanding of the case studies, I also held additional interviews with various people who had previous involvement with events or actions leading up to the committees’ establishment, or who had peripheral involvement during the course of the planning processes. These people were usually identified by one or more of the central case study participants (a ‘snowball’ technique [Kitchin and Tate 1999: 54]), though they also included two SOHE councillors whom I had observed expressing strong views about Beta’s project at Council meetings. Interviews took the form of casual discussions and focussed on clarifying events to which I was not privy, as well as the interviewees’ role in those events.
Further, throughout the project I discussed my ideas with my supervisors, other academics, fellow students, and various policy practitioners. I also presented papers at seminars and national/international conferences in May and November 2001, July and November 2002, July 2004 and January 2005 in order to obtain feedback from a wider group of scholars, and read widely in a range of related disciplines. This ‘peer debriefing’ (Lincoln and Guba 1985) was particularly useful in suggesting new lines of inquiry or analysis and in confronting preconceptions and biases.

**Immersion**

Finally, the enquiry was informed by my personal experience and observations (Denzin 1997; Sarantakos 1998; Blaikie 2000). In addition to having played a variety of roles in consultation processes, I had spent time living, working and recreating in both Scrubfield and Harbourtown, during which I had formed my own opinions about them and their governance. During the project, I again lived in each locality for at least six months and otherwise made an effort to become more familiar with the places under discussion: undertaking a self-guided tour of Lumbervale and other places discussed by Beta; taking a commercially operated boat cruise through Alpha’s study area. I discussed the general issue of stakeholder participation in casual conversations with various public servants and people involved with community organisations in the area, and listened to people’s views on aspects of the case studies whenever the opportunity presented.

My own experiences must have affected my interpretation of the events I was observing: personal bias is unavoidable in interpretive research (Denzin 1997; Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000; Flyvbjerg 2001). I nonetheless believe that, overall, the enquiry benefited from my local knowledge. For example, participants in meetings and interviews constantly referred casually to local people, places and things in ways which would have been quite bewildering to a ‘novice’. Indeed, according to many commentators, ‘prolonged engagement’ (Lincoln and Guba 1985) is the cornerstone of ethnography: in order to understand a culture well enough to gauge distortions within it, there must be an investment of time. Further, the use of numerous additional sources – to which I had access largely through local social and professional networks – provided complementary counter-biases for triangulation, and allowed me to ‘double-check’ ambiguous or apparently superficial
information/interpretations for relevance and contentiousness – a technique for establishing ‘credibility’ that Lincoln and Guba (1985) call ‘persistent observation’.

**Auditing**

The sources outlined above generated a large amount of potentially challengeable data. ‘Reliability’ (Yin 1984; Silverman 2000; ‘dependability’ and ‘confirmability’ in Lincoln and Guba’s [1985] terms) is established by means of the retention of all records relating to the enquiry – transcriptions and audio-tapes, related documents, records of my own movements and communications, regular reports to my supervisors, and notes pertaining to the development of my analysis and arguments – in a form suitable for audit (Huberman and Miles 1994). Indeed, the retention of all records (under lock and key) for five years is a standard requirement under Curtin University’s ethics guidelines, and was one of the conditions on my proceeding with this enquiry.

### 4.3 Fieldwork

The two case studies were independent of each other;11 this is how they are presented in this section. The stories here are expository, and do not provide much detail or critical comment: rather, they outline the events of my enquiry to provide an empirical basis for the analysis expounded in later chapters. For ease of reference, both stories are summarised and presented in table form as Appendix C.

This enquiry was a longitudinal study: I followed the cases from the initial establishment until the final meeting of each committee’s planning process. During this time, each committee progressed through a number of phases, in terms both of the work that they were doing, and of shifting direction and dynamics. The context for my data collection was therefore in continual flux.
4.3.1 Alpha's story

Alpha's planning process was carefully structured by DOMM to produce a management plan for the proposed marine reserve as 'efficiently' as possible. This meant that their agendas were explicitly outcomes-focussed, with most of their substantive items being drawn from the management plan's proposed table of contents. However, DOMM were also aware of a need to overcome a range of historical disputes arising from competition over resources in the area, which is exploited for commercial and recreational fishing, aquaculture, mineral/petroleum production, port uses, tourism, scientific research and various additional recreational uses centred on a number of islands (Figure 4.1). All the above interests were represented on the committee.

The phases that Alpha went through were carefully planned by DOMM: an introductory phase was followed by work on the 'non-contentious' wordy parts of the management plan (to promote the development of good working relationships), before moving on to what everybody expected to be the most difficult element – the designation of zones where various uses could be controlled/restricted.

*Phase 1: Getting started*

Alpha's first phase included their first two meetings, in August and November 2000, and my first round of interviews, from November 2000 to February 2001. The agendas focussed on familiarising members with the proposed planning procedure, with each other, and with some contextual issues pertaining to the study area.

The first meeting consisted of introductions and briefings, including Alpha's general instructions, explanation of the proposed public consultation program, and guests from several government departments speaking about aspects of the regional ecological, environmental, social and economic context. In briefing the committee about their role, DOMM stressed that individuals were to see themselves as representing not particular interests, but rather the community as a whole. The forum was explicitly constructed as deliberative, rather than bargaining (Elster 1998b): members had been appointed on the basis of their 'expertise', and were expected to contribute knowledge, rather than to negotiate on behalf of their sectoral interests. Such interests would instead provide input to Alpha’s deliberations via an additional
Figure 4.1: Scrubfield and the study area for the proposed marine reserve (fictionalised map)
public consultation program. Overall the first meeting was positive: members expressed support for the marine reserve proposal and, in their introductions, emphasised hopes and experiences that most of them had in common.

There was little active discussion at this meeting. Nonetheless, some issues were raised which were to have important implications: in particular, a request from three Alpha members to extend the study area to include 'Muddy Bay' (Figure 4.1), the principal location of a certain commercial fishery; and a further request from the management of Scrubfield's port that their area be excluded from the marine reserve proposal.

The port management's request was repeated, with support from the port's main users, at the second meeting, and the matter became the subject of a lengthy, difficult and unresolved debate. Eventually, the committee moved on to what DOMM had intended to be its main task for Meeting 2: agreement on some generic content of the management plan. This included a Vision Statement, Strategic Objectives, Generic Management Objectives and a list of Ecological and Social Values. The list was produced by brainstorming: anything 'valued' by committee members or DOMM was considered a valid entry. The other text was initially drafted by DOMM staff for discussion/amendment, setting the scene for Phase 2 of the procedure, in which meetings were dominated by such 'texting' work.

Following the second meeting, I began my first round of participant interviews (fifteen, plus three DOMM officers who had helped to establish the process but were no longer involved). This round took several months because it was interrupted by the Christmas period and because it included a number of people who did not live locally. In six cases, unfortunately, it was not possible to conduct the interviews until following the third meeting in February 2001.

This delay had obvious effects. The interviews were not highly structured, as I wanted to allow for production of participants' own narratives and issues. As a result, interviewees tended to emphasise immediate concerns, using the interviews as a kind of 'debriefing' on the last meeting and/or current 'extracurricular' negotiations. The earlier Round 1 interviews showed a clear preoccupation with the input of the port and port users, generalised as a concern with controlling the
behaviour of observers. The interviews conducted later reflected issues that arose during the third meeting: a high level of concern about the public consultation, and a growing mistrust of DOMM’s management of the process.

**Phase 2: Words**

The drafting of the management plan began in earnest at Alpha’s third meeting, and dominated the agendas for Phase 2 of the process, during which meetings were held every two months. To facilitate the drafting process, DOMM usually presented the committee with suggested text for each section of the plan, requesting comments, amendments and endorsement. Thus, each meeting’s outcome was a set of words that could be inserted directly into the plan.

At the third meeting, the agenda asked Alpha to draft ‘Objectives’ for all the ‘Social Values’ that they had listed in Phase 1, starting with the value ‘Indigenous Heritage’. At this point, members rebelled. As they saw it, the committee was being asked to endorse a set of words, regarding a highly sensitive issue, into which neither the committee nor any identified stakeholders had had any input; they knew of no consultation regarding Indigenous heritage or interests, and were painfully aware that local Indigenous representation was lacking at the table. Discussion became tense and awkward as members turned to complaining about procedural issues (especially the public consultation program), clearly displaying a lack of trust in DOMM staff. Their poor opinion was exacerbated by the fact that the issue on which the committee had spent so much time at Meeting 2 was resolved at this meeting by solicitors’ advice that the port could not legally be included in the marine reserve – thus, the stressful debate that they had had over the port became a ‘waste of time’.

The third meeting, therefore, was a trying one for both the membership and the executive. The fourth and fifth meetings went more smoothly. Although some time was still spent expressing and dealing with members’ mistrust of DOMM, Alpha mostly followed their agenda, endorsing most of the ‘wordy’ sections of the management plan. At the same time, however, absenteeism increased dramatically, culminating in the cancellation of the sixth meeting (initially planned for August 2001) due to poor attendance. Meeting 6 was rescheduled for two days in
December 2001: on the second day, the committee moved on to the zoning of the marine reserve, and Phase 3 began.

The absenteeism was a problem for my second round of interviews (sixteen, plus a regular observer of the meetings and a local DOMM officer who had been involved previous disputes over management of the islands), which began in June 2001 following Meeting 5. I wished to discuss meeting dynamics and other aspects of the formal process with members, and felt that this would be of little benefit if they had not formally participated since our last interview; therefore, some members' second interviews were delayed for several months until after their attendance at the sixth meeting. Once again, therefore, the interview round straddled two phases of the process, making direct comparison difficult. In particular, between the early and later interviews, the planning process had moved on from Alpha's texting work to what most of the members saw as the most important and interesting item – the designation of sanctuary (‘no-take’) and other use-restrictive zones. Consequently, the interviews reflected varying levels of enthusiasm, and a shift from an overriding concern with procedure – particularly external consultations, the committee’s role, and meeting control – to a keen interest in the content of the zoning scheme.

Phase 3: Maps

As any planner or politician knows, conflict comes to a head when the lines are drawn. (Neuman 1998: 215)

There was a significant shift in dynamics for the third and final phase. Meetings were longer, taking up two days, and became less regular, both because the external consultation effort between meetings increased dramatically and because of frequent postponements through which DOMM tried (unsuccessfully) to secure full attendance. The zoning discussions were characterised by excitement and ‘robust debate’ in which conflict often surfaced.

The zoning phase also differed from the texting phase in that Alpha began with a ‘blank sheet’ instead of drafts for consideration. DOMM facilitated the process through use of a sophisticated geographic information system (GIS) which stored habitat, ecological, tenure and use information collected prior to the committee’s establishment. GIS maps were projected onto an overhead screen so that this spatial
information – any item of which could be retrieved separately or overlayed – and the committee’s manipulation of the zoning boundaries could be given immediate visual form. In addition, the zoning was informed by more stakeholder presentations and input from the ‘public’, which alleviated, to a large extent, members’ earlier concerns about the effectiveness of the consultation process.

At the sixth meeting, the committee produced a first draft of a zoning scheme for the entire study area, identifying sixteen areas as either no-take or limited-take zones. Alpha endorsed this draft scheme on condition that it be subject to broad public consultation and reviewed by the committee before being released for its formal public submission period. To this end, DOMM embarked on a number of extra publicity exercises following Meeting 6. These were focussed on eliciting comment on the zoning scheme via a written ‘feedback form’. They included static displays at public libraries and key worksites in Scrubfield; staffed displays at Scrubfield’s shopping centres (held on weekends or late-night-shopping evenings and reportedly attracting 185 people); and formal presentations with a number of local clubs (mostly fishing clubs). As a result, DOMM received fifty-nine submissions, which staff summarised for presentation (as a document) to Alpha at their seventh meeting in May 2002.

At that meeting, Alpha discussed the submissions and produced a second draft of the zoning scheme. Submissions had come from recreational anglers, commercial fishers, aquaculture companies, port users, scientists and conservation organisations, and concerns they expressed about each zone appeared largely to be reflected among the committee membership, who had been nominated from a similar set of stakeholder groups. The zoning discussion thus repositioned the committee members as sector representatives, fragmenting the solidarity that they had adopted in their struggle with DOMM in Phase 2.

Following the seventh meeting there was a second de facto public submission period, though without the shopping centre displays. During this time, a local recreational angling club, the ‘Scrubfield Fishing and Diving Association’ (SFDA), held a number of public meetings with a view to encouraging as many of their constituents as possible to make submissions about the zoning scheme. I attended these meetings, where discussion focussed on five main issues: specific zoning restrictions perceived
as an attack on recreational fishing 'rights'; likely problems in enforcing the zones; the 'removal' of Muddy Bay from the proposal (an act seen as 'favouring' commercial over recreational fishers); deficiencies in DOMM's consultation process; and the laziness/apathy of recreational anglers not present.

Apart from the last, the above concerns appeared at Alpha's eighth meeting (in November 2002) in thirty-five submissions from recreational anglers. In addition, there were two form letters requesting changes to specific zones, signed by eighty-eight and thirty-six people, and a stakeholder presentation reiterating the content of one of those letters. Recreational angler members of Alpha made much of the weight of numbers in arguing for zoning amendments. Meeting 8 – originally intended to be the last Alpha meeting – saw a significant rise in tension between members, as the process drew closer to realising its product. This tension was not uniform, however. The interpersonal dynamic fluctuated between conflict and solidarity as members' alliances shifted according to the zones and issues at stake, and to their evaluations of the public/stakeholder submissions.

Contrary to DOMM's intentions, the eighth meeting did not finalise the draft management plan, and another meeting was called for February 2003. At that ninth meeting, before Alpha proceeded with the final zoning amendments, one of the recreational angler members made a presentation in which he withdrew his support for the zoning scheme, expressing his disappointment in the committee's response to the public submissions, and also a view that the entire approach of using spatial controls was flawed. This position, expressed at the 'eleventh hour', took most of Alpha's members by surprise. They had devoted three meetings (five days) to the zoning scheme and were reluctant to overturn the results of that effort; they therefore decided not to reject the zoning approach at this stage. They did, however, make further amendments to the current version of the zoning scheme at the request of the committee's other recreational angler.

Finally, Alpha also considered the management plan as a whole – including extensive sections on generic management strategies that had not previously been 'processed' through the meetings – and endorsed (after amendment) a letter of advice to the Minister for Marine Management. As the two days progressed, the agenda became more and more focussed on administrative tasks, and the number of
attendees steadily decreased. By the end of the meeting less than half of the committee members were present.

The close of the ninth meeting represented, formally, the end of Alpha’s involvement in the initial planning process. However, I decided not to proceed with my final interviews until the minutes had been returned to members. In the event, this took six months: DOMM staff had waited until the management plan and accompanying letter had been forwarded to their minister before finalising the minutes.

The third round of interviews (fifteen, no ‘outsiders’) took place in August and September 2003 and involved a retrospective look at the process as a whole. Even so, it was affected by immediate concerns. In particular, several members were aware that sections of the recreational angling community had mobilised a lobbying effort against the marine reserve proposal in its current form. Some members showed a preoccupation with this effort, which had potential to undermine the work that Alpha had achieved and the ‘consensus’ that they had reached. Another concern was the still-unresolved issue of Indigenous consultation. Australia’s Native Title legislation gives Indigenous traditional owners a right to negotiate over many changes to land (and water) tenure; some members interpreted DOMM’s failure to manage this within the project timeframe as leaving the traditional owners with a veto right, which again could potentially undermine Alpha’s efforts.

However, the issue most frequently raised in the final round of interviews, as for the previous rounds, was DOMM’s control over the process. The product-oriented structure of the agendas, the mediation of public consultation by staff, the presentation of information, and various other factors were seen by a majority of members as driving towards a particular outcome preferred by DOMM. Opinions varied as to whether such tight control was appropriate or not.

The third round of interviews represented the end of my fieldwork with Alpha, although I did continue to watch for progress on the marine reserve proposal. It was another eighteen months before a management plan was released for public comment, and the plan released was radically altered from the one agreed to at Alpha’s ninth meeting. The recreational anglers’ lobbying efforts had been successful: a significant proportion of the sanctuary zones, and the areas between
them, had been replaced by a new zoning which allowed recreational take only, banning commercial take (a result reached without consultation with the commercial sector). The public comment period closed in May 2005.

In February 2006, Alpha met for a final time to consider the public submissions. I was unable to attend that meeting, but the minutes show that the committee resolved to express dissatisfaction with the political process that followed their planning, which they saw as undermining the integrity of their consensus. It also substantially changed the spatial plan that had gone out for public comment, reinstating most of the zones agreed to at the ninth meeting. There has, at September 2006, been no public announcement regarding the adoption of the management plan or the declaration of the Scrubfield marine reserve.

4.3.2 Beta’s story

Beta’s planning process was more organic, less rigidly structured, than that of Alpha. The committee was established in an attempt to end a dispute between SOHE and Lumbervale residents over the removal of Council discretion to permit residential uses (‘caretaker dwellings’) in Lumbervale under SOHE’s zoning scheme, rather than to develop a specific product (see Figure 4.2). A comprehensive approach to industrial development in Harbourtown, including consideration of strategic industries associated with the local port, was seen as a means to achieve this. Beta’s membership therefore included representatives from a Lumbervale residents’ action group (‘LAG’), the port management (a state government agency), SOHE and three additional state government agencies: the ‘Department of Planning’ (DOP), ‘Department of Environment’ (DOE), and ‘Department of Regional Development’ (DRD). The committee was given considerable freedom to negotiate their own ways of doing things, and their direction altered several times as personnel changed and new constraints emerged. The five phases outlined below reflect these changes.

Phase 1: Settling

During the first phase, which included Beta’s first four meetings, members effectively shifted from an initially tense and antagonistic dynamic to productive working relationships. They achieved this by renegotiating their objectives and by
settling into a specific set of tasks that focussed their discussion on a ‘joint enterprise’ (Wenger 1998: 103).

I was unable to attend Beta’s first meeting, in September 2000, but have reconstructed it from the minutes/documentation and from the recounts provided in my first round of interviews. Most of the meeting was spent revising the objectives Council had set for the committee, and developing a new set of ‘home-grown’ objectives to provide a strategic foundation for Beta’s work. During the discussion, a new source of conflict emerged. Until that time, the ‘Lumbervale problem’ had been seen as centred on the principle of separating residential and industrial uses, leading to conflict between SOHE and LAG about the zoning scheme. Now the port manager, ‘Sam’, claimed a stake in the dispute: he had hopes of extending the port’s operational area into the undeveloped part of its land, which shared a boundary with properties in Lumbervale (Figure 4.2). The existence of residential dwellings in Lumbervale might impose constraints on these plans as, Sam felt, health and safety buffer requirements were likely to be more onerous around dwellings than around industrial uses. Sam therefore opposed any zoning for Lumbervale which might lead to an increase in the number of dwellings. As this opposition was in direct conflict with the LAG members’ hopes, it made SOHE’s planning problem more complicated and intractable than had been foreseen. Debate reportedly became rather heated.

Following the first meeting, Sam raised his concerns with SOHE’s senior management, and with staff at DOP. As a result, SOHE’s CEO and mayor attended the second meeting to mediate and to clarify the role of the committee as a forum for resolving such concerns. I was also present for the second meeting, and I saw little evidence of the antagonism that, I was told, characterised the first. LAG members were clearly worried about the possibility that the CEO’s purpose was to support the port’s position, but they and all other members made an effort to maintain a civil discussion. The sole item on the agenda was the revision of Beta’s new objectives, both to satisfy members as to the direction(s) they implied and, in the presence of the mayor, to ensure Council’s support for them. By the end of the meeting, the committee had changed their objectives again, and agreed to forward them to Council for ratification.
When the material for the third meeting was initially circulated, the committee’s objectives were again the only substantive item on the agenda. At this point the DOP officer, ‘Sue’, suggested that Beta should now start work on the industrial land issues, and that exploring land availability around Harbourtown would be a good beginning. Accordingly, this was added to the agenda, and the committee spent the third and fourth meetings, in December 2000 and March 2001, carefully evaluating ‘opportunities and constraints’ associated with a number of options for future industrial sites. During these meetings Beta achieved a great deal in terms of group cohesion: by the end of the fourth meeting, members’ working relationships appeared largely to be repaired.

One reason for this outcome was that at the third meeting the committee set the contentious issue of Lumbervale’s future aside pending further information, particularly regarding the port’s buffer needs, which Sam advised were to be addressed via a ‘port planning study’ (PPS) shortly to be undertaken. The committee, therefore, agreed to wait for these results and diverted their attention to other industrial land options. After two meetings, they had reached agreement on a priority ranking for ten potential light industrial sites, and agreed that an as-yet-unreleased area known as ‘Export Estate’ (Figure 4.2), originally set aside for port-using industries, should be made available for general industry.

My first round of Beta interviews – nine members, plus the consultant who had drafted the changes to Lumbervale’s zoning – was largely conducted after the second meeting, although a few participants who were not available at that time were interviewed after the fourth meeting. Unfortunately, there was one member with whom I was unable to arrange any time – this was the only failure to realise my goal of including all members in each round. That member instead had an extended interview in the second round, incorporating ‘background’ points from the first round.

The changing dynamic noted above was reflected in the interviews: early in the round, LAG, SOHE and port representatives displayed an intense preoccupation with the events leading up to Beta’s establishment, focussing in particular on ‘proving’ to me the rightness of the interviewee’s position. Later, interviewees spoke more about the meetings and the work that they were doing, praising themselves for devising a
satisfactory set of strategic objectives and expressing hope that the sites they had agreed to pursue would be realised.

Another feature of the first set of interviews was a remarkable consistency between the LAG members’ expositions of Beta’s background: discounting differences of expression, they concurred on every background ‘fact’, every opinion and every hope for the planning process. My interpretation of this was that they had discussed the matter thoroughly and frequently among themselves, constructing both an agenda and a version of events that could truly be said to represent a consensus of their organisation.

Three days after the fourth meeting, Beta’s project manager, ‘Larry’, was in a serious car accident, following which he was hospitalised for several months. This disrupted the committee’s progress just as they were on the verge of making some important decisions. With no alternative officer to progress the project, Beta stopped meeting, and LAG members returned to their customary relationship with SOHE, assuming the role of ‘watchdog’ over their activities. Five months later, in August 2001, LAG members approached the mayor to ask for support in re-establishing Beta, receiving a promise that meetings would commence again even if Larry should prove unable to return to work. SOHE’s CEO, ‘Len’, reconvened the committee in October 2001.\(^\text{19}\)

**Phase 2: Action**

With Len managing the project, Beta’s direction changed. During the second phase, the committee met four times. Meetings were shorter and, instead of being a forum for working together through issues, concentrated on making firm decisions and overseeing their implementation. After confirming previous agreements, Beta proceeded to approach key state government departments to enlist their support in progressing the release of Export Estate and their preferred sites for light industry. To this end, they invited officers from those departments to attend meetings (either in person or by phone), and resolved at their sixth meeting to establish a technical team to begin detailed planning for the proposed industrial sites.

At the eighth meeting (in March 2002), however, Beta encountered an obstacle. SOHE’s new town planner, ‘Lance’, had approached DOP (among other departments) to nominate an officer for Beta’s technical team. DOP replied that they
could not consider progressing the release of new land unless such actions were justified in a strategic planning document demonstrating the need for (or desirability of) the new industrial sites, and endorsed by Council. Beta had been trying to implement recommendations that had not yet been put to any officially sanctioned planning body. Lance, therefore, obtained a commitment from the committee to engage a consultant to prepare a strategic plan for industrial land, a Harbourside Industrial Strategy (‘HIS’), and it was with this commitment that Beta entered their third phase of activity. Also at this time, the port engaged consultants to undertake the PPS; the HIS and PPS projects were to run in parallel for the next seventeen months.

The second round of thirteen interviews took place after the seventh and eighth meetings, and included a number of new members. In addition to Len’s and Lance’s membership, a new councillor and an additional ‘community representative’ had been appointed following a Council election during Beta’s enforced ‘break’, and Larry had returned to work. Moreover, during Phase 2 the DOP planner (Sue) and the DOE officer had both left their jobs and been replaced; the new incumbents took their places on Beta. It was clear from the interviews that most of the new members had little background knowledge of Beta’s story, and thus did not see the project in terms of the conflict between LAG and SOHE, as the original members had. Further, the original members’ focus on that conflict had been replaced by a sense of excitement that their decisions were, first, being taken seriously by the CEO (Len) and, second, apparently coming to fruition. The need to produce a documented strategy was mostly seen as an annoying but simple step towards the release of the new sites.

*Phase 3: Preparation*

However, the process of engaging a consultant to prepare the HIS, which constituted Phase 3, took nine months. The ninth, tenth and eleventh meetings – from April to July 2002 – were spent considering various options and revisions for a consultant brief, and finally endorsing a brief that had been drafted by DOP officers in consultation with Lance (who was still providing professional and administrative support to Larry). The brief was put out to tender and Beta reconvened in
September to select the consultant, 'Colin', from a field of four. This choice was endorsed by Council later that month.

Also at that Council meeting, LAG's erstwhile president, 'Barry', was nominated as the new Council representative on Beta. Barry, who had recently been elected following another councillor's resignation, had been with Beta from the start and, thus, had both the interest and the background knowledge to take on this role.

The committee met twice more before work began on the HIS, in October 2002 to revisit aspects of the consultant brief and agree upon their expectations, and in January 2003 to brief Colin on those expectations and to question him on his proposed approach. Colin had submitted a three-stage program, which was endorsed, along with proposed timeline for production of the HIS – three months.

**Phase 4: Harbourtown Industrial Strategy**

During Phase 4, Beta acted as a steering committee for the HIS project, meeting only on completion of Colin's three stages. Each time, random events meant that, although Colin presented his research and recommendations, his report was not available to Beta members prior to the meeting, and they requested more time to develop a full response.

Stage 1 – a desktop review – was presented at Meeting 15, in March 2003. It began with contextualising sections on: the Harbourtown region; current planning instruments; social/demographic, economic and environmental profiles of the town; and existing service infrastructure. These sections appeared – to me and to Beta's members – to be ready to insert into the final HIS. The remainder of the report developed the study's analytical categories: defining various industrial land uses and locational criteria; identifying eleven possible sites to be evaluated; and consolidating a proposal for Stage 2 to evaluate eight of these sites for general industry or light industry (incorporating incidental residential uses). I was particularly interested in the detail of the report, because it represented Colin's interpretation not only of his brief, but also of the work Beta had done prior to his appointment.
Beta members were interested in the detail as well. Their immediate comments concerned Colin’s understanding of their objectives and of the history and nature of Lumbervale, and they requested amendments to the wording of some of the introductory sections. They did not, however, comment on what was to become the most problematic element of the project – the identification of Lumbervale itself as a candidate light industry site, rather than for general industry (its current zoning). This implied the possibility of future permissible dwellings in Lumbervale, a desirable state for LAG, but contrary to previously stated positions of the port, SOHE and DOP. However, no objections were raised either at the meeting or later, when members submitted written comments.

Stage 2 of the HIS was not presented to the committee until August 2003, mainly due to delays in the release of the PPS, the findings of which had to be taken into account under the terms of the consultant brief. At that time, the committee discovered that Colin had recommended light industry as Lumbervale’s future. This recommendation was in direct contradiction to those of the PPS, which was presented to Beta at the same meeting, and which stated that residences in Lumbervale should be phased out because they constituted a constraint to port development. The two reports represented precisely the stalemate with which Beta began, and all other detail became overshadowed by conflict over the Lumbervale issue. Beta agreed not to provide comment on the HIS at this time, but to meet again without Colin present to develop a collective response.

Two weeks later, more than a hundred Lumbervale residents attended a public meeting at which the port’s consultants presented their PPS. It was a fiery evening. Discussion was dominated by the issue of the study’s potential impact on the Lumbervale community and included personal abuse, threats of legal action, claims of dishonesty and manipulation, and requests for immediate compensation. The Lumbervale issue at the centre of Beta’s project had become intensely and publicly political, radically altering the committee’s dynamic and orientation.

By the time of the seventeenth meeting, in October 2003, lobbying on the issue had extended to a range of agencies and politicians, both local and state. At the invitation of DRD, a senior DOP officer, ‘Simon’, attended the Beta meeting to mediate between parties and to help find a solution likely to be acceptable to DOP.22 LAG.
reasoning that Barry (as a councillor) was no longer their representative, reinforced their numbers by sending their new president to the meeting in addition to Beta’s usual members.

The meeting was strained and awkward; all members were aware that common ground would be difficult to find. Larry, chairing the meeting, attempted to downplay their differences by focussing first on the less contentious elements of the Stage 2 report that did not involve Lumbervale, and establishing consensus on the preferred general industry site (Export Estate). Beta also agreed to request that Colin identify another site for light industry, either as an alternative to Lumbervale or as a long-term addition should Lumbervale become full. They failed, however, to reach any agreement on Lumbervale, in spite of Simon’s efforts. The comments eventually forwarded to Colin represented a mixture of consensual and individually made points.

The final draft of the HIS was presented in May 2004. Larry had wanted to wait until the PPS was finalised and its status (in relation to state policy) clarified; however, this was delayed to such an extent that other members became impatient and asked that the HIS be progressed. Colin had not altered the recommendations from Stage 2 and, in addition to presenting Stage 3 (implementation strategies), used the eighteenth meeting to justify those recommendations. In particular, he suggested that the dispute over Lumbervale’s future could not be resolved technically, and should be decided at the political level following public consultation. In an atmosphere of considerable tension, committee members avoided discussing the matter. Citing the fact that none of them had yet read the report, they again deferred making comment on it.

In the event, Larry decided against trying to achieve a seemingly impossible consensus by meeting again, and instead sent the final HIS to Council recommending its release for three months’ public comment without further input from the committee. Thus, in July 2004 Beta’s project entered the public arena without their consensus (though not without their consent [see MacCallum 2005: 352]), and the final phase of their project began. Phase 4 had taken much longer than expected, and seen the constructive working relationships Beta had formed disintegrate.
Phase 5: In public

During Phase 5, Beta met only once, to finalise the HIS after public submissions were received. However, that meeting was delayed for several months, during which other events threatened to commandeer many of Beta’s concerns.

In November 2004, the Minister for Planning sponsored a community workshop in Harbourtown, principally to discuss issues associated with specific developments but also to develop a long-term vision for the whole town. The main outcome of the workshop was a list of principles and generic proposals, including affirmation of Lumbervale’s nature as a general industrial area and a preference for phasing out residential uses there. That is, the report supported the port’s position on this issue rather than that of LAG and the HIS. LAG, although they had been represented at the workshop, publicly opposed both the report and the process by which the Lumbervale principles had been reached, and elicited from the minister a commitment to revisit the Lumbervale issue. Regardless of this commitment, the workshop report represented a view that DOP appeared to support. There were now two state government reports in circulation that contradicted the recommendations of the HIS.

In February 2005, SOHE held their Annual Electors Meeting (AEM), at which the president of LAG extracted a promise that Beta would reconvene to consider the final HIS in time to make their recommendation to the March Council meeting. A meeting – Beta’s last – was held in early March.

Four submissions had been received on the HIS, two each from both sides of the now entrenched conflict over Lumbervale. Colin had provided a detailed response to those submissions in a report that formed the basis for the final meeting’s discussion. From my perspective, the meeting was rather an anticlimax after the controversy surrounding the PPS and the minister’s workshop. No representative of the state attended – Sam sent his apologies, and neither DOP, DRD nor DOE responded to their invitations. A proposal to change the meeting date to allow Sam’s attendance had been quashed in discussion between Larry and Councillor Barry, reportedly on the grounds that finalising the project was ‘urgent’ (due to the promise made at the AEM) and that Sam could provide a proxy if he wished. Debate was subdued, limited as it was to input from LAG representatives (including Cr Barry) and SOHE
officers (including another new town planner) who refrained from taking a stance on
the Lumbervale issue.

The meeting endorsed Colin’s report, and formulated a recommendation to Council
that the HIS be ratified with minor amendments and that, further, SOHE’s zoning
scheme be amended as necessary to progress the recommendations: Export Estate, a
new light industrial area, and Lumbervale. It was well known that Sam would not
have supported the last recommendation.

Following the final Beta meeting, I interviewed Beta’s participants – the seven
current members plus Colin, Simon and Sue – for the last time. The long delay
between the second and third rounds of interviews was unfortunate, as there was a
possibility of ‘missing’ commentary on events that had been important at the time,
particularly during preparation for and Stage 1 of the HIS. Since Stage 2, however,
participants’ energies had been concentrated on the conflict between the port’s and
LAG’s/HIS’s positions and it was this issue that dominated the interviews, which
reflected a loss of any sympathy between LAG and the port. It was interesting to me
also that, with the overt politicisation of issues addressed in the HIS, the previous
conformity between LAG members’ representations of Beta’s project had broken
down, and that broader political differences (party loyalties, different approaches to
strategy) had come to the foreground. The events that members were recounting,
unlike the background that formed the central focus of the first round, were very
recent, and had not been ‘processed’ through LAG meetings; no coherent
organisational version of the project had been formed.

When Larry reported to Council later in March 2005, he knew that the state was
unlikely to support any amendments permitting further residences in Lumbervale.
He separated this committee recommendation from his own, suggesting that it be
deferred until the zoning scheme as a whole could be reviewed. Even so, Council
declined to make a decision, instead laying the matter on the table. As I write this
account, in September 2006, the matter has not yet returned to a Council meeting.
Rather, an alternative project has been initiated: consultants have been engaged to
develop a masterplan for SOHE, to be substantially funded by heavy industrial
interests and to include LAG on the steering group.
4.4 Summary

There were many differences between the planning processes undertaken by Alpha and Beta, including effects produced by having multiple or single lay-stakeholder groups, stable or fluid membership, and a substantive orientation towards natural resource management or urban development. Perhaps the most significant difference was in the executives’ processual orientation and focus. Alpha was constructed in a technical/scientific tradition as collaborating on a piece of research with a specific outcome in mind: the best (technical) plan possible in the given social environment. Members were explicitly instructed to act as ‘experts’ rather than ‘sector representatives’, and both meeting agendas and the management of discussion were consistently outcomes-focussed. Beta, in contrast, retained an emphasis on the conflict resolution aspects of its brief, spending considerable time ensuring that all members were comfortable with the committee’s objectives, and approaching contentious issues with great care. The process itself was rather organic, responding to immediate political and administrative necessities and undergoing several changes in direction. Neither DOMM nor SOHE has succeeded in producing a plan with which all their participating stakeholders are satisfied, and the outcomes of both processes have been laid outside of the public’s view.

My observation of the two case studies, and my interviews with participants, formed the fieldwork element of my enquiry. In the next chapter, I present the other key elements: the processes of analysis and writing.
5 At my desk

Chapter 4 outlined the fieldwork/data collection for this enquiry, including narratives of the two case studies in which the research is grounded. The texts generated by these cases included some 3,500 pages of meeting transcripts and 1,300 pages of interview transcripts, plus additional ‘internal’ reports, minutes and correspondence, field notes and incidental/contextual data (newspaper articles, Shire minutes, planning policies, development reports, and so on) filling eight lever-arch files and six magazine holders. Confronted with such a volume of data, I needed to develop strategies for its management. This chapter describes how I sorted, selected and analysed the texts and textual fragments used in this thesis, also reflecting briefly on the writing process.

Mats Alvesson and Kaj Sköldberg (2000: 248) suggest that social research involves a ‘quadruple hermeneutics’, extending the ‘double hermeneutics’ of Anthony Giddens (1976). In Giddens’ view, sociology mediates between the ‘real life’ intentions of the social actors it studies and the theoretical constructs of the discipline. The primary sources, therefore, represent a ‘first level’ of interpretation, and the researcher’s theoretical analysis a ‘second level’. Within this model, my ‘second level’ of interpretation itself involved several ‘layers’ of analysis: sorting and selection of data; a thematic framework analysis, and detailed textual analysis. These layers are outlined below, following which I address Alvesson and Sköldberg’s additional levels of interpretation – metatheory and self-critique.

5.1 Sorting

My first layer of analysis is represented by the fieldwork stories outlined in Chapter 4. It involved reducing several thousand pages of recorded detail, as well as unrecorded impressions and experiences, to a ‘skeletal’ chain of key events. I have not included in these stories all of the events relevant either to the outcomes of the two planning processes or to my research questions. For example, I have omitted almost all of the pressures brought to bear on the planning agencies by parties who were not directly involved in the participatory process (including, for instance, powerful corporations with a general, rather than strictly local, stake in marine
management or industrial planning). My choices in this regard, many of which were quite painful, were guided by three main principles:

- the stories needed to be internally coherent, and contain detail that ‘explains’ the (non-)outcomes;
- the detail needed to contain exemplars that address my key research questions:
  - the culture of planning,
  - the tensions of participatory planning,
  - the ‘metaprocesses’ through which different processual norms and practices are reconciled,
  - the meaning and value of those metaprocesses, and
  - the translation and presentation of participatory outcomes to other arenas.
- the details had to be presentable in such a way as not to compromise the cases’ anonymity.

The problem of maintaining anonymity was difficult, and could have been addressed in various ways. Originally, I intended to name the case studies and to protect the identities of individual participants by referring to them in code. This would have ‘opened’ the stories to much more detail regarding the political, economic, ecological and social contexts for the cases. However, it would also have ‘closed’ them to many important details regarding the roles and actions of individuals. In the case of Beta particularly, the small number of continuous participants and the polarisation of views meant that no coding could possibly have disguised certain people’s identities. This was the reason for fictionalising the two cases. Throughout the thesis, names of places, groups and organisations are fabricated; names of individuals are coded as follows.

- Alpha: employees of DOMM have names beginning with ‘D’; Alpha members’ names begin with ‘M’; observers’ names with ‘O’.
- Beta: local government employees’ names begin with ‘L’; state government employees’ with ‘S’; non-bureaucrats – in this case all small business proprietors (including councillors) – have names beginning with ‘B’; the consultant’s name begins with ‘C’.

The ‘fictionalising’ solution was developed in consultation with Alpha and Beta when I proposed to present a number of conference papers outlining parts of the
analysis (MacCallum 2002a, 2002b, 2002c). At the time, the committees were still actively engaged in their work, and (although the chances were slim) it was conceivable that discussion of the cases in public could affect their outcomes in ways not envisaged by the participants. Later, one participant requested that their identity, and that of the case study, be kept anonymous in my documentation even after the planning process was finished.2

5.2 Framework analysis

My second layer of analysis involved identifying a framework of themes through which to critique the two processes at a holistic level. Within the thesis, this ‘framework analysis’ (Richie and Spencer 1994; Lacey and Luff 2001) is represented chiefly by Chapter 9, which focuses on choices made by DOMM and SOHE. Initially, though, the need for a general critique was associated with my promise to deliver case study reports; as such, it was through those reports that this layer of analysis was developed. The thematic framework for the case study reports reflects two main sources:

- themes raised repeatedly by case study participants in the interviews. For each report, I began by reducing the interviews to short ‘comments’. These were then organised in three steps:
  - separating ‘procedural’, ‘substantive’ and ‘contextual’ comments;
  - according to recurring themes within these broad classes; and then
  - with attention to the presence of ‘alien discourse’ (Bakhtin 1981: 342) – that is, to the intertexts/habitual discourses influencing participants’ ‘take’ on the issues.

This framework was then combined with:

- my own concerns about how the agencies enacted normative discourses of participation. In particular, these included:
  - inclusion/access;
  - management of difference, conflict and power; and
  - synthesis/translation of ‘outcomes’.

Within these three broad themes the analysis yielded a number of sub-themes which reflected the executive staff’s orientation and strategies.
The presentation of the framework in this thesis differs from that in the case study reports. In particular, the thesis omits 'substantive' themes and certain other themes that I saw as either highly specific to the cases (carrying a risk of identifying them) or beyond the scope of my PhD enquiry (for example, Indigenous involvement). Chapter 9, where the analysis is presented, is also structured according to the three issues listed above as 'my own concerns', whereas the case study reports take their forms from the interviews’ recurring themes.

5.3 Textual analysis

5.3.1 Sampling

The third layer of analysis focussed closely on the textual data. Given the amount of data I held, it would not have been possible to analyse the entire corpus systematically. This third layer, therefore, involved the application of a brutal sampling strategy as well as the use of text-analytic tools. I limited myself to a particular genre chain that, in my view, represents most explicitly and consistently the practice of participatory planning:

- meetings (the principal site of participatory decision making);
- minutes (the 'true and accurate record' of what takes place at meetings); and
- planning documents (the formal ‘outcome’ of the decision-making process).

These three genres are, from a bureaucratic point of view, driven by an instrumental purpose – to reach agreement on specific questions, to fix those agreements beyond challenge, and to justify future actions implied by those agreements to a wider audience, including political decision makers. Each genre achieves its purpose through a set of conventional stages that are usually explicit: meetings have a formal agenda; minutes inscribe resolutions onto that agenda; planning documents have a table of contents. This staging provides structure – delimiting ‘items’ or ‘sections’ also breaks each genre down into reasonably coherent samples.

Of the three genres, the meetings – representing most directly the participatory part of the process – received the bulk of my attention. It was in the meetings that my key issues of tension and resolution were realised. To select appropriate samples from the meeting transcripts, I followed Fairclough (1992: 230) by identifying
‘cruces’, or ‘moments of crisis’, from each meeting. These included points of disagreement or misunderstanding, and associated conciliatory or reparative action; I also focussed on moments of resolution, where discussion was resemiotised or reframed ‘intratextually’ (Reid et al. 1998: 2). From some such ‘moments’ – those that were in themselves extended conversations – I selected fragments that appeared to illustrate the main stages in their development. In identifying these moments, I appealed to my other sources, as well as to my own instincts. Minutes and other resemiotised records, for example, gave focus to moments that would become formally embedded in later discussions. The perceptions of the participants, expressed in interviews, were particularly helpful in corroborating or challenging my own interpretations, and brought several ‘cruces’ to my attention.

In addition, I made a deliberate effort to focus on ‘unruly material’ (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000: 250). That is, I looked for deviant examples when I felt that I had identified a particular phenomenon in the case studies, and examined those examples’ environments to see whether their deviance could be explained. This is a ‘trustworthiness’ technique that David Silverman calls the ‘refutability principle’ (2000: 178; also Lincoln and Guba’s [1985) techniques of ‘referential adequacy’ and ‘negative case analysis’).

One consequence of this approach, which fits well with my general assumption of ‘well-meaningness’, was that I scrutinised the texts and utterances of all participants – those with whom I agreed, as well as those with whom I did not. While this might appear to be the obvious implication of ‘comprehensive data treatment’ (Silverman 2000), it can pose emotional difficulties, particularly when the ideologies of ‘socially disadvantaged groups or people who have been subject to abuse’ (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000: 256) are in question.³ Jim Martin (1999, 2002, 2004) has responded to this difficulty by proposing a form of critical discourse analysis called ‘positive discourse analysis’, which sees the strategic use of language ‘more as a resource for making interested truths ..., less as a tool for distorting reality’ (2004: n.p). Or, as Silverman put it, ‘we should aim to identify the interactional skills of the participants rather than their failings’ (1993: 194).
5.3.2 Passing through the data

Once the samples had been selected, I made two text-analytical ‘passes’ through the data. The first of these focussed on tensions, that is, on conflict and misunderstanding, particularly between the planners and other participants. The first analysis asked a number of questions:

- Do members share a coherent view of what they are talking about? This question concerned the ideational metafunction: it was examined through the lexical choices participants made, and the retrieval of topics through reference (see Appendix D).

- How do members form alliances and/or practice-groups around agenda items? This principally concerned the interpersonal metafunction, though ideational and textual choices also marked sets of intertexts/interdiscourses through which participants established similarities and differences. The key ‘tool’ used to examine this question was appraisal (White 1999, 2002) – the use of words and modalities that express attitude, engagement and graduation (Appendix E). Broad patterns across all three metafunctions contributed to the analysis.

- How are relations enacted between members, and between members and the executive? For this question, I mainly looked at the interpersonal expression of basic exchanges, such as requests, offers and statements of fact and opinion, adapting the framework developed by Suzanne Eggins and Diana Slade (1997) for casual conversation (Appendix F).

- How do those relations affect the agreements that the committees reach? For this issue, I turned to the textual metafunction, specifically by identifying how – and whether – certain themes were developed and/or ‘closed’ (Appendix G). I also looked at how agreements were fixed in minutes and reports.

The results of this first ‘pass’ are outlined in Chapters 7 and 8 of this thesis. In presenting the analysis, I make extensive use of fragments from the transcripts. These have been (re)edited: I have chosen to depict only the speakers’ words and pauses, unless features such as pronunciation, stress and intonation are particularly relevant to the meanings being discussed. I have also used, as far as possible, standard ‘grammatical’ punctuation (that is, suited to written English) in the reproduced fragments, even though this has not always accurately represented the speaker’s stress and intonation. I recognise that this choice introduces an additional level of interpretation to the utterances of participants. My primary reason for it was
to make the transcripts more accessible to the reader, but I also felt that 'standardised' transcripts would be more respectful to the speakers (Bourdieu 1999: 622-23), as spoken English can look very clumsy in print.

The second text-analytic 'pass', which in the thesis is represented by Chapters 10 and 11, asked one key question:

- How, in the face of difference, conflict, and power inequalities, do the committees make decisions that enable them to 'move on'?

Through this analysis, I hoped to identify 'metaprocesses' through which groups reconcile different cultural practices. I focussed on one specific area of discursive practice – decision making – mainly to keep the scope of this issue under control. As in the first pass, the analysis was mainly at the discourse-semantic rather than lexicogrammatical level, a decision made in part to avoid burdening the thesis with more technical linguistic jargon than necessary; the delicacy of lexicogrammatical choices often requires explanation in terms that I think are less intuitively accessible than discourse-semantic ones. It made particular use of the exchange framework (Appendix F) and broad patterns of transitivity, that is, the types of processes invoked in the discourse – material, behavioural, mental, verbal, relational, or existential (Appendix H). However, this passage focussed more specifically than the first on change: it was the logogenetic development of decisions, and the 'ergogenetic' development of decision-making practices, that I wished to interrogate.

The key questions that I asked of the minutes and planning documents related to the translation of outcomes and metaprocesses for implementation and publication purposes:

- What do these translations 'do to' the discourse – the relations, emphases and practices – realised in the meetings?

- How does the process of resemiotisation create hegemonic meanings?

This analysis is invoked occasionally throughout Parts 2 and 3 of the thesis, and addressed specifically in Chapter 9, Section 9.3.
5.4 Reflexivity

The three analytic layers described above correspond to the second level of interpretation in Alvesson’s and Sköldberg’s ‘quadruple hermeneutics’ (2000: 248). They sort, label and relate data according to particular theoretical frames. However, for a critical enquiry such as this one, Alvesson and Sköldberg suggest that further layers are necessary. Their third level is metatheoretical, involving consideration of how the primary and secondary interpretations reflect underlying structures, and how those structures might be challenged. Critical discourse analysis models (Fairclough 1989, 1992, 1995, 2003; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999) provide a different framework to a similar end, recalling that discourse needs to be analysed as a moment of the social, and related explicitly to broader societal structures and/or practices of which it is an element. This requires a ‘transdisciplinary’ interplay of theoretical models relating the micro and macro. As an example, my use of the generic staging of meetings, minutes and plans to help me with my data selection (5.3.1) needs also to be considered in relation to the rhetorical and political effects of that staging, how it ‘works for’ the institutions (planning, bureaucracy, politics) in which it is situated (Chapter 9, 9.3).

In my enquiry, this interplay forms a fourth ‘layer’ of analysis, involving explicit theorising of micro-macro relations in the data’s ‘fields of production’ (Bourdieu 1984, 1993). For this analysis, I draw on a range of sociologies, separate from the communicative planning theory that frames my research questions (Chapter 2). The theorising step is presented explicitly in Chapter 6 and related to other levels of analysis throughout the discussions in the remainder of Parts 2 and 3.

Chapter 12 presents further metatheoretical reflection on how the interaction of theory and micro-analysis worked to alter my understanding of planning as a practice, linking this analytical layer to the final level in Alvesson and Sköldberg’s model. Both Alvesson and Sköldberg’s quadri-hermeneutic and Chouliaraki and Fairclough’s CDA propose a level of self-critique, a kind of extended reflexivity that represents a ‘postmodern’ response to the problem of rigour, inherent to qualitative research. This means consideration of how my interpretations at all other levels, and the presentation of those interpretations in this thesis, invoke particular discourses to construe the social world in which I am personally involved (Richardson 1994).
Extended reflexivity also suggests attention to how the thesis constructs my own identity for the reader. Chapter 1 placed my enquiry in the context of my professional life. My early choice to write a ‘traditional’ PhD monograph reflected a particular, old-fashioned, stance towards academia: an understanding that a PhD should represent a single, sustained project within a well defined set of disciplinary conventions. It was not until I was engaged with my candidacy that I began to recognise how tenuous those conventions are: planning theory does not provide a coherent, self-contained body of knowledge (Allmendinger 2002a, 2002b), nor does it naturalise a clear repertoire of research practices. Much of my attention in the early stages of the enquiry, therefore, was devoted to (re)constructing my own view of the discipline: the process of enquiry has realigned my professional identity.

Moreover, my original hope was that systematic analysis (of the sort that a grammar can provide for) would lead to clear, generally applicable answers: in the event, it worked rather to demonstrate the contingency and ‘murkiness’ of planning practice in a context of difference. This is not to say that I have ‘lost faith’ in empirical research or systematic thinking. As noted in Chapter 2, I do believe that knowledge is socially constructed, but I also believe that empiricism is a valid way of constructing it:

Science is indeed, as Gramsci saw well, an eminently political activity. Yet it is not for all that merely a politics and therefore incapable of yielding ... truths. 5 (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 47)

In addition to its account of two case studies, therefore, this thesis tells the story of my own changing perspectives both as a planner and as a researcher. This is made explicit in positioning statements, in sections such as the present one, and in occasional endnotes.

5.5 Conclusion

Part I of the thesis began in Chapter 1 with a research problem, or motivating question, then developed that problem into a proposal for enquiry in Chapter 2, further describing a specific text-analytical framework in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 outlined the project’s fieldwork as it progressed, including the evolution and execution of my data-collection methods and (fictionalised) details of the two case
studies in which the enquiry is grounded. This chapter has completed my recount of the project by describing the analysis and writing processes and, thus, concludes Part 1. The remainder of thesis presents the analysis and findings of the enquiry as two broad steps in my overall argument. In Part 2, I explore the first part of my motivating question: the culture of planning and the tensions that participation brings to that culture. Chapter 6 begins this exploration by theorising how participation puts planning culture(s) at risk, in preparation for the empirical examination of the case studies in Chapters 7 and 8.
Part 2: Strangers in a strange land
6 Planning culture(s) at risk

In Chapter 2, I drew upon the institutionalist stream of communicative planning theory to reframe collaborative planning as a ‘cross-cultural’ practice. This framing problematises the ‘culture(s)’ of planning – the tacit relations, beliefs/representations and other organisational principles which frame practice. In this chapter, I explore this notion in more detail, theorising planning as a cultural practice in order to develop ‘starting points’ from which to explore my key questions (Chapter 2, 2.3.1). In particular, I focus on how collaboration, as an encounter between different practices, might place planning culture(s) at risk.

Section 6.1 begins by teasing out the notion of practice in relation to action and professional identity, then introduces the idea of power as intrinsic to practice before bringing these ideas together in a conceptual model of cultural institutions. This section draws on a range of sociologies – Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger’s ‘communities of practice’ (1991); Pierre Bourdieu’s fields of production (1984, 1990b, 1991, 1993); the semiotic approach of Actor-Network Theory (Law and Hassard 1999) – assembling them in the manner of a bricoleur in order to make explicit a view of institutions as constraining but, at the same time, dynamically constructed. I do not present my model as the Truth; nor do I imagine that the authors of the concepts I use would necessarily endorse my use of them together in this ‘mixed’ context. Rather, my model gives expression and form to my own multiple identities as practitioner, stakeholder and observer of planning practice. The concepts it draws upon have powerful explanatory potential with respect to both my personal experience and my research data and, as the remainder of the chapter will show, they provide foundations on which to build connections between the micro-processes of planning events and the macro-outcomes of institutional change.

Section 6.2 applies the ideas developed in Section 6.1 to characterise traditional Australian planning as a bureaucratic and as a discursive practice, then outlines some key challenges that participation poses to tradition: a misfit between discourses of participation and the traditional bureaucratic field; the entry of new, differently habituated voices; the complex nature of the learning that takes place; and the conservative effects of translating ‘outcomes’ for the political/public sphere(s).
6.1 Practice and power

6.1.1 Participation and reification

Planning is a practice – it is something that people do. But this characterisation begs a number of questions. How is that ‘something’ recognisable? What are its boundaries? How many ‘people’ have to do it? Who can those people be? How often do they have to do something for it to become their practice? Do they have to do it well? What might ‘well’ look like? These questions reflect the fact that the word ‘practice’ connotes regular performance. To be worthy of the name, a practice must have achieved the kind of ‘chronic reproduction’ that Giddens (1984, 1991) refers to as ‘structuration’. However, a sociological account of practice must also recognise that the instituted regularity of a practice – that which allows it to be identified and named – is in tension with the fact that its ‘reproductions’ are not identical, and their details cannot generally be predicted. The improvisations and creativity of practitioners, it is often noted, cannot be accounted for by positing formulaic ‘rules’. As practitioners become competent, they stop referring to the codified procedures or instructions on which beginners rely, and their performance becomes less conscious, more intuitive, more responsive to context (Flyvbjerg 2001, citing Dreyfus and Dreyfus 1986). Moreover, Étienne Wenger points out that as this learning process progresses the practice becomes more central to the practitioner’s social and personal identity: the practitioner becomes part of a ‘community of practice’ (1998; Lave and Wenger 1991). The question ‘what do you do?’ is likely to attract a response of the form, ‘I am a planner.’

Practice, then, is regular but not reducible to its regularities. Aspects of a practice may be codified as rules or procedures, but these codifications can never fully represent or predict their own animation in practice. Wenger (1998) provides a framework for understanding the relationship between practice and what I am calling ‘procedure’ by analysing practice as two complementary elements: participation – human engagement in actions and interactions, through which meanings are negotiated – and reification – giving form and existence to those meanings through representation or codification (naming, writing down, and so on), thereby producing the infrastructure that supports institutions. The relationship between these elements is mutually constitutive: reification represents the projection of participation onto the
'real' world (1998: 58), and its products become resources upon which participation
draws, 'as people use the law to argue a point, use the procedure to know what to do,
or use the tool to perform an action' (1998: 59). 'Procedure', in this thesis, is used to
refer to a particular product of reification: the formal staging of rituals or routines
that represent the institutionalised core of the practice of planning (Dear 1986: 379).2
For the products of participation – the actual chains/networks of events generated
when procedures are instantiated or ‘put into practice’ – I will use the term
‘processes’. Differing contexts, the improvisations of practitioners, responses to the
unexpected, and so on mean that processes are not uniform. Processes are the
foreground, the concrete, which maintain and transform both practices and, through
reification, the institutions with which those practices are associated.

Figure 6.1 summarises the relations between these elements of practice. The dotted
line between the reification and participation ‘sides’ of practice is intended to
indicate that they are not discrete but mutually constitutive and dependent. The ‘U’
shapes between ‘vertical’ elements represent a relation of constitution: procedures
are ‘made up of’ rituals, processes ‘made up of’ events. As both procedures and
processes can be broken down into constitutive elements (rituals and events), I have
extended this analysis to the more holistic notion of practices (as a count noun),3
allocating the term ‘activities’ to the implied new element. That is, practices can be
seen as combining a number of distinct activities. The diagram also shows two types
of relationship between the (arbitrarily designated) left and right hand sides:
Wenger’s reification and participation are complementary elements of practice, but
there is also a direct relationship, in that procedures/rituals codify processes/events,
and processes/events instantiate procedures/rituals.

This Wenger-derived model of practice reframes the traditional distinction between
social structure and agency, and helps to account for the well recognised dialectic
between the two: the institutions established through reification, and which constrain
action, are continuously and actively constructed through the participation of
knowing agents (Giddens 1984). However, for my purposes, there remain some
important gaps in this model.4 First, the instituted regularities of practice are not
always formally reified. There are conventions that, without requiring concrete
‘existence’, govern action no less than rules and procedures. Second, the model does
not explicitly address the issue of power. The potential of participation to modify
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Figure 6.1: Elements of practice
institutions is not evenly distributed. The social ordering of institutions does indeed seem to provide pre-existing and inaccessible constraints on the (inter)actions of many agents (Layder 1981). Sharon Hays suggests that:

Agency ... occurs on a continuum from ... structural reproduction ... to the structural transformation of successful revolutionaries. This continuum is influenced by the depth and durability of the structural form in question, by the level of power held by those making the choices, and by the larger cultural milieu in which the choices are made ...' (1994: 64, emphasis in original)

This continuum, I think, is what makes events – the observable part of the social world – interesting. Events may be explored for patterns that express and construct social order; the continuum also makes possible enquiries into their transformational possibilities. My framework needs to be extended to allow me to describe the topology of this continuum. To do this, I turn to the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu.

6.1.2 The topology of social space: fields, capital, habitus

Bourdieu's work provides a framework for understanding the 'logic of practice' (1990b) in terms of social relations. He sees action as taking place within an instituted 'space', called a social field, a concept that is implicitly applicable both to society as a whole and to particular institutions (Earle 1999). The social field is structured by dimensions of capital, a term extended to include cultural and social assets (such as education or 'connections') as well as economic ones (Bourdieu 1984). Social action within a field can be seen as a form of economic exchange in which positioned agents realise and attempt to increase their capital endowment. Ruth Wodak and Eva Vetter make this point clearly:

Each field has its rules defined by the following questions: Which forms of capital are at stake? How it is distributed? How is symbolic capital – the perceived and legitimized form of the other forms of capital – generated? (1999: 212)

This last question is crucial to the relational ordering of institutions. Symbolic capital is constituted in its recognition by social agents: it represents a kind of consensus (or, at least, hegemony) of values. Another type of capital (knowledge,
for example) is convertible to symbolic capital (prestige or reputation, say) when, first, it is realised in some form (such as a speech) and, second, other actors perceive that the capital is valuable and that the form of realisation is legitimate. Like other aspects of practice, the realisation of symbolic capital may be codified (reified) in systems of material artefacts (awards, clothing), titles (Professor, Executive Manager), honorifics (Dr, Sir), edicts (delegations of authority, statutes) and so on, creating the relational ‘hard infrastructure’ of institutions. Indeed, Bourdieu has claimed that the process of codification/objectification is one of the defining characteristics of modernity:

In short, there is a shift from a diffuse symbolic capital, resting solely on collective recognition, to an objectified symbolic capital, codified, delegated and guaranteed by the state, in a word bureaucratized. (1994: 11, emphasis in original)

The codification of symbolic capital is an aspect of the exercise of symbolic power – the power of ‘constituting the given ..., of making people see and believe, of confirming or transforming the vision of the world and, thereby, action on the world and thus the world itself’ (Bourdieu 1991: 170), a power that Bourdieu sees as concentrated in the state through its ‘monopolization of the universal’ (1994: 17) – conferring of ‘natural’ status on its field characteristics.

Figure 6.2 is a conceptual representation of the symbolic structure of an arbitrary social field. The three dimensions represent different types of capital that can be realised as symbolic within the field. As agents may be positioned within this three-dimensional field according to their stock of capital, their distance from the origin represents their total stock of (potentially symbolic) capital. The polarities represent an actor’s implied dominance (dominating, dominated) within the field (Bourdieu 1993: 186).

It is in the realisation of symbolic capital that influence – and therefore the capacity to sustain or alter the status quo – lies. In any given field, actors are differentially endowed with capital that may be realised as symbolic. In addition, individuals respond to the contexts in which they find themselves through their personal habitus: values and dispositions shaped by their history of immersion in particular social fields. Habitus is the embodiment of institutional logics of practice in people,
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Figure 6.2: Symbolic structure of an arbitrary social field (adapted from Bourdieu 1993: 186)
orienting them to certain types of capital, and giving them the skills to realise those logics unreflectively: the 'feel for the game' of the experienced player (Bourdieu 1990a: 9), the 'gut-level' skills that allow practice to be both regular and creative. It is the interaction between field and habitus that simultaneously enables and constrains agency. A feel for the game allows actors to follow institutional norms and conventions – whether codified or not – and nonetheless to use them spontaneously and innovatively: 'nothing is simultaneously freer and more constrained than the action of the good player' (1990a: 63). Moreover, it is through the habitus – embodiment in agents through practical learning – that norms and conventions are reproduced and sustained (Taylor 1999). Thus, returning to the Wenger-derived model of practice, habitus can be seen as an 'informal' – that is, non-codified – aspect of reification.

Although habitus operates at a non-conscious level, it may be brought into conscious focus. Situations in which there is the potential for conflict, for example, may cause agents to act more reflectively, reverting to codified rules and conventions and 'checking' their behaviour (Bourdieu 1990a: 78). Similarly, when actors come into contact with those from different cultures, who react in different ways, they may question their own reactions. That is, cross-cultural encounters put habitus, and the social fields that have shaped it, at risk (Bourdieu et al. 1999; Bourdieu 2002; see, for example, Friedmann 2002; Waterson 2002).

Thus, Bourdieu offers a perspective on practice which complements that of Wenger; one which embeds practice in instituted relations, and which adds a dynamic aspect by reframing institutions as sites of struggle: actors may act (consciously or otherwise) not only to increase their stock of capital within a social field – thus enhancing their positions with respect to other actors – but also to reinforce or subvert the symbolic structure of the field according to their own habitus and orientations to capital. Bourdieu also provides insight into how institutions differentially enable and constrain the choices of agents – the 'topology' of Hays' agency continuum. Agents' options and the transformational potential of their actions can be seen as affected by the amount of economic and socio-cultural capital they hold, by the degree of naturalisation of the symbolic structure of the field in which they act, and by the field's interaction with other, differently structured fields.
A number of Bourdieu’s critics claim that habitus, as a concept that renders practice unreflective, leaves little space for reasoned or consciously transformative action (Butler 1996; Bohman 1999). I do not agree with this critique. I read habitus as enabling agents to work for or against ‘the system’ from within (Bourdieu 1990b, 1991, 1998b, 2002). Moreover, because habitus may be problematised in cross-cultural encounters, it suggests a potential for those ‘outside’ to challenge the symbolic structuring of institutions and to generate reflexive critique within them (Bourdieu et al. 1999; Bourdieu 2000: 161). However, while I think that Bourdieu’s framework is a useful one for understanding the links between practices and institutional structure, and thus the transformational potential of practice, I do not find that it adequately addresses the processes through which institutions are constructed and changed. I need a way to look at how certain objects, behaviours and knowledges are ‘capitalised’ within social fields, how consensus is formed and maintained about the value of symbolic capital, and at how the resulting ‘symbolic structure’ of institutions is articulated with their human and other physical elements. Actor-Network Theory (ANT) provides such a viewpoint.

6.1.3 Capitalisation, (re)formation, (re)articulation: Actor-Network Theory

ANT arose from studies in the ethnography of science (Callon et al. 1986b), in which one of the fundamental mysteries facing researchers was how the human and non-human worlds were combined in the laboratory, and the resulting ‘hybrid’ forms (knowledge and technology) released into the social world (Latour 1991; Law 1991). This can be reframed as a political question: how is ‘nature’ brought under the control of scientists, and how are the (material and non-material) constructions of scientists given the power to act at a distance?

ANT, then, is a perspective that treats science/knowledge and politics – two of the most important realms of power in modern democracies – as equivalent. It adopts a number of key principles:

- rejection of any a priori distinction between the social and the natural: what Michel Callon (1986b: 196) calls the principle of ‘free association’;
commitment to explaining different viewpoints – including those of human and non-human agents – in the same terms: the principle of ‘generalised symmetry’ (Callon 1986b: 196; Latour 1993: 103);

‘agnosticism’ with regard to controversies (Callon 1986b: 196); and

a non-Euclidean view of space/distance as defined by connections between actors: ‘network topology’ (Murdoch and Marsden 1995; Thrift 1996; Law 1999; Bridge and Watson 2002).

These principles give the theory considerable power to explain the resources (the socio-cultural and economic capital) upon which actors draw in social action. Power in ANT is seen as the ability to enlist the wills of others and thereby to act with their collective force. The methods by which an actor achieves this are collectively called ‘translation’, a term that draws upon the Latin pun tradutore-traditore – translation-treason – to hint at the complexity and impurity of these methods. Wills are not faithfully transferred, but transformed: ‘Translation … speaks for others but in its own language’ (Callon 1986a: 26).

Through translation, an ‘actor-world’ (Callon 1986a) is created of heterogeneous entities, or ‘actants’ – people, artefacts, nature, places, thoughts, relations, actions – that are at once real and constructed. The translator – the spokesperson for the actor-world – is an actor, but is also a network of connections, him/her/itself constituted in the translations that construe the associated entities: ‘entities take their form and acquire their attributes as a result of their relations with other entities’ (Law 1999: 3). Thus, in its dynamic aspect, an actor-world is an actor-network formed by ‘chains of translation’ (Callon and Law 1995).

The process of translation is one of definition, seduction, enlistment and displacement. In Callon’s (1986b) classic description of how a group of marine biologists sought to translate the interests of both the fishers and the scallops of St Brieuc Bay, he distinguishes four ‘moments’ of translation. Each moment is not a discrete stage in the process, but an ongoing effort with mutually-constitutive ties to all the other ‘moments’:

- problematisation: defining the nature and problems of another entity and showing that the solution to those problems can only be reached through one or more
'obligatory passage points' (in the St Brieuc Bay case, the biologists' research program) controlled by the translator;

- *interessement:* attracting other entities to the actor-network and locking them into the roles proposed for them by the translator, who thereby becomes the mediator between the actor-world and the 'outside' world;

- *enrolment:* assigning roles to and relationships between entities in the actor-world, and establishing their consent to the program of obligatory passage points; and

- *mobilisation:* fulfilment of the program through ensuring that entities follow the imposed itinerary and do not 'betray' the translator.

Translation's moments are not simply transactions between translator and translated, but between those two entities and a third. As spokespersons, translators require the faith of those with whom they speak, as well as the loyalty of their constituents.

Actor-networks, therefore, do not distinguish between entities on the basis of their attributes, which are considered to be defined in the process of translation. Instead, actants may be distinguished by their roles. The term 'actor' denotes an entity that successfully translates others, thus becoming their representative in interactions with the world outside of the network. Through translation, an actor is able to simplify and 'black-box' (Callon and Latour 1981) passive actants as fixed points in the network — as 'immutable mobiles' (Latour 1987: 227, 1990: 26) — upon which the actor can draw without the need continually to renew them. Another type of entity in an actor-network is the 'intermediary': an entity that defines the relationship between actors/actants. The role of intermediaries is to carry translations; they make possible action at a distance. Any actant can be an intermediary — human, money, telephone and so on — but one of the most effective and important kinds is *inscriptions* (Callon et al. 1986a: 10): durable texts (written or otherwise recorded) that can pass from producer to receiver without the need for temporal or spatial proximity, thereby allowing actors to increase their influence and the extent of their actor-world (Callon and Latour 1981). Inscriptions approximate Wenger's reifications of practice and Bourdieu's codifications of symbolic capital — they may incorporate practices and/or social relations, as well as knowledge of 'nature' or 'reality' — but their special power lies in their ability to represent and fix nominal 'consensus' between the actants in their actor-world. Intermediaries may also become actors and vice versa.
I do not propose to adopt ANT’s ruthless reduction of everything to semiotic relations (Law 1999: 3) as an ontological framework: as pointed out in Chapter 2, I believe that there is a ‘reality’ to be translated, and that many material power resources can be understood without the need for semiotic analysis. However, I do find the notion of translation an especially useful one in describing the dynamics of Bourdieu’s capital. Capital within a social field can be seen as constituted in actor-networks: an actor who successfully translates the wills of natural and/or social/economic actants acts with their collective force, and those actants become part of the actor’s ‘stock’ of capital. The realisation of capital, in turn, can be seen as the use of intermediaries (money, objects, texts, people) to extend the actor-network beyond its existing scope. If successful, the actor-network restructures relations between entities in its new, extended scale. Thus, social ‘structure’ is not simply a site of (or container for) struggle; structure, identity and knowledge are continuously and simultaneously being (re)created at multiple scales through the struggles of social actors. Moreover, ‘translation’ denotes an open set of practices. It extends the relationship of mutual production between practices and power relations to incorporate construction of knowledge and values (Thrift 1996).

Thus, institutions, including their associated relations and beliefs, are underwritten by particular ‘logics of practice’ (Bourdieu 1990b). Practices (count noun), relations and beliefs are dialectically related through this logic as moments of an institution: that is, as analytically distinguishable elements each of which, at any given time, internalises continual flows between it and all the others (Harvey 1996: 62-64; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999: 37; Fairclough 2003: 101). For example, practices internalise relations as certain roles that participants adopt in instituted rituals, and as general orientations to particular forms of capital that are realisable as symbolic. They internalise beliefs as forms of reason embedded in their reifications, and as (formal and informal) associations with certain issues. Relations internalise beliefs as hegemonic values represented by a field’s symbolic structure, and practices through their embodiment in agents as habitus. Beliefs internalise practices as faith in the ‘obligatory passage points’ through which translation creates consensus, and they internalise relations as the actor-networks represented by consensual knowledge and values. And, importantly, these three moments are continually renewed and/or transformed through practice without the need for overt reference to its reifications.
6.1.4 Cultural institutions

It is these sets of practices, relations and beliefs that I refer to as ‘culture’ (Baum 2000). Culture, in this sense, does not conform to either geo-political boundaries or divisions based on ethnicity or race; nor is it limited to the fields of art and literature (as in Bourdieu 1993 on ‘cultural production’). It is, rather, a fluid concept that connects people in shared (but ambiguous) ‘webs of meaning’ (Geertz 1973: 5) which they continually construct in every facet of their social lives. Susan Wright, discussing how the concept of culture is applied in organisational studies, emphasises this point, also drawing attention to the implicit links between the three moments:

... to an anthropologist influenced by Geertz’s ideas, ‘sharedness’ is more likely to imply a common repertoire of ideas [beliefs] which are reworked continually in imaginative ways that are systematic, explainable, but not predictable [practices]. Not only is ambiguity essential, as it provides the space for this reworking, but the process is political [relations]: meanings of concepts and symbols are not just not fixed, they are actively contested. (1994: 4)

Thus, the ‘shared meanings’ that constitute ‘culture’ are complex, contested and contingent. Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe understand them as ‘nodal points which partially fix meaning’ (1985: 113), points which result from the discursive establishment of relationships between different social resources as moments of a new element, a process which they call ‘articulation’ (also Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999: 121-26). Articulation can be seen as a form of actor-network translation and, when it successfully ‘fixes meaning’ (for example, in inscriptions or in the habitus of actors), of reification.

Through reification, culture is (perhaps temporarily) ‘crystallised’ (Hays 1994: 67) in identifiable institutions, whose moments include not only the fluid cultural elements listed above, but also their symbolic manifestations as hard infrastructure, material products and discursive codifications such as titles, job descriptions and so on. Hence, an army can indeed ‘be said still to “exist” when no soldier at all is engaged in manifesting army membership or army-relevant practices’ (Coulter 2001: 37). An institution’s reifications sustain it through (limited) times of zero participation.
Because society is complex, institutions are not discrete. People and other actors participate in many institutions as they act out various facets of their existence, which may involve identifying with any number of different socio-cultural (gendered, ethnic, religious, professional, familial, interest, and so on) groups (Douglas 1986; Chaiklin and Lave 1993; Clyne 1994). Hence, participants in social life interpret events and structure their own actions in various different ways according to their understanding of the institutional context, a concept that has been packaged by Erving Goffman (1974) and others as framing.\(^{10}\) Moreover, many rituals are shared by a number of different institutions, which consequently overlap as those rituals are instantiated by events. A football game, for example, might typically articulate the institutions of sport, media, commerce, bureaucracy and technology, among others. Nonetheless, institutions are intuitively identifiable and, therefore, may be characterised. The next section will focus on traditional planning/policy making in Australia, applying the framework developed above to characterise some aspects of my profession’s institutional inheritance.

### 6.2 Planning and the challenges of participation

**Some disclaimers**

This thesis focuses on planning as a public sector practice associated with the institution of bureaucracy. As such, it is the bureaucracy that is put at risk by transformational capacity of collaborative planning. I do not discuss collaborative planning as a threat to the institution of representative democracy, though I believe that this is an important issue and that my enquiry may have corollaries that would contribute to such a discussion. My case studies are firmly embedded in the bureaucracies that support our existing system of government, and it is upon this level that I concentrate.

It should also be noted that the depiction of planning offered in this section is an attempt to capture some moments of traditional bureaucratic planning culture in Australia, rather than a normative model for meeting democratic or social ideals. In this it differs from many other analytical characterisations within the communicative planning field (for example, Innes 1996b; Healey 1997; Innes and Booher 1999a),
whose aim in problematising cultural characteristics (practices, relations, beliefs) is to enhance potential for building institutional capacity.

6.2.1 Practising within a bureaucratic field

Many actors participate in planning – planners, politicians, lobbyists, developers, concerned citizens. However, not all these actors can be said to practise planning. That is, much of this participation takes place as ‘boundary encounters’ (Wenger 1998: 112): the actors do not identify with a community of practice, they do not draw upon planning’s reified resources, they do not ‘share the enterprise to which participants are accountable’ (1998: 152). I therefore differentiate in this discussion between ‘participant’ and ‘practitioner’. As a bureaucratic practice, planning takes place within a bureaucratic field, and internalises the symbolic structure, hegemonic beliefs, and other practices of that field.

The beliefs that traditionally underlie the bureaucratic field are profoundly modernist, arising from the separation of the public and private spheres, and bureaucracy’s location in the public. A practitioner in the bureaucratic field – a bureaucrat – is traditionally expected to embrace a particular kind of instrumentally rationalist ethic concerned not with his/her immediate social relations and contacts, but with accountability to the citizenry as a whole (du Gay 2000). The classic exposition of this rationalist ethic is Max Weber’s ‘ideal-type construction’, in which (an individual’s or organisation’s) authority to act rests on a number of key principles (summarised from Weber 1947):

- official functions bound by rules;
- a systematic division of labour;
- hierarchical organisation of offices furnishing clear lines of communication and accountability;
- a system of technical and/or normative rules and regulations governing action;
- separation of administrative functions from personal vested interests;
- recruitment and promotion according to qualifications, seniority and achievement rather than personal ‘rights of appropriation’; and
- permanent documentation of administrative acts, decisions and rules.
These traditional ethics represent norms rather than ‘reality’,\textsuperscript{11} that is, they form a hegemony of values within the bureaucratic field, meaning that certain forms of capital held by practitioners are more likely to be realisable as symbolic (and therefore powerful) than others.

As Bourdieu points out in his own analysis of the bureaucratic field, one of its defining characteristics is the intense codification – Weber’s ‘documentation’ – of symbolic capital: the ‘official representation of the official’ (1994: 2) that allows its practitioners to accept the bureaucracy’s structure as unproblematic and its concerns/interests as universal. Authority to perform acts on behalf of the state does not flow from social esteem but from statutes delimiting the division of labour, which concentrate and codify a number of different species of capital (1994: 11). The principal codification of symbolic capital shaping practice within bureaucracies is the practitioner’s place in the hierarchy: institutional rank. Rank formally represents an actor’s level of authority to represent part of the institution, and discretionary powers over policy.

This particular form of symbolic capital construes a social field internal to the bureaucracy, in which at least three types of capital are important:

- cultural capital – knowledge of internal procedures, background policy, appropriate behaviours and so on, as well as appropriate literacies through which to interpret and produce bureaucratic meanings (Iedema 1998);\textsuperscript{12}
- economic capital – control over institutional resources/budgets;
- social capital – a network of formal lines of communication encompassing codified relationships with bureaucratic and political actors at certain levels of influence.\textsuperscript{13}

Thus, an individual’s rank in a bureaucracy formally realises their level of (theoretical) institutional knowledge, budgetary discretion, and access to the hierarchy.\textsuperscript{14} Within the confines of the institution, individuals are expected to perceive and respect these symbolic meanings.

However, the bureaucratic field cannot be completely characterised by its internal symbolic structure.\textsuperscript{15} To fulfil its purpose it must interact with, construct knowledge of, and advise politicians about, the world ‘outside’; thus, alternative forms of capital
link it to that world. Figure 6.3 shows, in addition to rank, two such forms of capital, either of which may be realised as symbolic, but which are uncodified within the field. Both forms of capital are underwritten by the ethical values referred to above, and neither is economic: bureaucracies are traditionally held to operate independently of their members’ private finances; therefore the symbolic power of economic capital is restricted (formally at least) to institutional budgets (crudely, wealthier bureaux have more power than poorer ones) – that is, to the field’s internal structure. In Weber’s ideal-typical model, qualifications and experience (rather than personal connections, money, and so on) contribute to practitioners’ access to higher office.

First, there is a form of cultural capital – distinct from the internal form construed by rank – which I have called “access to “truth””. This means primarily, in accordance with the rationalist ethic, knowledge of scientifically/statistically established empirical ‘facts’ about the bureaucracy’s realm of external influence (Smith 1990; Farmer 1995). But it also includes recognised specialist knowledge that cannot be so established because its variables are either secret (for instance, the intentions of corporate investors) or for other reasons unknown to science (for example, knowledge about the culture of Indigenous communities). This form of capital is similar to the ‘intellectual capital’ promoted by Innes (Innes et al. 1994) and Healey (1997; ‘knowledge resources’ in her later work [2004a; Healey et al. 2002]), but more limited in its orientation towards the ‘provable’. Access to ‘truth’ may be realised in various ways – the display of academic qualifications or production of appropriately worded texts, for example – in order to be recognised. The ability for access to ‘truth’ to be realised as symbolic capital is a contextualised reframing of Sir Francis Bacon’s ‘knowledge is power’ dictum. Combined with the already codified symbolic capital of rank, it extends my model of bureaucracy to encompass both managerial and professional aspects.

In addition, I have posited a form of ‘ethical capital’ that individual bureaucrats may realise in various ways: impartiality. Impartiality can be framed both negatively, as the absence of personal interest, and positively, as dedication to public accountability. This means placing the interests of the citizenry – an actor-world represented by the institution’s policies and procedures – before those of an individual client, as well as before those of the bureaucrat’s self (du Gay 1994). The
Figure 6.3: Bureaucratic field: symbolic capital constituted in dynamic actor-networks
valorisation of impartiality, as Weber’s ideal type suggests, is traditionally central to public administration – so much so that codifications such as the requirement to declare ‘conflicts of interest’ (normally associated with political institutions) were frequently invoked at the bureaucratic level during the course of my case studies.

Each of these forms of capital can be seen as constituted in actor-networks, a perspective that undermines any illusion that the bureaucratic field’s structure is ‘real’, ‘fixed’ or incontestable. Institutional rank encodes an actor’s status as a representative of a particular section of the bureaucracy – a constantly shifting actor-world composed of other bureaucrats, ‘clients’ (black-boxed as statistics, case histories, and so on), hard infrastructure, memos, policies and other governmental technologies. In turn, the actor may be a simplified point in a higher-ranking bureaucrat’s actor-world. The ranked bureaucrat’s power to mobilise their actor-world requires the loyalty of other actants – that is, a lack of will to ‘betray’ their representative by rejecting the obligatory passage points (such as the (re)formulation of clients’ ‘relevant’ details according to standardised forms [Sarangi and Slembrouck 1996: 129]; see Agar 1985 on institutional and client frames). Access to ‘truth’ – specialised knowledge – implies the translation of an actor-world external to the bureaucracy, rather than within it: it implies that an actor defines and controls the means (obligatory passage points) by which that ‘outside reality’ – scallops, nature, the population, a technology, a community – expresses itself, and is thus able to speak on its behalf in encounters with the state. Impartiality implies that an actor translates the bureaucracy – and through it, the entire citizenry – in encounters with the world outside the bureaucratic field (Figure 6.3).

Thus, seeing capital as constituted in actor-networks emphasises the role played by ‘ethical capital’ in positioning even junior bureaucrats as more powerful than ‘clients’ in certain bureaucratic transactions. From the bureau’s point of view, this can be an important role in situations where the client may, outside of the bureaucratic field, hold more economic and/or cultural capital than does the official. The ANT perspective also helps to account for an important feature of bureaucratic practice: seeking increased capital through the deliberate ‘extra-curricular’ enlistment and black-boxing of actants both within (through networking, seeking positions close to the minister, and so on) and outside of (collection of statistics, consultation, further education) the institution.
Many of the most important translation practices that build and rebuild these actor-networks are reified as the bureaucracy’s formal rituals – standardised forms of reporting, research protocols, meeting procedures, client transactions, and so on, which draw upon and reproduce (usually) positivist forms of reasoning and knowledge production. ANT thus provides a perspective that qualitatively unifies the different species of capital, shows capital in a dynamic aspect in relation to the bureaucracy’s instituted reifications of practice, and makes explicit the links of both symbolic structure and instituted practice to the modernist rationality underlying the (Weberian) bureaucracy’s existence.

As Bourdieu (1994) points out, the bureaucratic field structure is strongly oriented towards its own naturalisation, and consequently tends towards conservatism and inertia (Hall 1980; Ku 2001). However, as an institution in constant contact with other, less conservative institutions – most consistently politics, but also institutions with which individual departments are concerned (family, science, technology, economics, and so on) – bureaucracy is constantly at risk. A significant shift in a close institution, or in the nature or frequency of contact, could bring into question and destabilise the structure (and associated habitus) of the bureaucratic field. Herein lies potential for the transformation of the field through, among other things, collaborative planning.

A key naturalisation technology is reification: traditional planning, like most bureaucratic practices, is highly reified. Practitioners draw upon standard rules and procedures, and are supported by these reifications in boundary encounters, particularly with politicians and clients. Planning procedures combine a number of rituals (Dear 1986; Byrne 1998; Abram 2000; Tait and Campbell 2000) – including, for example, measurements, calculations, site inspections, formal and informal meetings, report writing and plan drawing. As these regular activities are instantiated, they construct an actor-network represented in the office by the practitioner, building up their stock of symbolically-realisable capital (in particular, access to ‘truth’) until they have acquired enough authority to formally make or recommend a decision. Planning’s procedures (chains of rituals) are instantiated as conjunctures – networks of events representing particular projects. The events in these networks are linked by common participants/actants, substantive issues, and – crucially – intertextual ties between the inscriptions and other (spoken) texts that
mediate between participants. As noted in Chapter 2, planning relies heavily on language, an issue developed in the following sub-section, which reframes planning as a discursive practice, and notes how contemporary trends are destabilising traditional bureaucratic discourses.

6.2.2 Planning as a discursive practice

When I use the phrase ‘discursive practice’, I do not do so with any normative intent; ‘discursive’ here is descriptive, rather than signalling a preferred approach to practice (as in, for example, John Dryzek’s [1990] ‘discursive democracy’). Specifically, I mean that the practice of planning – traditional, rationalist planning as well as participatory planning – is realised largely by discursive activities, that is, by the production of linguistic (and other semiotic) texts.

Monoglossia

I noted in Chapter 3 (3.3.3) that patterns of texts generated by planning practice can be understood through Rick Iedema’s concept of resemiotisation. Insofar as these patterns realise formal procedures, we can understand them in their systematic/teleological aspect as genre chains (Fairclough 2003) shaped by a particular purpose: ‘to synthesise different types of information and give it a spatial interpretation’ (Lapinte 1998: 190). Although the instantiated detail of such a planning procedure may well be messy and non-linear, it has an overall monoglossic ‘direction’ from ephemeral, local meanings (realised as talk, for example) towards fixed, universalised ones (realised as material change):

It is through resemiotization, then, that … meanings are relegated from the relatively volatile sphere of embodied semiosis, into the naturalizing contexts of spatio-material semiosis … . (Iedema 2001b: 26)

As such, planning processes – the ‘progressive concretisation of policy’ (Hill 1997: 24) – help to ‘prepare the way’ in the public consciousness for their durable outcomes.

Monoglossic resemiotisation in planning is the discursive aspect of extending actor-networks: genre chains are chains of translation, mobilising actants (people, institutions, ideas and so on) that have been enrolled in the translator’s program, and
problematising certain issues for future action. Thus, resemiotisation can be seen as a technology of governance (Burchell et al. 1991): it naturalises otherwise ephemeral discursive positions, bringing increasing numbers of actors and practices into the regulatory domain of the translator. Like other such technologies, monoglossic resemiotisation may be structurally motivated, as the term ‘genre chain’ seems to suggest. Alternatively it may, as Iedema himself prefers, be an emergent property of discourse: the contingent sedimentation of nodal points which represent – often temporarily – the ‘common’ (Hardt and Negri 2004) in the multi-directional unfolding of discursive events and projects (compare Laclau and Mouffe 1985). I believe, and my research data (Chapters 7-11) corroborate, that both the teleological and the emergent are powerfully present in planning practice. I therefore prefer the general term ‘resemiotisation’ unless directed translation between genres is specifically the object of analysis.

Resemiotisation as a technology of governance is both a linguistic and a sociological concept, providing useful insights into the social and material power of discursive action. The textual intermediaries used by planners are increasingly ‘immutable mobiles’ (Latour 1987: fixed but mobile across time and space). They black-box nominal convergences of wills between ever-larger numbers of actants, thereby becoming actors in their own right. However, as actors, these texts have no habitus. Their action/influence depends on the mediation/translation of appropriately habituated humans. Resemiotisation and the invocation of planning’s textual products become realisations of symbolic capital in planning.

It is primarily through discourse that these and other realisations of capital take place within activities that make up the practice of planning. The legitimacy of such realisations – and therefore their capacity to be recognised as symbolic and influential – depends on how they draw upon orders of discourse appropriate to the bureaucratic field and, more specifically, to planning. Any characterisation of these will necessarily be tenuous and incomplete – society’s expectations of bureaucracy and planning are, as Chapter 2 pointed out, changing, and their associated genres increasingly hybridising with those of other fields (Fairclough 1992, 2000b; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; Fairclough et al. 2003; see ‘Heteroglossia’ below). However, some general features may be assumed, in particular a tendency to confer authority on naturalising discourses – the technical, the scientific, the impersonal –
which realise both cultural and ethical capital (access to ‘truth’ and impartiality),
positioning their producers in opposition to ‘non-realists’ (such as ideologues) and
interested parties (such as clients). Numerous studies have shown that such
discourses de-emphasise agency and reify contingent processes (Charrow 1982;
Halliday and Martin 1993; Sarangi and Slembrouck 1996; Iedema 1997b; in the
planning field Tett and Wolf 1991; Whatmore and Boucher 1992; Fischler 1995;
Throgmorton 1996; Hillier 1998b). As such, they have a tendency towards
monologicity (White 1999): they suppress difference and close opportunities for
divergences of meaning, strategically creating ‘lines of force’ (Latour 1991).

**Heteroglossia**

Recent trends in management show a normative direction away from Weberian
‘ideal-typical’ structures. As noted in Chapter 2, post-modern society is seen as
complex, fragmented and uncertain, bringing into question public trust in
representative democracy as well as in the reductionism and ‘one-size-fits-all’
approach of traditional bureaucracy. Some key features of this shift, particularly
since the 1980s, are associated with governments’ adoption of the ‘rationality’ of
market mechanisms rather than technical ones to ensure ‘efficiency’ (Osborne and
Sarangi and Slembrouck 1996 for associated discursive shifts). David Osborne’s and
Ted Gaebler’s (1992) exposition of such ‘entrepreneurial’ government includes, for
example, the introduction of the profit motive, competition between service
providers, and ‘outcomes-driven’ performance measurement. It also demands a
higher level of responsiveness to the complex, fragmented demands of what are now
often called government’s ‘customers’ (du Gay 1994, 2000): flexibility rather than
rigid standards; offering more ‘choices’; involving customers in direction setting
through ‘market research’ and participatory decision making. Further, bureaucracies
have introduced measures to increase ‘productivity’ by giving employees and clients
a level of ‘ownership’: management through incentives and a sense of ‘shared goals’
rather than by commands; decentralisation of authority and ‘flattening’ of previously
rigid hierarchies; achievement through teamwork within and across bureaux and
sectors (public, private and non-profit). Thus, the trend in bureaucracies away from
hierarchical structures and formal discourses and towards (financial, professional and
decision-making) partnerships and participation – the ‘conversationalisation’
(Fairclough 1995) of government – reflects not only changing ‘democratic’ values, but also the ‘marketisation’ of the public sector. Increased participation in direction setting, both within and between organisations, serves to implicate officers and clients in the market discourse: to increase people’s comfort with fixing and allocating resources to their ‘choices’ (Rose 1999; Mayer 2003).

These organisational trends can significantly change the culture of bureaucracies. The contemporary public sector is marked by peculiar tensions: between public accountability and market rationality; public and private ‘interests’; control and discretion; standardisation and flexibility/creativity; administrative and political strategic concerns (see Haynes 2003: 12-13). These tensions are regularly played out in intra- and inter-sector interactions which destabilise personnel structures and institutional values previously thought to be fixed. Indeed, interactivity has been identified as the key characteristic of a possible ‘post-bureaucratic’ ‘ideal type’ (Heckscher 1994). Even in Australian public sector planning and environmental management, whose agencies generally retain traditional hierarchies and rule-based accountability norms, there is a clear tendency towards teamwork and inter-departmental partnerships that cut across formal structures and often, for strategic planning initiatives, include ‘stakeholders’ from outside of the public sector (for example, Searle 2004; Meadowcroft 1999 for similar trends in the UK). This interactive tendency creates recurring contexts in which officers at all levels need to (re)negotiate and (re)construct procedures, practices, values and professional identity with a variety of (professional and other) voices (Iedema 2003a; Iedema and Scheeres 2003). Those contexts do not have the permanence or generality construed by Weber’s ‘ideal type’. They are often local, temporary events: groupings of particular people, for particular purposes, in particular places and times. Thus, the discursive aspect of bureaucracies, including planning, takes on a heteroglossic, as well as a monoglossic quality: planning practice and discourse are realised in continually changing contexts and by ever-diversifying sets of voices.

In sum, the shift towards partnership and participation in public sector practices is related to cultural change at the societal level – economic and political forces impose change ‘from above’. But this trend creates shifting work contexts and increases the closeness or frequency of contact with other fields, thereby introducing alternative discourses, practices and forms of capital to bureaucratic rituals at the event level,
and undermining institutional fields ‘from below’. Coaffee and Healey (2003; also Healey 2004a, 2005b) suggest that, if initiatives towards ‘mainstreaming’ citizen participation are to result in enduring institutional change, a number of criteria need to be met at all three levels (governance culture, practices and specific episodes). These relate, primarily, to widening the space for diversity in the three cultural dimensions I developed above (6.1.4): ‘networks and coalitions’ and ‘stakeholder selection’ (relations); ‘discourses’ or issues/problem-framing (beliefs), and practices. Institutional capacity building is seen as fundamentally related to the heteroglossia of collaborative planning practices.

6.2.3 Collaborative planning as a cross-cultural meta-practice

Collaboration challenges the field of traditional bureaucratic planning in a number of ways. First, its inclusion in the planning process is a conscious decision, on the part of a planner (and/or other practitioners), to restructure the institutional field by allowing interest (or ‘stake’) to be realised as a legitimate form of symbolic capital, in clear tension with the bureaucracy’s traditional ethic of impartiality. The planner may also significantly restructure the conventional genre network that represents the planning procedure by introducing additional interactive genres (stakeholder meetings and so on), which need to be incorporated into the resemiotisation process. A key challenge here is to resolve a tension between the heteroglossic tendencies of collaboration (opening practice to a more diverse range of genres, discourses and styles) and the monoglossic pattern of planning’s formal genre chains (shifting meanings from the ephemeral/local towards the fixed/universal).

Second, ‘collaboration’ is itself a discourse concerning the administration of planning and implies a certain ideological (democratic) orientation, regardless of the planner’s reasons for embracing it. As these reasons are as likely to be pragmatic as democratic, this can create tensions. The discourse of collaboration represents stakeholder input – often unreflectively – as a ‘Good Thing’, to be maximised quantitatively and qualitatively (Sandercock 1978; Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998; Tewdwr-Jones and Thomas 1998; Campbell and Marshall 2000). It demands that planners value all views and forms of knowledge, challenging the traditional capitalisation of ‘truth’ and potentially leaving decision makers with no clear way of prioritising inputs other than their own biases (Campbell and Marshall 2000).
Figure 6.4: Collaboration introduces new actor-networks and, thus, forms of symbolic capital into the bureaucratic field.
Discursively, this tension may be realised as inconsistencies in how different stages of the collaborative process are framed: if traditional beliefs, relations and practices are ‘put on hold’ in collaborative action, register expectations regarding field, tenor and mode are revised in ways that are continuously being negotiated. However, contingent meanings produced in collaborative fora may be lost, become inappropriate or irrelevant once they are translated/resemiotised into bureaucratically meaningful outcomes:

... if we define knowledge as ways of construing the world, rather than the simple accruing of facts, then we can see that participation ... must involve the meeting of different forms of knowledge. Once alternative rationalities have been translated into existing policy discourses, then, as systems of knowledge, they must also be transformed. The problem for subordinated forms of knowledge is that once translated into the dominant (usually ‘scientific’ or ‘technical’) discourse, alternative rationalities, arguments and thoughts may lose their original force. (Abram 1998: 6)

Thirdly, as pointed out above, the bureaucratic field is potentially destabilised by the introduction of non-habituated participants. Even in cases where bureaucrats do not make conscious adjustments to the field of capital or to their expectations about orders of discourse, collaboration introduces new expectations in the persons of other participants, whose habitus orients them to different kinds of capital. Non-planners/non-bureaucrats are ‘strangers’ to the rituals of planning; they bring to those rituals ‘strange’ meanings. That is, they may draw upon foreign understandings of the genres (what is a ‘meeting’?), alternative themes (especially private ones), and alien discourses and styles (non-naturalising, emotive, and so on). Moreover, in order to be understood, planners need not only to use professional skills, but also to perform them (Iedema 2003a; Iedema and Scheeres 2003): to explain and, thus, to open to challenge the principles and technologies (administrative and technical) underlying their institutional capital.

To illustrate these issues, Figure 6.4 shows collaboration as introducing a strange and uncertain ‘fourth dimension’ to the symbolic structure of the bureaucratic field, one in which symbolic capital is constituted in external actor-networks: that is, external actor-worlds, externally mediated. The networks constituting this fourth dimension
have the potential to unbalance, merge with and otherwise alter the traditional, internally-situated ones of rank, 'truth' and impartiality in context-specific ways (compare Marsh and Rhodes 1992 on the interaction of 'issue', 'producer' and 'professional' networks with 'policy communities').

The 'fourth dimension' is internally complex and unpredictable, as it may itself represent the intersection of as many institutions as there are participants (or, just as likely, more). It is also, from the planner's perspective, relatively uncontrollable, as its operation relies on (textual and other) intermediaries which are not part of the genre networks that articulate bureaucratic planning. Each event in a collaborative process is part not only of that process, but of a number of other event networks (Fairclough 2003). Therefore, any event/text generated by a collaborative process can be seen not only as an intermediary/actor in the formal process of monoglossic resemiotisation, but also as the intersection of several networks of translation which, for each participant, may instantiate a different set of rituals and orders of discourse. These in turn may be associated with the practices of different cultural institutions: in this sense I say that collaborative planning events are cross-cultural events.

Collaborative planning events differ from the more usual types of boundary encounter (such as client-official transactions) that characterise bureaucratic practices (for example, Peters and Nelson 1979; Agar 1985; Sarangi and Slembrouck 1996; Cedersund and Saljo 1997; Whittaker and Rojo 1999), in that the non-bureaucrat/planner participants are directly engaged in bureaucratic/planning procedures and, in theory at least, share with the bureaucrats an enterprise of some sort. Under these conditions, we could predict that a new 'community of practice' might emerge, characterised by its own forms of mutual engagement and a shared repertoire of knowledge, social connections and strategies upon which they can draw (Wenger 1998: 103).

These features of a community of practice can be seen as shared understandings of the discourse context – both of culture and of situation. As a new community of (collaborative planning) practice emerges, participants might be expected to begin unreflectively to draw upon common sets of intertextual patterns (sometimes reified as procedures, roles and agendas) and discursive formations, and to demonstrate, via their linguistic choices, similar perceptions of field, tenor and mode. The
‘metaprocesses’ by which participants’ understandings converge, then, can be seen as processes of situated learning (Lave and Wenger 1991; see Peel 2002) – of a shift from ‘legitimate peripheral participation’ to competent practice. For any participatory process, whether or not this learning takes place, and whether it is mutual (as John Friedmann [1973] recommends) or didactic would seem to be questions central to whether the process can be called ‘collaborative’ in Healey’s normative sense. That is, situated learning can be ‘one-way’, educating non-bureaucrats about traditional institutional practices (Atkinson 1999), or it can be ‘two-way’, possibly leading to the emergence of new institutional practices.

6.2.4 Collaborative planning and its presentation to the public

The inscribed outcomes of participatory planning processes and metaprocesses predictably become intermediaries in further boundary encounters with political, media and other previously non-participant institutions, whose practitioners bring prior understandings of bureaucratic practice to their interpretation. To be effective, these inscriptions need to ‘speak’ convincingly to such ‘outside’ actors.

For the purpose of this thesis, I understand the outcome of a strategic planning process to be the plan. In bureaucracies, the plan is often an obligatory passage point between talk and action, which represents in technical – ‘rational’, ‘universal’ – terms the meanings developed in the planning process, and the meanings to be construed in future texts. Figure 6.5 shows the plan’s special place as the crux of many genre networks.

Moreover, the plan is traditionally the first stage in the process of resemiotisation that needs to be meaningful to the general public (or at least to their political and/or bureaucratic representatives). In translating discourse from private to public, a plan not only presents the substance of prior and future texts, but also justifies that substance. One of the most common ways that plans achieve this is through a generic schema in which proposals for action appear to be ‘logically’ derived from a combination of ‘fact’ and ‘value’ premises (Simon 1997). This schema tends to consist of:

- ‘Issues’ (encompassing all contextual information – ‘fact premises’);
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Figure 6.5: The plan is crucial
- ‘Aims’ (desired outcomes – embedding assumed or consultation-derived ‘value premises’);
- ‘Objectives’ (analytical relation of aims to issues);
- ‘Strategies’ (proposed means to achieve the objectives, including evaluation of
effects); and
- ‘Actions’ (analytical breakdown of how strategies are to be implemented,
  encompassing also regulations, monitoring, resources etc.).

This ‘logical’ structure metaphorically re-presents the planning process in linear,
instrumentally rational terms, which frame local meanings and interests
contributing to the plan as general ones, permitting them to become embedded in the
‘relations of ruling’ (Smith 1990) that organise the experience of others. It is a very
inexact metaphor – even the most conventional planning processes tend to be messy
and affected by political factors outside the plan’s ‘universe’, rather than being
strictly logical. In collaborative processes, where discursiveness is foregrounded,
and where sensitivity to alternative rationalities is considered critical to
democratic/procedural quality, the metaphor might be considered not merely inexact,
but inappropriate to account for the plan against these new criteria. Further, the logic
of the generic schema may not reflect the practices, relations and beliefs of any
emergent community of practice.

This is an important challenge for collaborative planning. Translation from the local
to the general is always an ideological practice – an act of symbolic power – which
may be either alienating or empowering to the interests involved. Actor-network
theory reminds us that inscriptions such as the plan are critical to the ability of
decisions and practices to act at a distance, beyond the specific events in which they
are enacted. It seems to me that the problem of translating collaborative
metaprocesses and associated practices for the plan may be an important aspect of
the phenomenon observed by Coaffée and Healey (2003) – that changes at the levels
of specific episodes and governance cultures appear to have less (or more slowly
realised) influence on planning practices than might be expected.
6.3 Conclusion

The institutional inheritance of Australian planning is located in the modernist bureaucracy, underwritten by rationalist values and practices, and intensely reified in organisational hierarchies, procedures and documentations. This inheritance is put at risk by contemporary trends in government, which reflect a discursive shift to market (rather than technical) logic and participatory (rather than representative) democracy. A central part of this shift is an increasing tendency to produce procedures, rituals and professional identities in ongoing interactions – cross-professional and interagency teams, cross-sector partnerships, and participatory planning/policy fora.

Thus, many of the reifications of the bureaucracy – while still crucial to its existence – have become less permanent, less ‘natural’, more explicitly constructed in social interaction, and so more susceptible to event-level transformation. In addition, events have become more multi-vocal. Teams, partnerships and stakeholder/public collaboration introduce non-habituated participants – strangers – with different discourses, intertexts and orientations to non-bureaucratic forms of capital. That is, collaborative events are boundary encounters between different (actor-)worlds of practice. And in collaborative planning, the ‘boundary’ between practitioners and other participants in these encounters is not clear-cut: the new voices reach to the direction-setting centre of the institutional field. In these cross-cultural contexts, symbolic capital and professional identities may be de-naturalised: confronted with alternatives, they are discursively brought into the open. They may thus become more available to challenge and, possibly, to change through a process of situated mutual (re)learning.

In the remainder of Part 2, I examine how this cross-cultural aspect of collaborative planning is instantiated in my case studies. Chapter 7 focuses on crucces in which procedural and interpersonal tension surfaced between Alpha’s members and DOMM officers; then Chapter 8 looks at similar moments from Beta’s process.
7 Science and politics: DOMM and Alpha

In this chapter and the next, I examine my case studies to interrogate my theoretical contention that there is something 'cross-cultural' going on in collaborative planning. To do this, I explore the meanings realised in a few crucibles from each committee process – times when tension surfaced between bureaucrats and other participants. These moments exemplify a number of recurring patterns of interaction, each of which (re)produces a level of mistrust or frustration, particularly on the part of the non-bureaucrats, who found themselves 'strangers' in the strange world of bureaucratic practice. Such patterns tended fairly consistently to emerge when the committees entered new phases of business: when the 'tasks' embodied in their meeting agendas shifted; when their procedural roles changed vis à vis other participants; when they encountered constraints on the scope of their action potential (Chapter 4, 4.3).

Chapter 7 is focussed in particular on three of Alpha’s meetings, characterising some of the issues underlying members’ disagreements with their executive, the staff from the Department of Marine Management (DOMM). In particular, such disagreements emerged over DOMM’s organisation of the planning process (exemplified by Meeting 3), members’ need to keep the management plan ‘open’ to input by excluded stakeholders (Meeting 5), and how submissions from the public should be treated (Meeting 7). All of these issues related to a fundamental difference in approach: DOMM staff treated planning as a rational, scientific practice, while several of Alpha’s members treated it as an essentially political activity. That is, conflict arose from participants’ diverse understandings of their institutional framing. Before beginning this exposition, I reflect generally on my analytical process.

Analysing meetings

A committee meeting is a very complex text. In Alpha’s and Beta’s meetings, participants mobilised a range of meaning resources in addition to talk – body language; prepared visual aids (slides, power point presentations, overhead transparencies); improvised whiteboard illustrations. In addition, members’ talk often explicitly quoted other texts – correspondence, minutes, reports, policies and so on – and there were frequently several conversations being conducted at once, each
constructing meanings that would ultimately contribute to the whole committee’s agreements. Moreover, the meetings represented, for different participants, stages in different networks of events (Chapter 6), and as a consequence several ‘sets’ of intertexts could be mobilised at once. Besides this practical complexity, the relative spontaneity of talk (compared to writing) means that generic expectations are continually being revised and renegotiated in all but the briefest and most ritualised spoken exchanges.¹

Such data do not lend themselves easily to a systematic analysis using a single set of tools. Rather, logogenesis – the dynamic development of meaning – within a meeting is better understood by taking account of ‘syndromes of complexes’ (Iedema 1997a: 157) of lexicogrammatical and discourse-analytic features. Therefore, the analysis drew opportunistically on features associated with all three metafunctions – ideational, interpersonal and textual – and uses a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. For the purposes of this chapter, I am interested in how the discourse of participants construes their immediate context: what is relevant; what is taken for granted; what is negotiable; what is ‘good’; what is appropriate (compare Hajer 1995).

Because my primary interest is in how bureaucratic and non-bureaucratic construals differ, I treat participants as broad collectivities – government and non-government – rather than as individuals. Such a treatment glosses over many subtleties, including that the members of Alpha came from a variety of practice realms, and that four of the ‘non-government’ participants themselves worked for public sector agencies (in the samples cited in this chapter, those four members do not feature strongly). In what follows, DOMM officers’ names begin with ‘D’, members’ names with ‘M’, and observers’ names with ‘O’.

Each section explores one crux, an item from the agenda of one meeting, broken down into fragments exemplifying particular sources of conflict or misunderstanding. The fragments are reproduced on the unnumbered pages beside the analysis to provide a point of reference; it is not generally necessary to read each fragment in full.
7.1 Meeting 3: the logic of the plan

Alpha’s third meeting was the committee’s introduction to the ‘texting’ part (Phase 2) of their work: drafting sections for inclusion in the management plan. DOMM’s intention was to present the committee with drafted sections of the plan for consideration, amendment (if necessary) and endorsement – a fairly standard bureaucratic practice which delegates the time-consuming job of wordsmithing to the executive outside of the meetings, treating the committee as decision makers rather than workers. On this meeting’s agenda were ‘Objectives’ for each of the ‘Social Values’ on the list from Meeting 2.

There was a level of tension between Alpha and DOMM before the texting began, since legal advice regarding the port’s exclusion had, to many members, rendered most of the previous meeting a ‘waste of time’. As the texting session progressed, members’ unhappiness consolidated around the issue of DOMM’s management of the process. In particular, it became clear that DOMM’s framing of the planning process as the step-by-step production of a plan was at odds with members’ understanding of their enterprise as a political one, oriented to broad consultation and decentralising control over the marine reserve area.

Content

DOMM’s agenda for this texting session included not only the committee’s consideration of the text, but the executive’s exposition of the consultations they had conducted between meetings, as Debbie’s instructions in Fragment 7.1 explain. A traditional planning text reflects a modernist separation of facts and values, the latter being formalised as, for example, ‘visions’, ‘goals’, ‘aims’, ‘targets’ and/or ‘objectives’ (Chapter 6, 6.2.5). There was, therefore, a certain taken-for-granted logic in combining the consultation report and the text as a single agenda item: the ‘Objectives’ were supposed to reflect the values and aspirations of the consulted stakeholders. However, this logic was not made explicit, and the following debate made it clear that it was also not shared by all members of the committee.

Debbie has softened the impact of her instructions by adopting the speech of the powerless: hesitating (the number of ‘ums’, repetitions and pauses); marking
Debbie: Um, okay. The, the next phase, I guess, of the process is to look at each of the Social Values – and um you should’ve all got a list of values in your mail out? Um: Each of the values we’ve um drafted Objectives for. And these are fairly generic sort of objectives that have gone to protect that value.

Um:: what I’ve done is ah, spoken to a number of ah community groups, individuals – um, we wrote letters to. um, a variety of people as well – to get their feedback on, um, these Objectives, and just general feedback about how the process is going, and what they’d like to see with the area.

Ah so, I guess, ah what I’d like to do is discuss each of the values in turn. Let you know what, um – and this is in that report that, that was on your desk this morning, if you want to follow what’s going on – um, just give you an idea of, of what people had to say about that value, and um, and then put up the draft Objectives for your consideration.

* Transcripts in this thesis are verbatim. A disconnected colon ' : ' indicates a one second pause. Elision, either within a turn or across turns, is indicated in the usual way: ‘...’.
statements for low intensity ('fairly generic sort of', 'just general', 'I guess'); and reframing the instructions as a personal offer of service ('what I'd like to do is ... let you know ... give you an idea ... put up the draft Objectives for your consideration'). These are 'dialogic' tactics: rhetorical resources that expand the discursive space for divergence and diversity of meaning (White 1999, drawing on Bakhtin 1981). As such, they could be seen as inviting the challenge and divergence from the agenda that follow. Debbie intends that the committee focus on the text presented to them, and goes on without interruption to present the first set of Objectives (for the value 'Indigenous Heritage'); however, it is to the instructions and consultation report that members respond.

This is illustrated through an analysis of ideational cohesion in the debate that begins with Debbie’s instructions and finishes with a resolution to defer consideration of the Indigenous Heritage Objectives, some twenty-five minutes later. Ideational cohesion tracks subjects and themes through a text, making it recognisably ‘about’ something, and is realised largely through reference and lexical relations (Appendix D).

Table 7.1 summarises an analysis of the reference chains in the discussion, showing how often the subjects raised by Debbie in the introduction – incorporating both the instructions and the exposition of Indigenous Heritage Objectives – are subsequently retrieved through reference (subjects that are not retrieved are omitted from the table). It shows clearly that the Objectives themselves were not taken up as topical by Alpha’s members. Only three of the Objectives’ 45 retrievals were by Alpha members rather than DOMM staff, and almost all of the 45 occurred only after the chairperson – at this meeting a DOMM staff member – had called for a decision, some twenty minutes into the discussion. Even more noticeably, the objectives’ subject matter – Indigenous heritage – was never retrieved at all following the exposition. Instead, members’ response focussed on the process – especially the consultation process – described in Debbie’s introduction and summarised in ‘that report that was on your desk this morning’. The most consistently topical aspect of that process was Alpha’s role in relation to that of DOMM.

This tracking of subjects was reflected in the debate’s development of ideational themes through lexical relations, an analysis of which is partially shown in Table 7.2. The clear thematic focus of the discussion overall was to do with communication and
Table 7.1: Reference chains generated by Debbie's introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject raised by Debbie</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process</td>
<td>17 retrievals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Social Values</td>
<td>17 retrievals, 15 of which are by DOMM staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha ('you')</td>
<td>137 retrievals, through whole discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie ('I')</td>
<td>40 retrievals, all in reference to Debbie's actions in the consultation process. 15 of the retrievals appeared within the introduction itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I've done</td>
<td>6 retrievals, all part of one request for clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people consulted ('a number of community groups, individuals …')</td>
<td>10 retrievals, all part of one phase concerned with an apparent lack of interest reported in the summary report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMM staff ('we')</td>
<td>41 retrievals, through the whole discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area</td>
<td>9 retrievals, all after being reintroduced by a member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That report that was on your desk this morning</td>
<td>24 retrievals in two separate phases in which members queried the content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The draft Objectives (general)</td>
<td>45 retrievals, 38 of which were by DOMM staff. The other 7 were contained in two separate queries about the process used to draft them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition of the objectives for Indigenous heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary (an absent Alpha member)</td>
<td>10 retrievals, all by DOMM staff and one member concerned about Mary's potential exclusion from the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Objectives for Indigenous Heritage</td>
<td>45 retrievals, 42 of which are by DOMM staff. 34 of these retrievals occur only after the acting Chair has called for a decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the planning process – specifically, evaluating and ‘visioning’ the consultations undertaken. Highlighted categories in Table 7.2 show several themes that were apparently important to the executive but not to members. DOMM’s attempts to refocus the committee on the Objectives for Indigenous Heritage were mostly rejected, and their references to the consultative effort that they were making were largely ignored: members were concerned with the quality and quantity of consultation, not with its difficulty.

The lexical relations also reflect an association, on DOMM’s part, of the planning process with sections of the management plan: although they are represented in Table 7.2 as separate semantic categories, plan sections and process stages were consistently collocated in the speech of DOMM staff. This association was not shared by Alpha’s non-bureaucrat members, in spite of the fact that it was embedded in their meeting agendas (most agenda items took the titles of plan sections). Rather, they tended to collocate the process as a whole with consultative mechanisms and evaluative judgements. That is, DOMM staff and Alpha members framed the ultimate purpose of the planning process differently – as the production of a plan; as community consultation. This discrepancy was central to growing tensions between the members and the executive.

**Tensions**

The tensions were not hidden. Alpha members expressed their unhappiness in strong terms throughout the conversation. Their major explicit concern was an apparent lack of public input into the process so far, which they saw as undermining the legitimacy of any decisions they might make (Fragment 7.2). DOMM’s defence reflected organisation of the process as a progression through the plan’s text: the lack of wider input was a function of the stage that they were at. Objectives, they claimed, were uncontroversial and uninteresting to stakeholders, and Alpha could be sure of receiving more ‘community input’ once Strategies appeared on the agenda (Fragment 7.3).

Alpha members had difficulty accepting such assurances, because they had not internalised DOMM’s framing of the process as product. By extension, they did not accept that the processual relationship between Alpha’s participation, the wider
Table 7.2: numbers of words in the sample for each of the fifteen most frequently occurring semantic categories (‘total’ includes utterances by observers as well as by Alpha members and DOMM staff).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic category*</th>
<th>Spoken by ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words to do with ...</td>
<td>DOMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (spoken and written)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process / progress / movement through time</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings / evaluative judgements</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation / participation</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought / knowledge</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections of the management plan (including ‘objectives’)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee / meetings</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities / land uses (other than Indigenous heritage)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work / effort / difficulty</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place - enclosure</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous heritage</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fragment 7.2: Alpha Meeting 3, Objectives for Social Values

Mike: This, I reckon this is ah, this is something – we look, touched on this last meeting – but it seems to be an ongoing problem to get any involvement apart from round this table. And ah, in the end, when this process goes through to um, to be ticked off, this is in fact what's going to be looked at as being the community's involvement, and if it's not satisfactory and it's not done satisfactorily, then all the recommendations don't hold any weight at all! And ah, I, we're about to go through it again, and it's sketchy still!

So how, how in the end do we get the required level of input – community input – to put any weight behind anything that the committee says in the timeframe we've got, given that all the efforts by DOMM staff so far have, a lot of them have come up short?

Fragment 7.3: Alpha Meeting 3, Objectives for Social Values

David: Well, I think, I think the answer to that is, is, is further down the track when you start looking at Strategies to achieve those Objectives, it's, it's when you start looking at those – they're the sort of things that people are interested in, because it has an impact on them. And w, once you start doing that, then you get people's attention, and their ears open, and you'll get lots and lots of input then.

And so I, I wouldn't be too concerned at this early stage about, um, y'know, running too far ahead of, the community, because I think they'll, they'll catch up when there's something firmer ....

* ‘Semantic categories’ are formed through repetition and through the grouping of words taxonomically (that is, as parts of a whole, or as general classes) or by collocation (consistent/typical association) (see Appendix D).
consultation, and the text itself was an indirect one: that the Objectives were 'generic', broadly reflecting stakeholder values rather than being specifically derived from their words (Tauxe 1995; Hoch 1996; Tewdwr-Jones and Thomas 1998). David's point (Fragment 7.3) raises an inherent contradiction between the framing of community values as abstract 'Objectives' and a consultative process in which community input is not expected on this aspect, but only on the 'firmer' 'Strategies'. Strategies, as DOMM makes explicit later in the process (Chapter 9, 9.2.1), are 'logically' derived from Objectives: the Objectives provide planners with a defence against challenges to the Strategies. That is, under the modernist principle separating facts, values and procedures, the community's interest comes at the 'wrong end'. Framing the process as product, and conducting consultation according to the linear logic of the plan, thus empowers the planners over the 'community'. I think Alpha's members know this intuitively.

The problem of the Objectives' derivation became explicit only after the chairperson called for a decision on those for Indigenous Heritage. In Fragment 7.4, Mitch voices for the first time a second concern shared by many of Alpha's members: that, because of DOMM's focus on the text of the plan itself (rather than on gaining community involvement), Alpha's role had been reduced to one of 'sign[ing] off' on bureaucratic decisions. This concern was fundamental to the committee's unwillingness to address themselves to the agenda item. Mitch portrays the development of the objectives as arbitrary and casually undertaken and, by invoking a previous planning process, emphasises DOMM's apparent lack of local sensitivity.

The problem here seems to be that although the text was being presented in association with sector consultations, it was not a resemiotisation of any discursive event(s) to which Alpha's members had been privy, and therefore did not translate any of their meanings. They had come, in this sense, from nowhere and, in actor-network terms, appeared to represent only the will of DOMM – an actor to whom Alpha members' loyalty has not been enrolled. Dick, to whom both the process-as-product framing and the committee practice of endorsing pre-drafted text are 'natural' (that is, habitual), does not seem to understand this issue: he does not address it, focussing instead on Alpha's arbitrarily conferred authority to change the words before endorsing them, and responding enthusiastically to the word 'reasonable' even though its context suggests (to me) that it is ironic.
Chair: But if, ah, so that D, DOMM can take these ah, Objectives back to the interest groups, they need endorsement by the committee to say, 'yes, we are happy with these as objectives.' They can then go out and be discussed with ah, with interest groups. So on that basis, are people happy ah, with the Indigenous Heritage Objectives?

Mitch: I'm not sure that I'm actually happy with the process that we've come to these, but what I would like to ask is: in the case of [town], how were these actually determined? The, the management objectives. How was that um -- :: Because at the moment, what I see is we're being um, we're being -- as the advisory committee -- being asked to sign off on a piece of work done by DOMM.

Dick: But on behalf of the committee! And if you want to change anything up there, just do it! I mean this is just a draft, you know what I mean? Yeh. That's the process.

Mitch: {Yes, I know. I just want to understand what process you went through to get these.} {So, --}

David: {And that, and that has been some {consultation, but obviously --}

Mitch: {And that's just what happened at [town], is it?

All you guys sat down, draft it, 'hey, we think these are reasonable', {threw it at the committee, 'what do you reckon?'}

Dick: {Yeh!

Dick: That's right. The committee has to en, endorse it. They don't have any, um, y'know, {ah, any, --}

Chair: {The DOMM staff are working on behalf of the committee here.
In trying to make sense of where the draft objectives came from and who controlled the texting process, a third tension emerged. In Fragment 7.5, Mark turns the conversation to recreational angling, and the presentation of the summary report from the consultation, which listed all views expressed by individuals under sector headings. Having been resemiotised into writing, the lists are understood by Mark and others (erroneously, as Debbie points out) as translating those views into a consensual position for each sector, so that a list of individual zoning suggestions, for instance, 'looked like' a collective suggestion that all the listed zones be adopted ('there's areas in here ...').

That DOMM had taken on the role of representing the views of sectors in this way may have angered Mark partly because it appeared as an attempt to usurp his own identity as a sector representative, a major source of his power within the committee in spite of DOMM's instructions not to act as such. However, equally important, I think, was the implication of non-negotiability associated with writing. Because the report was presented in conjunction with the draft Objectives as a nominal resemiotisation of DOMM's external consultations, Mark had inferred that the apparently consensual positions in the consultation report – representing not abstract 'values' but concrete proposals for action – would be somehow 'contained' in the Objectives and that, having been 'tick[ed] ... off', they would become 'givens' without further debate. He expected, too, that once meanings were resemiotised as part of a written plan, they would become part of the bureaucratic apparatus, outside Alpha's control. This fear was exacerbated by his expectation that the bureaucrats would try to manipulate Alpha into endorsing suggestions of which the community would not approve. DOMM had not gained Alpha's trust in either procedural or substantive matters, and members were not yet willing to be enrolled in the obligatory passage points – amending or endorsing pre-drafted text; accepting summary reports for external consultations – that DOMM was attempting to impose. Trust is widely considered a fundamental enabling factor for joint decision making (Moore 1995).

**Reframing**

Despite Alpha's obvious mistrust of DOMM during this third meeting, members did not directly challenge any procedural instructions – neither the nature of their task as
Mark: Can I can throw two bob in here? Just the recreational one here, ... There's areas in here that there is no way that, that the guys would agree to over the phone! You know? ... [reads from the summary report]

Chair: Mark, can we leave that {one until we --
Mark: {No. No, they want, no. The whole reason I'm going to do this is that there are areas in here that we haven't had a chance to have a look at, and you're expecting us to turn around in the next twenty minutes or so, and tick the bloody thing off!
{And there are things in here which, which shouldn't be in here! {Maybe --
Debbie: {No, -- {No, that's not, that's not the {way it's supposed to be.
Mark: {Maybe --

Mark: Maybe we should take these away, and maybe fix them up for the next meeting, or call another meeting in, in three or four weeks time, once we've had a chance to read this and see what's actually {in it! Because some of this stuff is rubbish!
Debbie: {Well Mark, all, all that's in here is what people said to me? It's not um, anything that DOMM supports or doesn't support, or that anyone necessarily supports or doesn't support. It, it's only what the people that I spoke to -- and it's only a small group of people for recreational fishing, because I was actually unable to contact a lot of the people that I tried to contact -- um, there's only what people have said to me. So it's just individual points of view. It's not, um, in any way supposed to reflect what the sector as a whole : um, thinks.
producing a plan, nor their role as ‘experts’ rather than representatives, nor the organisation of the agenda according to the plan’s structure. Rather, they initially ignored those instructions, and worked together to resist the power represented by DOMM’s control of the process. They did this by adopting very assertive – sometimes aggressive – communication tactics: they expressed opinions as unequivocal facts (Mike: ‘if it’s not satisfactory ... then all the recommendations don’t hold any weight at all!’; Mark: ‘There’s areas in here that there’s no way the guys would agree to ...’); they refused to be satisfied with the responses they received (Mitch: ‘Yes, I know. I just ...’); they disregarded instructions from the chairperson (Mark: ‘No. The whole reason ...’); they disrespectfully projected actions onto DOMM (Mitch: ‘All you guys sat down ... “hey, we think ...”’); they gave unqualified negative appraisals (Mike: ‘sketchy’ ... ‘come up short’; Mark: ‘bloody thing’ ... ‘rubbish’).

At another level, this discussion subtly put at risk the bureaucratic framing of the planning process, enabling Alpha’s members to devalue the symbolic power of DOMM’s contributions. Because Alpha was formally responsible for the process’ outcome, its members found themselves in the position of bureaucrats with respect to the community consultation – trying to synthesise inputs into a cohesive, ‘universal’ statement. When the inputs failed to appear, the members began to distance themselves from that position, and to reframe their activity as one to which they, as experienced lobbyists, were more habituated: that of political negotiation. This is particularly evident in Mark’s speech towards the end of the debate (Fragment 7.5): the strong boundary between the exclusive ‘we’ (Alpha) and ‘you’ (DOMM), the assumption of solidarity with the community (‘the guys’), the assumed knowledge of their opinions. The ‘expert’ role has not been explicitly rejected, but there has been a discreet reminder of Mark’s power as a political representative.

Throughout the discussion, too, most of Alpha’s members attributed positive value to public/stakeholder input (and negative value to the lack of it), and tended to disregard bureaucratic policy, such as the standardised plan structure and DOMM’s statutory responsibility for developing the plan. They also shifted away from ‘bureaucratic’ (or technical) styles of discourse. Indeed, Mitch’s progressive ‘translation’ in Fragment 7.4, from the bureaucratic ‘how were these ... determined?’ through the active but still nominalised ‘what process you went through’ to the more
congruent/informal 'all you guys sat down ... threw it at the committee ... ' suggests a high degree of control of these features and a conscious decision to discard them. In ignoring the agenda, members downplayed DOMM’s focus on outcomes and closure in favour of keeping open a dialogic space for further creation of meanings. One effect of these strategies was to undermine the immediate hegemony of the bureaucratic field, allowing for a renegotiation of context, particularly with respect to the power relations between Alpha and DOMM.

**Consolidation**

That renegotiation became very clear towards the end of the third meeting, when members recalled the debate outlined above during the committee’s regular ‘where to from here?’ session to demand that DOMM encourage more stakeholder groups to present to their meetings, thus placing the interpretation and synthesis of stakeholder input under Alpha’s control rather than DOMM’s. The initial statement of this request was somewhat tentative, but power relations were quickly revised when DOMM staff appeared to resist.

In Fragment 7.6, Mike embeds the request in a series of grammatical metaphors: the result of the proposed action is framed as a possible state of affairs (‘that we in fact have more people ... and that in fact we forward ... ’); this state of affairs is ‘recommend[ed]’ to DOMM, and the recommendation itself is disguised as an offer to recommend, reducing its performative force and thus leaving open the question of whether Mike is institutionally authorised to instruct DOMM in this way. A recommendation from the committee to the executive is a reversal of the normal conventions, and could be interpreted as subtle criticism, implying that DOMM, not Alpha, are the real decision makers.

David’s response appears to me as an attempt not only to defend DOMM’s actions, but to reestablish some solidarity with the committee members. Although the statement is at first characteristically bureaucratic – replacing personal, specific and congruent forms with abstract ones (‘they’ → ‘Representatives of all ... ’; ‘involved in this’ → ‘that have an interest’) – it shifts quickly into a more casual mode, with ‘we’ as the explicit agent of a material process ‘force’, and an implied invitation to join him in laughing about the situation. Mike firmly rejects this attempt at camaraderie.
Fragment 7.6: Alpha Meeting 3, Where to from here?

Mike: And I, to sort of follow on from that, Marshall, I, I would actually like to recommend to ah DOMM that we in fact have more people available for the, as resources, and that in fact we forward some of this information to different people for their comment. Um, I've written a few things, and this is, you know, rough. ... [reads out a list of interest groups with names against them, raising in particular the need for the 'Department of Industry' to attend the meetings, with agreement from Monty]

Monty: Could be an outstanding example of different perspectives needed.

David: Just -- (I mean just on that, there is, ah, they are invited. Representatives of ah, of all the agencies involved in this -- that have an interest -- are invited to every meeting.

Mike: Right. (Well -- {Well --

David: However we can't, we can't {force those people to attend [laughing].

Mike: Well (it's gonna --

David: {Y'know, they {find --

Mike: {That's, that's, that's fine, but, but I think that um, somehow or another we, we require them here.

Fragment 7.7: Alpha Meeting 3, Where to from here?

Mitch: But if, possibly something we could do as a committee is, our request to DOMM is: please request of those agencies that we believe they will add value to the process we're going through. So rather than just say 'the meeting's on; would you like to come?' You can use our influence to provide that.

David: Yeh.

Chair: Ah y, should that be specific ah, according to what the agenda {would make a {difference?

Mike: {Yeh.

Mitch: {Oh yes. I {agree.

Mike: {Oh, I think so, yeh.
with an unequivocal statement of opinion ('that's fine, but I think that somehow or another we require them here'). This is a more powerful move, which raises the stakes in the struggle between members and staff.

Shortly after this, Mitch enters the conversation (Fragment 7.7), repositioning DOMM as subservient not only to the committee, but generally. Mike's 'recommendation' here becomes a direct 'request', congruently framed as an imperative ('please request of those agencies ...'). Mitch then suggests that DOMM present a highly modalised and incongruent appeal to those agencies' vanity ('we believe they will add value ...'), an extremely low status realisation of a request, and offers the use of the membership's (political) 'influence', implying that staff's (bureaucratic) own is inadequate to the task. Thus, Mitch asserts the membership's growing control over the framing of the planning process as explicitly political rather than merely procedural. Both David and the chairperson adopt relatively low status positions in response, one by agreeing and the other by switching from a command (*you should) to the less powerful request for the membership’s opinion.

The altered framing is consolidated shortly afterwards in a decisive confrontation between the bureaucratic and political lifeworlds. In Fragment 7.8, Mark introduces the 'minister' theme obliquely, referring to political events that were common knowledge at the time, before beginning to suggest that a letter to the Department of Industry be 'cc'ed' to the Minister for Industry. David, seeing an opportunity to reestablish some solidarity with the membership, attempts to 'join in' what appears at first to be a tangential conversation. Dick, however, anticipates Mark’s suggestion, and confidently rejects it, with an unqualified statement about the bureaucratic ‘reality’ of such actions ('to go for a minister you go to your CEO and then it's sent up'), implying that Mark’s idea arises from ignorance of the conventions in Dick’s lifeworld.

Mark (an experienced lobbyist) replies with an equally confident statement about the political reality of such actions. Uncertainty (modalisation) is placed with the bureaucratic option ('probably won't get a response'), whereas the political one is presented as unproblematic ('[the CEO] will send somebody' ... 'you'll get whatever you ask for'). Mark thereby invalidates Dick’s lifeworld interpretation and reframes the committee’s task according to his own. That is, Mark is matching the social field
Fragment 7.8: Alpha Meeting 3, Where to from here?

Mike: Yeh, as I said, if we wrote, if we wrote to the CEO of Industry, and said that we were disappointed with the input from Industry in an area that has industry in it, and potential {ah, conflicting
Mark: {I think it — [comment about the Minister of Industry] And, and {actually --
Mike: Yeh! [adds comment].
Mark: And C -- and {CC it -- -- {C s--.
Dick: {That's [right [laughing]]
Mike: {But to go for a [minister you go to your CEO, {then it's sent up!
Mark: {If, if you CC it to
the minister, :: {then [the CEO] will send somebody up.
Mike: {Yeh!
Mike: {Yeh.
Mark: {If you don't — if you just send it to him — you probably won't get a response. But as soon
as you CC it to the minister {you'll get whatever you ask {for.
Mike: {And cer --
Mark: [Certainly it should be CCed
to the Minister for Marine Management, because she started this whole process, and surely
she would like to see {it, {this, this --
David: {Oh. : I, I mean {I, I would, I would prefer to, y'know make it
clear to those agencies concerned that, that there is a level of disappointment, and that, and
that ah, we strongly recommend that, that they attend, before writing letters off to the
ministers.
Mike: Well {is it --
David: {Y'know, I mean it may be that, y'know that, I know that the Department of
Industry regional manager wanted to attend this meeting, and um, certainly I was
encouraging him to attend. At the last moment he couldn't make it because of some other
commitment, but I, I don't think it was a lack of desire to come to the meetings.
Mitch: Oh. I think, {I think that they might --
Mike: [I, I can understand that you don't want to write to Penny Perkins and say
[laughing] to Penny, 'I'm disappointed with the attendance!' {But the --
{[loud laughter]
Mike: {But the other side of that, David, is --
Murray: {But it's as a committee! We don't need to get DOMM to do that; as a committee we, yeh.
{We could {do it ourselves! {We can write to them [inaudible] and --
Mike: {Yes.
Martin: {That's right. yes.
Monty: {Yes. We can write to the minister, to the minister
{as a committee.
Murray: {Yeh! Marshall to sign it off as, as Chairman : {for the committee at this point!
Mike: {Well, --
Mike: Well can we ah, can we perhaps ah, identify the individuals that we should be writing to?

Penny Perkins is a politician. In this thesis, the sex of politicians is randomly assigned.
to his own habitus, rather than adjusting his behaviour to suit somebody else's conventions. Mike takes Mark's suggestion one step further, threatening also to copy the (hypothetical) letter to DOMM's own minister. Again, he does this metaphorically, with a statement about what 'should' happen, further modalised for high certainty ('certainly', 'surely') to emphasise the threat.

David often appears to lapse into bureaucratic language when under stress: although their next statement is in terms of personal preference ('I would prefer ...'), the tone is deliberately impersonal: he wants to 'make it clear to those agencies concerned' (not specifying the Department of Industry, which had been named eleven times in the preceding conversation), that 'there is a level of disappointment'. Here, negatives are expressed in highly nominalised, agentless language, and positives more congruently (though still using bureaucratic lexis – Table 7.3). Mike unequivocally rejects the hegemony of bureaucratic discourse in this extract, translating David's statements into a personal, conversational register: participants are mostly present ('you'; 'Penny'; 'I'), and attitude is explicit ('you don't want'; 'I'm disappointed'). Mike's use of 'I can understand' here is ambiguous: is it an expression of sympathy for David's position, or a more literal reminder that his bureaucratese is not fooling anyone?

The remainder of Fragment 7.8 establishes the committee's independence from the executive: Murray's 'We don't need to get DOMM to do that ...' and the repetition and agreement from the others (many of whom have been silent until this point). DOMM is outnumbered. However, the membership's victory seems to be purely symbolic: the minister is never mentioned again, and nobody objects when Mark's suggestion is absent from the final motion, which reads:

That DOMM will draft letters to heads of government departments and peak bodies to ask for assistance and a commitment to sending people to meetings when they are required. (Alpha Minutes, February 2001)

What the committee has achieved, however, is an 'unprivileging' of bureaucratic capital in their meetings, and a consequent significant alteration in their power relations with the executive. They continued their challenge with renewed confidence at the fourth meeting: significantly amending the drafted minutes, openly contradicting staff on matters of fact and inference, and insisting on actions that
Table 7.3: David's expression of positives and negatives, Fragment 7.8

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>'there is a level of disappointment'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>'we strongly recommend that ... they attend'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>'the Department of Industry regional manager wanted to attend'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>'certainly I was encouraging him to attend.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>'some other commitment'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
officers were reluctant to carry out. Several members commented on the altered power relations during their interviews with me, one of them citing Meeting 3’s ‘where to from here?’ session as a crucial turning point.

Summary

Alpha’s third meeting represented a struggle not only between individuals, but also between institutional cultures characterised by differing orientations and discursive practices. For the bureaucrats, the outcomes-oriented framing of the process as the step-by-step (ritual-by-ritual) production of a planning text was logical and unremarkable. Within this framing, conventional practices such as separating ‘Objectives’ from ‘Strategies’, drafting text for the committee’s endorsement, providing summary reports on external consultations, and observing specific protocol when approaching other departments’ ministers did not need to be negotiated with their collaborators. Yet these practices became the basis of a range of tensions between the executive and the committee members, whose habitual orientation was apparently not to fixing and closing meanings through monoglossic resemiotisation, but to opening the discursive space to the actants who constituted their own actor-networks (Mike’s industry connections, Mark’s recreational angling friends). Many of them were enacting this meeting not as a planning ritual, but as a part of their lobbying practice. They therefore actively resisted the bureaucratic framing: while nominally accepting DOMM’s definition of their ultimate task, they shifted away from the agenda and worked hard to prevent DOMM from gaining control over what they wanted to say. The conflict between members and executive staff, in this case, resulted largely from their adoption of different institutional framings.

7.2 Meeting 5: Closing down openness?

The catalyst for the concerns raised in Meeting 3 was the exposition of draft Objectives for ‘Indigenous Heritage’ at a time when the committee felt that there had been inadequate consultation with local Indigenous people. This issue haunted Alpha throughout the planning process, as there was no local Indigenous representation on the committee, and DOMM’s attempts to consult with this group continued to elicit very little response (Chapter 4, note 14). The problem was raised
again in the fifth meeting, at which the committee was again texting against each of the ‘Social Values’.\textsuperscript{10}

The debate, however, was very different from that of Meeting 3. There was only one DOMM staff member present, Debbie, a junior officer from the local office in Scrubfield, and the meeting was chaired by a member of the committee, Mike, rather than someone from DOMM.\textsuperscript{11} Further, the subject of Indigenous heritage was raised by the acting chairperson in response to concerns expressed informally during the lunch break by an observer of the meeting, Oscar, a non-Indigenous employee of the local representative body.\textsuperscript{12} None of the committee members, nor the observer, felt appropriately authorised to speak on the issues: the cultural distance and severe socio-economic disadvantage that characterise Indigenous communities, in association with a legal right to negotiate over land use changes, tends to mean that they cannot be ‘spoken for’ by others. In this session, committee members struggled to reconcile conflicting needs arising from the interaction between political, legal, development and planning fields, attempting simultaneously to perform their openness to new knowledge, to acknowledge the inadequacy of their ‘information’, and to produce a written outcome in accordance with DOMM’s agenda.

\textit{Confusion}

A noticeable feature of this session, compared to Meeting 3, is the changed balance between the volume of members’ and staff’s talk: 254 to 29 utterances respectively, and of the staff member’s utterances, two thirds (19) are either ‘yes’, questions about what the committee think, or confirmations of what has just been said.\textsuperscript{13} This is partly the result of the lesser number of staff and of the fact that the chairperson is a member; but it also reflects changed power relations.

The committee sits ‘between’ their confidence with respect to their relationship with DOMM, and their lack of confidence \textit{vis à vis} their subject matter, as the chairperson’s (Mike’s, in this case) opening statement (Fragment 7.9) shows. He confidently takes control and enforces the change of agenda – there is no uncertainty or hesitation in his opening. However, the rest of his statement is full of long pauses, fillers, and low certainty (‘somehow’, ‘perhaps’), culminating in his admission that ‘I don’t know what action to take ...’. The confusion is exacerbated by his adoption of
Chair: Um, well, we're actually gonna have a -- You should know, since I've taken over, I've just changed the agenda.

Um, but ah, there's, one of the things that we're missing whilst doing this is that there is um, considerable impact to these ah, social objectives by um, Indigenous issues, which ah we don't have any ah, representation here to help us with. Um, um my understanding from Oscar is there's ah -- Debbie, you're going to do some um, consultation over the next month or so, isn't it?

Debbie: Yep.

Chair: And that, these will be gone through {with regard to issues that um, affect the um,

Debbie: {Yeeh.

Chair: local Aboriginal communities? Ah, we need to bear that in mind, and I also think that we need to ah, make it quite um, : quite clear that we aren't moving ahead without regard; that we are, : that we um, : we do feel that it's very important that the, that, that it's covered. And somehow I would like to : ah, be able to assist in that process, by perhaps um, : : : I don't know what action to take to actually do it. But um, : : and I'd certainly like a recommendation from the committee.
the language of closure – the terms of bureaucratic meetings that need a recorded ‘outcome’ – ‘make it quite clear’; ‘it’s covered’, the nominalised ‘impact’, ‘issues’, ‘representation’, ‘understanding’, ‘consultation’, ‘action’. This language does not support the lack of closure that Mike is trying to perform, and becomes more and more confused and fragmented as the statement progresses. Modalisation returns to certainty at the end, when he ‘names’ the type of closure being sought (‘a recommendation from the committee’).

The chairperson’s next statement is less hesitant – following a brief tangent he returns to the point, carefully justifying it (Fragment 7.10). The solution suggested by Morrie in response is posed in the terms of the meeting agenda and – consequently – of the plan’s text, terms with which most of the members have, by this time, become comfortable. Morrie and Monty appeal to nominalisations (‘issues’; ‘aspirations’; ‘interests’) that are by nature generic and open to interpretation, but which once again represent the language of closure – the objectifying, dedifferentiating language made possible by writing (Ong 1982). Thus, they undermine the chairperson’s performative purpose in opening the discussion and prompt an interruption by the observer who had raised the issue at lunchtime, who tries to prevent the monologic reification of ‘Indigenous issues’ (‘a thing called ... ’). However, the committee continues to struggle to devise a statement that can be recorded as an outcome, with various members suggesting ideas for inclusion in the planning text – additional ‘Values’, additional Objectives for other Values, additional Generic Management Objectives, and so on (Fragment 7.11). The chairperson resists this form of resolution as lacking the openness required.

Throughout the early part of this discussion, Debbie is almost completely silent. She becomes active in the conversation only when it is explicitly brought back to the agenda, and her input consistently interprets the process as being centred on the planning text. For example, in Fragment 7.12, Debbie (supported by Morrie) twice interprets Mitch’s ‘the background’ as referring to the management plan section titled ‘Background’ under each social/ecological value. As such, once it is ‘actually written’ and endorsed, it will become fixed – an immutable mobile – and cannot be reconciled with Mitch’s apparent desire to use it as a temporary site for performing the committee’s awareness of the process’ shortcomings. As in Meeting 3 (Fragment 7.4), Mitch shifts from bureaucratic (‘...opportunity for an explicit statement ...’) to
Fragment 7.10: Alpha Meeting 5, Social Values

Chair: Anyway we, we've, er DOMM's obviously worked a um, : a program up of, of consultation. What we need to do though is to recognise that we're not just going through this willy nilly --

Max: Yeh.

Chair: -- and that. Because what's gonna happen is Debbie is going to turn up and start talking about this stuff, and it needs to be made quite clear to the people she's talking to that, that um, we haven't just forged ahead on the basis of

{'ah well, we know that y'know you guys'd turn up when you care.' Sort of.

Monty: It's not a fait accompli!

Max: Mm.

Chair: So how do we go about that? I don't know.

... 

Miles: One

Morrie: I think one obvious thing is: I look at the agenda; it just says 'Indigenous heritage'. : Maybe we need to identify almost like Indigenous : issues. {Like access for --

Monty: Indigenous aspirations (for the area!

Morrie: {Interests!

Chair: Ca'-- Ah, Oscar, you've got a comment?

Oscar: Yeh. I, I was just gonna say it might be useful for the purpose of the minutes to mention a couple of the examples that we talked about during the break then. To say that I don't think it's an issue of just having a, a thing called 'Indigenous issues', y'know ...

Fragment 7.11: Alpha Meeting 5, Social Values

Mitch: A' er in, in light of that, perhaps, thinking if we went back to, for example, recreational fishing, ... a recognition in the background that there is an Indigenous take, of, on which we have very little : or no knowledge! But almost flagging in the background, so that when Debbie does start going through this, that we've at least identified: 'hey there's, there an Indigenous dimension to this, which we don't profess to understand. But can you please give us specific input on this dimension?'

Chair: {Well, well --

Monty: {You can own that in that. Adding onto Mike's note, just say for example y'know as examples of values that have been discussed, {Yes.

Chair: {Yes.

Monty: where y'know it's highly likely there'll be, an Indigenous component: e.g. fishing, ah, geomorphology, {et cetera.

Chair: {Yeh. : So if that -- So can we just note that there is going to be variation? I don't think we should try and preempt it by deciding where they {are, {um, but um, --

Mike: {No.

Mitch: {Nup,

Miles: {Well we're not expert in that area, {no.

Chair: {No.
conversational language ('stick it in ... these guys ... a bunch of white folks ... making a call') when he encounters resistance, at the same time ‘dropping’ the modalisation (‘I think ... probably’) and grammatical metaphor (‘there’s ... an opportunity to’ v. *Do it!) that softened the request in its first realisation. The implication is that the conversational mode is, for Mitch, more forceful and dominant, reflecting his framing of this process as a political performance, rather than a technical exercise.

The chairperson is still unable to be decisive, relating the performativity problem to formal procedural elements: their ironic appraisal of a note in the minutes as ‘great, but ...’. However, Morrie and Debbie between them find a solution, and Debbie appears to see this as the end of the discussion: her request for confirmation of the action to be taken (‘... did you wanna add ...’) realises the usual formula used by DOMM staff to summarise.

Yet, the suggested actions did not satisfy the committee. The conversation continued for another fifteen minutes (Fragment 7.12 occurs approximately half way through this item), with members largely repeating their suggestions and receiving similar responses from Mike (Chair) and Oscar, as noted above. Eventually Mike, recognising this repetitive pattern, puts a stop to the discussion (Fragment 7.13).

**Summary**

The issue of Indigenous consultation highlights a fundamental dilemma faced by Alpha: the need simultaneously to pursue the closure expected of the bureaucratic meeting genre (and its resemiotised forms, the minutes and planning text) and to create an open space for new voices and knowledges. Even after they have established their status and accepted (with reservations) DOMM’s staging of the planning process, members’ understanding of the political imperatives inherent in being observed (both at the meetings and through the distribution of their decisions) generates internal tensions, confusion, and ‘talking in circles’.
Fragment 7.12: Alpha Meeting 5, Social Values

Mitch: Um, I think there's probably a, opportunity for an explicit statement in the background, that um, to date these values've not been scrutinised by the relevant Indigenous people.

Morrie: Well hopefully they will be (by the time this plan goes out -- they will do.
Debbie: {That, that will, will've been done by the time the (Background's actually written.
Mitch: {Yeh, no, but --

Mitch: But I reckon you should actually stick it in now, before you even put it in front of these guys: i.e. explain the shortfalls up front. We, a bunch of white folks, sitting around, making call on this!

Max: Mm!

Chair: Yeh. Well that's, {I, I mean I don't know the best way to do that --
Max: {They would certainly appreciate that,

Chair: whether it's put it in the minutes -- I mean that's great, but it gets circulated to us!

Mitch: {[laughs] {Yeh,
Morrie: {Well this is go ing to the sector {consultation groups though.
Debbie: {It's gonna go to the sector consultation groups though, yeh. {They're one of the ah --
Morrie: {At the end of this, {this meeting.
Chair: {Well perhaps, perhaps it should be a, a note in the minutes, as per what {we've done so far.
Debbie: {The Backgrounds: probably won't actually go to the sector consultation group. That's just a, like an introduction to our discussions.

Morrie: So that could be done in a covering note. : Per {haps when you -- Yuh?
Debbie: {Yeh.

Debbie: Um, did you wanna add another ... objective about ah, aspirations of Aboriginal people?

Fragment 7.13: Alpha Meeting 5, Social Values

Chair: We're j, all we're doing is recognising the other social values; that there is more input to be had.

Max: {Mn.
Monty: {Objective ... number 3 {could be cut and pasted in, like Debbie's got,
Morrie: {Yeh.

Monty: to the other values, : {and that,
Morrie: {We'd be able to cut and paste all of em {into, : just for repetition --
Chair: {I, I think we're now talking in circles! I, I reckon we've covered what we're talking about. If, if we wanna go into details, I reckon we should be doing that after we've had the input.

Max: Yeh.

Chair: And we can, we can't make any further determinations on what should or shouldn't be in there, because that's, it's not for us to do that. : So unless somebody's got something that directly relates to that, I'd like to go on to the next one.
7.3 Meeting 7: the power of the public

By their seventh meeting, Alpha had progressed from Phase 2 to Phase 3: from texting to mapping spatial controls (zones), considering the feedback from their first de facto public consultation period and revising the zoning plan in the light of those comments. As they worked through the submissions some members displayed growing discomfort as they grappled not only with their substantive disagreements, but also with the complex bureaucratic work of evaluating the public’s input, synthesising the comments and giving them spatial expression using the GIS. Conflict arose repeatedly as members enacted differing roles: as technical planners, as advocates, as adjudicators, and as political representatives.

Finding meaning

There was a continuing struggle over how the submissions should be treated: what types of meaning(s) should be given to individual and/or collective comments? There is evidence that, as a group, the committee used the submissions to provide focus to discussions about matters that were outside of their own interests. For example, Table 7.4 compares the debate about a sanctuary zone around ‘Sandy Island’, about which none of Alpha’s individual members expressed a strong personal view, with a zone around ‘Fishy Island’, which was vehemently opposed by at least one member. The sessions were not greatly different in length, but in the case of Sandy Island the submissions or their authors were invoked more than twice as often to initiate arguments. Moreover, opening invocations fairly consistently generated more than four times as many follow-up references.

It seems that in the case of Sandy Island, the submissions provided the basis for discussion, whereas the committee instead talked about members’ own views and interests in the case of Fishy Island. That is, the consultation took on a special importance where the committee members’ views were unclear, ambivalent or disinterested. Submissions were actors representing the actor-worlds of their authors; however, without the additional power of speech, their ‘voice’ had to be explicitly raised by other actors – especially Alpha members – who tended not to do so when their own interests/actor-networks required strong representation. The consultation did ‘fill a gap’ in the participatory process, giving voice to actants.
Table 7.4: number of times submissions and/or their authors were invoked in discussing Sandy Island and Fishy Island Sanctuary zones, Alpha Meeting 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sandy Island (~40 minutes)</th>
<th>Fishy Island (~35 minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Other*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41 (including initial summary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*‘Other’ includes prolonging, developing and reacting moves: that is, it indicates that the initial (opening) invocation of the submissions led to further discussion about them.
unrepresented (Briggs 1980; Sarkissian et al. 1986; Innes 1992; Mansbridge 1992; Godschalk et al. 1994; Graham and Healey 1999; Stocker and Moore 1999; Nichols 2002), but in this case the gap was more geographical than social, in that the significance of those extra voices was strongly related to ‘competition’ from members’ own actor-networks in the context of particular places.

Within this general framing of the submissions there were internal struggles over their meaning. DOMM’s summary report analysed the submissions as ‘issues’ for systematic consideration by the committee, listing these ‘issues’ against each zone (or against each sector when comments were not zone-specific). For example, Fragment 7.14 is the verbal summary of input for Sandy Island, the first zone that Alpha considered. David’s use of the word ‘issues’ in this summary is typical: throughout the seventh and eighth meetings, the contributions of DOMM staff consistently discuss submissions in terms of the issues they raise. Here, ‘issues’ includes not only ‘neutral’ matters – framed in the submissions as ‘facts’ about the ecological or administrative environment (for example, ‘this is a nesting site for seabirds’; ‘this is a mining tenement’) – but also social and economic interests (‘my friends and I fish here’; ‘my business relies on this area’). Either type of comment may influence the committee, depending on the values members wish to foreground. The chief difference between ‘neutral’ and ‘interested’ comments is the use, or the implied use (‘everybody fishes here’), of the first person – knowledge and interests are unified under ANT as the representation of different actor-networks (constituted by actants that are natural, institutional, social and so on). DOMM’s request to Alpha to consider both ‘types’ in the same way is, in this sense, an invitation to the committee to decide which types of actor-network to capitalise.

In contrast, some of Alpha’s members – particularly (but not exclusively) the recreational anglers – consistently refer to the submissions in quantitative terms such as ‘majority’, as in the summary, by an angler member, of the same submissions (Fragment 7.15). The constant collocation of the submissions with quantitative lexis suggests that, for these actors, it is the size in human terms, rather than the type, of the actor-network that matters. The submissions are seen as a form of ‘voting’ (itself a kind of translation) framed by a democratic ideal that the wishes of the majority should rule. The difference between DOMM’s ‘rational’ and Matt’s ‘democratic’ framings became a significant source of conflict throughout the seventh and eighth
Fragment 7.14: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 1, Sandy Island Sanctuary Zone

David: So I guess er, I think the, the, there's two, there's two major i', issues that the committee needs to deal with. Um, and that, and that, relates to, I guess, one: whether or not there um, there should be areas on the western side incorporated into that, that zone; and, and also: whether or not the, the ... boundaries should be amended to taking account of the comments from the um, sort of West Scrubfield communities.

Fragment 7.15: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 1, Sandy Island Sanctuary Zone

Matt: Well what I'm reading from ... West Scrubfield people here is: resi', reduce the zone around the northern and eastern sides, to allow recreational fishing around the edge of the island. Basically the only recreational fishing area available to people in West Scrubfield that has good beaches and reefs! : : : : And I think the majority are saying reduce the ah, that northern boundary! : : Is how I'm reading it.

* Most of the submissions regarding Sandy Island came from recreational anglers who lived in a different part of town (‘West Scrubfield’) than did Alpha’s recreational anglers.
meetings, not only between the membership and DOMM, but within the membership, several of whom supported DOMM's 'issues' framing. In Fragment 7.16, for example, Matt suggests that, far from merely raising issues for the committee to consider, the 'comments', as expressions of the desires of stakeholders, carry the authority of instructions: the majority are 'for ... not enlarging' the zone; therefore the zone should not be enlarged even for practical reasons. Miles' view of the committee's role is different: sometimes the right decisions are 'hard decisions'—the public, at least as represented by the submissions, is not always right (Gyford 1991; Campbell and Marshall 2000; Fischer 2000; Beierle and Konisky 2001). The interpersonal dynamic between Matt and Miles (an amateur yachtsman who rarely goes fishing) becomes antagonistic, characterised for instance by non-supportive interruptions, exaggeration ('size of matchboxes'; 'they're all for reducing') and emphatic intonation (indicated by exclamation marks). It did not improve over the course of the next two meetings.

There was an obvious strategic advantage to Alpha's anglers in the 'majority' framing, which rendered symbolic their own key source of capital—the representation of many humans (as distinct from nature or economic wealth, for example). It also particularly empowered the submissions which tended to support their own positions, because about two thirds of the submissions came from people who identified as recreational anglers. It was, therefore, a source of considerable frustration to Matt and Mark that this framing was not accepted by Alpha as a whole.

Early on Day 2, Matt attempted to make his concern explicit (Fragment 7.17). He poses his criticism as a question, asking DOMM staff to reflect upon how they have 'represented' the submissions in their report—this suggests to me that he feels that the presentation of DOMM's report has imposed a 'wrong' frame on the committee. David and Dick both answer in terms of the 'issues' raised in submissions (whether all of those issues have been included in the report), and continue throughout the session to defend their report according to this framing.

Matt's next statement reveals his real concern, a matter of the report not mentioning the force of numbers behind some submissions (Fragment 7.18). But David does not seem to hear this concern, responding again in terms of 'issues'. In Fragment 7.19, David ignores Matt's concern about numbers completely. Rather, he identifies a
Morrie: I propose we bring that – think, thinking of the, the, the West Scrubfield people – bring the provisional red line closer to Sandy Island, and, and stay out at least as far as that green line, if not right to the boundary of the reserve. And then offer that to the --

Matt: Why do we want to increase it? Why do we n, why do we need to increase it?

Morrie: Well, I'm thinking 'why not?' I mean do you think people will find the edge of that line somewhere, and say 'there's this little block we could, we can --

Matt: Well, I don't think we should be putting in, ah red', um, enlarging boundaries just for the sake of making it easy for um, DOMM to control! ... And I mean most of the um, comments are about reducing it!

Morrie: Yeh, --

David: Yeh, {but --

Matt: And not, not enlarging it! So I think we should stay within er, within those boundaries.

Miles: Yeh! But, you know you're gonna have to make decisions here. This is why we're on the committee!

Matt: Exactly! {And, and we're not about rolling over -- what we're about is taking the considerations of these comments! {And they're all for reducing!

Miles: I, I agree with you there! No, I agree! But, {but --

Miles: Yeh. {Yeh, but --

Matt: {Not enlarging it!

Miles: They'll always be for reducing!

Matt: Um, through the chair, what, Debbie, I've just got one question wha', while we're moving a bit away from the zoning that I'd like to -- I guess um, David, you're in the chair, but um, do you perceive that you um – being DOMM – have ah, represented the public submissions adequately?

David: Well, I think, I think in this sort of forum, Matt, it, it's hard to go through every, : every issue that's been brought up in those submissions, because y'know we're talking about, was it 50, fifty submissions? ... It's just, (it just becomes too much! : Um, going through the --

Dick: But everything's been, everything needs to be considered!

David: Yep.

Dick: But you can't act on everything, obviously, Be {cause they're not all --

Matt: {No!

Dick: But everything should be considered.

* The data is full of intertextual references to the GIS display, such as 'the ... red line' here. I will not continue to note them.
possible criticism according to DOMM’s own ‘issues’ framing, and elaborates his counter to that criticism at length. Matt’s contribution is reduced to minor clause agreements in the face of DOMM staff’s defensiveness.

The point I wish to make here is not that either DOMM’s or Matt’s framing has more ‘objective’ justification (though each certainly has strategic advantages to their proponents). Rather, they represent different institutional perspectives on the purpose of consultation – a discourse of ‘rationality’ versus one of majoritarian democracy (Phillips 1996; Burgess and Harrison 1998; Hastings 1999; Burgess et al. 2000; Hajer 2003). For DOMM staff, the rationalist framing is so internalised that they are unable to respond to Matt in his terms, or even to recognise the ‘fault’ that Matt has identified with the report. This is a major source of tension throughout Alpha’s last three meetings.

As Fragment 7.19 indicates, Matt is unable to assert the democratic frame: he responds in DOMM’s terms, appearing to agree. Later, he tries again and is similarly implicated in his opponents’ position. In Fragment 7.20, Matt again appears to be agreeing, and this is how his input was interpreted at the time by DOMM staff and by sympathetic members such as Morrie and the chairperson. However, I am certain that this interpretation was incorrect. Matt’s dissatisfaction with the presentation of the submissions, and with the committee’s reaction to them, continued to be a source of conflict throughout Meetings 8-9, and was forcefully expressed in Matt’s final interview with me. Moreover, Matt’s ‘democratic’ perspective was reflected after Meeting 7 in his involvement, through the Scrubfield Fishing and Diving Association, in organising three ‘public’ meetings – explicitly an attempt to enrol more numbers to the weight of recreational angling in Alpha’s deliberations. His repetition of ‘yeh’ in Fragment 7.20, then, seems to have some interpersonal function other than expressing agreement – most likely as attempts to conclude/terminate the conversation.

Throughout the three last meetings of Alpha, tension between ‘issues’ and ‘majority’ discourses surfaced in exchanges which showed an increasing level of frustration on the part of Matt and his allies. The latter discourse tends to equate the ‘majority’ of submissions as the voice of the ‘general public’ (Fragment 7.20) – the ultimate authority in a representative democracy. The rationalist approach adopted by
Fragment 7.18: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 2, introductory session

Matt: Just, some of those um, submissions were from clubs, organisations; some of those clubs have members of something like two hundred and fifty people! There was sort of no mention of that, y'know if it carries, y'know? It's --

Fragment 7.19: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 2, introductory session

David: I, I am sure that there is issues in here that we didn't discuss yesterday. {There's, there's no doubt about it! : Um, but it's, it's, it's a matter of having, having time.

Matt: {Yeh.

David: It's, I mean you ob, you've obviously gotta focus on the big issues, to get them resolved, and then start focussing on the, on the lesser issues? ... So it's, it's a good point, because y'know it's, it's always hard. {It's, it's hard for us, to sort of bring all that,

Matt: {Oh!

David: so much information to the committee and um, : y'know we, we've gotta decide what's a major issue, what's a minor issue, and try not to miss anything?

Matt: Yeh.

David: But invariably you do miss some things. But um, it, it's hard, it's hard not to do that! ...

Fragment 7.20: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 2, general comments

Matt: Yeh, it, and, and given that, then, : really w, we didn't have a role then to go through these submissions; to present the general public's -- So that, I'm saying now -- for future committees -- it was then charged with DOMM to present the general public's submissions!

David: Which is what this is!

Matt: Yeh.

David: Yep.

Matt: And {I think that's what you, you're saying. [speaking to Mitch]

Morrie: {And I'm, I think you've done it well! I think this is a really good way of doing it!

Dick: Bit hard to {get them all, but --

Matt: {Yeh, we just --

Chair: Ah, yeh! I think we, I think we've had what we've, what we've needed y'know ...

Matt: Yeh.

Chair: all I wanna do is to get the, the main points! {And that, and certainly DOMM's done that,

Morrie: {Checkpoints. Yeh!

Chair: I think, in the, {in the way that it should be.

Matt: {Yeh!

* A club's financial membership is a simple sort of actor-world; membership fees can be interpreted as a form of enrolment ensuring loyalty to the positions of the club's elite. Matt does not, of course, extend this principle to other forms of enrolment which could be mobilised in support of the power of other submissions -- for example, employment by corporations or other large organisations. More complicated is the question of who government departments might be said to 'speak for', particularly when -- as in the case of Alpha's submissions -- different departments express contradictory positions.
DOMM staff (and several members), on the other hand, places the force of the 'better argument' above the force of numbers. This approach appeared at the time to prevail, sustaining a framing of the 'public consultation' process as an administrative, rather than political, one: the committee's role as planners is 'speaking truth to power' (Wildavsky 1979), and the representation of human numbers is assumed to be taken care of outside the process, through the election of the ultimate decision makers.

**Finding value**

Parallel to the struggle over meaning, in which a few particular members were in opposition to DOMM throughout Meetings 7 to 9, was a second struggle over the question of how much credence to pay to each submission. This struggle over value was not a contest between fixed positions, but a continual series of negotiations and explorations by the committee. Various principles were invoked at different times to help carry decisions, often with little or no input from DOMM staff.

One such principle related to the expressed importance of an area to the person/organisation making the submission. This principle was useful in a number of cases, as it bracketed the question of whether submissions expressed 'issues', according to a scientific perspective, or 'votes'. Fragment 7.21 represents the beginning of a temporary settlement regarding perhaps the most controversial sanctuary zone proposed in the draft plan. The wording of the museum's submission is brought to the attention of Mark, who until this point has been arguing in general terms against the Rocky Island zone. There is a conscious and deliberate attempt to evaluate the authority of this submission and its use of the word 'must' – a modulation expressing high obligation which can be read, metaphorically, as a command. The modulation is contrasted with the submission's wording regarding other areas: Mark finds that there is more to the claim than simply a dogmatic style, and states an explicit evaluative principle ("... if it's the only place ... where they've stipulated "must include" ... they must be pretty serious ... if they're really serious, ... maybe we should be").

It is, for Mark, the museum's restrained use of 'stipulations', rather than their access to 'truth' (as an actor representing nature by acquiring and disseminating scientific
**Fragment 7.21: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 1, Rocky Island Sanctuary Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Now that's the, is that the area that's the concern of the museum?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Their advice was that, that, is that <strong>must</strong> be in the --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>'Must include bay at northwest of Rocky Island!' ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>It's the next bay up .... : 'Must include bay northwest of Rocky Island'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>... : : I mean in the light of that, that sort of makes you think, well,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>{there is a good -- Y'know maybe, maybe we've gotta leave that!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Well, : yeh, I would agree if s, er er er, I guess in that area, {but move it along!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>{And if it's, if it's the only place they're, it's the only place where they've stipulated 'must' include.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Hm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>You know, everywhere else, they've sort of said 'yeh, it's pretty good for this and this and this!' But that's the only one that I've seen where they got 'must' in there, really well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Yeh, hm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>So they must be pretty serious about it. So if they're really serious about it, maybe we should be.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
knowledge), that renders their submission worthy. Indeed, to several of Alpha’s members, the museum’s ‘knowledge’ is no different from any other stakeholder’s ‘interests’. In Fragment 7.22, Matt construes the museum unequivocally as holding a personal/vested interest: they ‘want that area’; the committee has the power to ‘give it to em’. In this discourse, those submitting comments to the committee about zoning become supplicants: there is no neutral or public interest to consider, just more and less worthy requests.

This became clear at the eighth meeting, when Alpha considered a second museum submission that more constantly ‘stipulated’ for increasing the sanctuary zones (Fragment 7.23). Mike’s ‘cynicism’ was not shared by all of Alpha’s members – several saw the museum as a neutral, scientific and therefore trustworthy party – and the appropriate treatment of the second submission became a matter of dispute.

Another principle for evaluating the worth of submissions was a perception of general disadvantage, for which sympathy and affirmative action are appropriate responses (Wagle 2000). Fragments 7.24-25 show that West Scrubfield people were constructed as doubly disadvantaged: procedurally, because they were ‘not represented here’, and substantively, because ‘That’s their only island ...’; ‘that’s their one little spot’. Disadvantage is the result of a kind of deviation from normality, in the standard appraisal framework (White 2002). Judgement tokens such as ‘only’ or ‘little’ can be seen as cues for the affective reaction of sympathy, which carries with it an implication of benevolence: of not only good will towards the unfortunate, but also power and/or superiority over them.

Mark, in Fragment 7.25, uses explicit ‘authentic’ appraisal (Iedema and Grant 2004) regarding the committee’s role: insecurity (‘worried’) regarding the possibility of committing a morally dubious act (‘I’d hate to ... pass judgement ...’). This is a risky move in bureaucratic discourse (Chapter 8, 8.2), but in this case Mark is supported by co-members, whose interruptions express agreement, compliance with the request to ‘put it somewhere else’ and solidarity (‘Yeh’, ‘What about ... [name] ... instead’, ‘that was my argument’).

However, invocation of the sympathy principle was not always successful. Later in the meeting, an attempt to portray another group of anglers as disadvantaged led to
**Fragment 7.22: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 1, Rocky Island Sanctuary Zone**

Matt: No, b, I mean include that area! If that, the museum want that area in there, then I agree! Give it to em! Y'know?

---

**Fragment 7.23: Alpha Meeting 8, Day 1, zoning discussion**

Mike: ... I, I must say, I'm turning into a cynic! And I've re', I, I selectively read all the museum comments, and they all said: 'make it {bigger. Extend this way. : Change it that way!'

Matt: {More?

... Chair: That's, that's a cynical com {ment!

{[loud laughter]

---

**Fragment 7.24: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 1, Sandy Island Sanctuary Zone**

Mark: I, I'm just, just a little bit worried about this one in particular, because West Scrubfield basically isn't represented here, [and --

Morrie: {That's their only island, really.

Miles: Yeh!

Mark: I, I really don't know where they fit! I'd hate to sort of sit here and pass judgement and say 'hey, no, leave it as it is' if that is one of their prime areas to fish! {If, if, if, if we can --

Debbie: {From talking to people --

Mark: If we can juggle it, and put it somewhere else, then let's put it somewhere else!

---

**Fragment 7.25: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 1, Sandy Island Sanctuary Zone**

Morrie: What about, I mean if we had [place] in there instead ...? Would we just be shifting a problem, or would we {be better --

Murray: {Yeh, you'd just be shifting the problem to East Scrubfield-based fishers.

Morrie: But they've got more choice ... than {West Scrubfield people.

Miles: {Yeh. That, that was my argument: that the

{West Scrubfield people -- by, I'm just going on what they are saying --

Mark: {Yeh!

Miles: they were saying that they, that's their one little spot, where we saw from the other diagram. Where the East Scrubfield people go, it's in a totally different area.
conflict, rather than solidarity (Fragments 7.26-27). Matt’s discursive tactics are interpersonally clumsier than Mark’s. Rather than beginning with his own feelings, Matt starts with a statement modulated for high obligation (‘it’s gotta ... ’), a high-status realisation of a request which can be interpreted as aggressive. On meeting resistance, Matt’s sympathy for the anglers is so exaggerated with its repetition of sympathy cues (‘poor little recreational guys in their little boats’) that, without knowing much about the context, it could easily be heard as sarcastic. This dialogue escalates (Fragment 7.27) from non-supportive interruptions into the personal accusations of arrogance implied in ‘They haven’t all got big boats, like you ... ’ and ‘Consider the small boating population!’, which are met with general disengagement and a change of subject.

However, the interpersonal dynamic may not be the only factor underlying Miles’ and Morrie’s lack of sympathy for Matt. Most obviously, the nature of the disadvantage Matt is claiming (having small, rather than big, boats) is substantive only – there is no suggestion that the anglers who use Fishy Island are procedurally disadvantaged. Indeed, Matt is arguing for his own interests, rather than for the authors of submissions – he represents the use of the area as his personal knowledge (‘a lot of people fish in there’), rather than as something arising from the consultation. Further, the repetition syndrome that undermined the power of the museum’s submissions at Meeting 8 (Fragment 7.23) may be operating. For most of the day, Alpha’s attention has been directed to submissions from recreational anglers, which have almost exclusively demanded the reduction or elimination of sanctuary zones.

At Meeting 7, the repetition syndrome was certainly a factor in Alpha’s evaluation of comments from a group of commercial aquarium collectors. In this case, the mitigating factor of procedural disadvantage (the group had no representation on Alpha) led to a growing sense of discomfort on the part of the committee. That discomfort was eventually allayed by a DOMM officer who provided focus for members’ general frustration, and justification for devaluing the sector’s claims. Fragment 7.28 occurred towards the end of Day 1, after several of the proposed zones had already been discussed. For each zone to that point, the consultation report had noted comments from the aquarium collectors that the proposed zone would interfere with their business. Merv’s query about how to ‘deal... with that’
Fragment 7.26: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 1, Fishy Island Sanctuary Zone

Matt: No. It's gotta pick up that, that bay!

Miles: Why?

Morrie: Why?

Matt: Because a lot of people fish in there! It's the same for --

Miles: Well that's, that's the old B.L. syndrome!

Matt: Well, you know --

Miles: Bad Luck!

Matt: Yeh, but what about, y'know we're supposed to be giving em half of the island. Yeh!

Morrie: No, that wasn't the --

Matt: in, in all, in, in the middle of weather? Protection -- [interrupted]

Fragment 7.27: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 1, Fishy Island Sanctuary Zone

Miles: The point is boats can still go in there to shelter, but have a cup of tea instead of a fish! Yeh!

Matt: I know that, Miles. I'm trying to cater for an, for all others.

Miles: I know! I know that's --

Matt: They all haven't got big boats, like you, that can get way out to the [name] and other areas!

Miles: I know that, --

Matt: Consider the small boating population!
was to DOMM officers who, as usual, defended their actions with reference both to the effort they had already made, and to difficulties that were out of their control: specifically, that the aquarium collectors had changed their information.

Dick's response establishes a hard line between 'us' and 'them' in explaining these difficulties: repeated reference to the collectors as 'that group of those people'; greatly exaggerating the extent of the shift ('it was no overlap' → 'now there's a hundred percent overlap'); attributing positive actions to 'we' (DOMM) and negative ones to 'they' (Table 7.5).

Dick's talk goes further than merely 'blaming' the collectors: framing 'the problem' in terms of 'two sets of information' — importantly, quantifiable information ('hundred percent'; 'sets of data') — he constructs the committee as a group of technicians. At the same time, the committee's agency is missing, replaced by an impersonal nominalisation ('we actually looked at ...' → 'part of the zoning took into account') a classic bureaucratic shift that institutionalises what might otherwise be perceived as personal responsibility (Iedema 1997b). Thus, Dick endows the committee with the bureaucratic power — the cultural and ethical capital — of the impartial expert. This power was enthusiastically embraced by all of Alpha's members when, at the eighth meeting, they dealt with the aquarium collectors face-to-face. Faced with what they saw as 'unreasonable demands', they argued for a 'public good' against sectoral interests; they refused to be swayed by 'emotion'; they refused to consider a 'trade off' proposal on the grounds that it did not conform to the meeting agenda; they performed 'balance' by repeatedly thanking the collectors for their input and expressing understanding of their position. In sum, they assumed the identity of bureaucrats par excellence.

Summary

The difference between the seventh meeting, in which Alpha was closely engaged with the task of zoning, and the earlier 'texting' meetings was profound. Although performing openness was still important to members, it became secondary to achieving their strategic aims. As a consequence, the membership's previous solidarity, largely based on treating DOMM as a common enemy, began to break down, to be replaced by traditional sectoral conflicts over resource sharing.
Fragment 7.28: Alpha Meeting 7, Day 1, zoning discussion

Merv: ... My only comment in regards to this area ... with those ... particular aquarium collectors, given all the comments that we see pop up, where do we start compromising on their behalf, to accommodate their needs? And just how real ah, is it all? ... Or how, how are you deal, how are we dealing with that?
...

Dick: Well the, the problem, the initial problem was that we actually did get from that, from that group of people areas that they considered to be important. : But once they saw the draft zoning scheme, the, they {then said 'the real areas of importance are, 

Mark: {All the zones!

Dick: happen to be in the areas that you did.' So the two maps - we've got two sets of information: one prior to this draft zoning scheme, that was done originally at the start of the planning process along with everything else, in consultation with those people; and now a completely different view:

{o' of that. So we, we have to talk to them to try and reconcile why we've got ambiguous --

Mark: {Because we actually looked at those guys' set areas up there!

Dick: It does make it very difficult when the industry gives us a, a set of areas that are important, and it, and it, and it was no overlap, and tha', and that's what the z, part of the zoning took into account er, at that last meeting. : But since they've sa', s, -- as I say -- since they've seen this, they've revised [laughing lightly] that, and now there's a hundred percent overlap! : So we've gotta talk to them about why the two sets of data they've given us are so different. : And, and what we're gonna do about it. Cos they have presented us, through that process, with a, with a difficult issue!

Table 7.5 : Positives and negatives in Dick's speech, Fragment 5.28

| + | we actually did get from ... that group of people ... |
| - | once they saw the draft zoning scheme, ... they then said ... |
| + | we have to talk to them to try and reconcile ... |
| - | when the industry gives us ... a set ... But ... since they've seen this, they've revised that ... |
| + | we've gotta talk to them |
| + | what we're gonna do about it |
| - | they have presented us... with ... a difficult issue |
(particularly between recreational and commercial users). Sectoral positions were strategically supported by different framings of the meaning of consultation: as information; as the voice of a public ‘majority’; as a form of supplication or bargaining.

Members found particular solidarity in the latter framing, which construed the committee as institutionally powerful (reifying the symbolic capital of authority), able to dispense mercy or justice according to the perceived worth of the submissions (see Hillier 2002a on local councillors). As members became increasingly frustrated about how to sort and manage conflicting comments, they negotiated and renegotiated ways of valuing and devaluing the input of particular parties, especially by constructing a dichotomy between ‘fair/reasonable’ and ‘greedy/unreasonable’ demands (whether grounded in ‘interests’ or ‘knowledge’): the committee became negative towards authors whose demands/stipulations were persistent or numerous as this meeting and subsequent ones wore on. I believe that the structure of DOMM’s consultation report and agenda exacerbated this tendency: single submissions that addressed several/all zones were presented over and over again as each zone came up on the agenda.

That the principles justifying Alpha’s constructions of authors had to be continually renegotiated suggests that their use of those principles was strategic, rather than consistent: members invoked different principles to reinforce or to downplay their own identification with particular sectors as and when necessary. This oscillation between different framings and evaluative principles highlighted some members’ sophisticated ability to make strategic use of bureaucratic conventions while – equally strategically – refusing to embrace fully the bureaucratic construction of themselves as technical experts, of stakeholder input as ‘information’, or of the zoning issue as requiring closure.

At earlier meetings, members had forcefully rejected the bureaucratic field in favour of a more political one, oriented to heteroglossic rather than monoglossic resemiotisation (bringing in more voices rather than fixing meanings as planning text). They managed this without challenging their explicit instructions, demonstrating a high level of control over the conventions of the meeting genre and a willingness to use them to their own ends (MacCallum 2002a, 2005). Yet,
confronted directly with problems inherent in their unaccustomed role as bureaucrats – in particular the need to reconcile heteroglossic and monoglossic resemiotisation by synthesising inputs as ‘outcomes’ – they became confused and frustrated. During the seventh meeting, as their personal stakes rose and their solidarity against DOMM evaporated, confusion and frustration led to overt conflict and, eventually, to the surprising (to DOMM) decision by some members to abandon the planning process in favour of more conventional political tactics such as lobbying.

7.4 Conclusion: institutional tension, misunderstanding, withdrawal

Alpha’s planning process was characterised by recurring tension and anxiety, which tended to find expression as concerns over the committee’s relationship with the broader community. Such moments tended to emerge when the committee entered new phases of action and, consequently, members needed to renegotiate their immediate context: to ‘learn’ and personally stamp the planning rituals; to stake their claims; to ‘discover’ relevant alliances, oppositions and power relationships. At such times, patterns of interaction involving ‘strange behaviours’ on the part of the non-bureaucrats suggested that tensions arose at least partly out of divergent framings of the contexts of situation and culture. In particular, Alpha’s case seemed consistently to reveal discrepancies between technical planning, as practised by DOMM, and politics, as practised by some of the members.

The planning model imposed by DOMM reflected its institutional inheritance as an agency dominated by scientists (chiefly marine biologists) and governed by scientific conventions. Participatory planning was new to DOMM staff: until recently, their methods had been more in keeping with a rational-comprehensive approach, involving extensive data gathering, systematic analysis of options, organisation according to a standardised table of contents, and endorsement by a series of increasingly senior actors culminating in the minister. These habits, and associated orientations to symbolic capital in the forms of ‘truth’, impartiality and rank, sustained DOMM staff through the daunting task of managing a collaborative planning exercise in an area characterised by numerous and conflicting interests. Officers applied their habitually reductionist thinking not only to the substantive planning task, but also to the participatory process itself, mapping out the entire procedure at the start and allocating well defined roles to the participants (Chapter 9,
9.1.1). Alpha members’ reluctance to keep to either the procedure or their allocated roles was, therefore, a source of considerable stress.

During the early part of the process (before zoning discussions began) members struggled with an intrinsic contradiction within collaborative planning practice: the need simultaneously to achieve monologic closure in order to progress, and to be dialogically open to diverse knowledges and ideas. This struggle led to their most consistent ‘strange behaviour’: complaining about the management of the procedure instead of working towards consensual solutions. That is, members resisted the closure that ‘consensus’ implies and instead used the meetings as arenas in which to perform openness, as well as to keep their own strategic aims on the table. At times, this prevented the committee from moving on according to the linear model that DOMM was attempting to follow. Indeed, I maintain that the problem was exacerbated by that model which, in spite of its generic relation to the products of planning (plans), was an unrealistic representation of a planning process (Chapter 9, 9.3).

When the committee progressed to the zoning, the generalised tension between DOMM and the members gave way to more specific conflicts between different members. While these conflicts were both strategic and historical, they found expression in divergent interpretations of key actor-networks: DOMM’s summary reports of the public submissions, and the submissions themselves. The submissions were framed qualitatively by DOMM as issues/information – as representing an external ‘reality’ which included (but was not limited to) the interests of stakeholders. Some members, taking DOMM’s reports at face value, adopted this framing. However, other members resisted it, and instead interpreted the submissions quantitatively as ‘public opinion’ – as representing the will of the populus, the only significant authority in a democracy. Such framing differences are deeper than substantive disputes (Goffman 1969; Tannen 1993; Roe 1994; Gray 1997; Boltanski and Thevenot 1999). Different framings appeal to different institutions – planning, science, democracy – to shape practice and, consequently, confer authority on different types of capital. DOMM staff and Alpha members gave various different meanings to their interactions, resulting in ongoing tension and misunderstanding between them. Institutional habits and constraints – not only those of the bureaucrats, but also those of the stakeholders – resulted in identifiable
dissatisfactions which, eventually, led to the withdrawal of some members' support, threatening the whole project.

Thus, Alpha's case illustrates the embedded nature of conflict in some collaborative planning exercises. In the following chapter, I look closely at Beta, a very different case, in which explicit institutional constraints (such as the need to produce a standardised plan) were for a long time set aside in favour of a more 'relational' approach (Graham and Healey 1999).
8 Practice and practicality: SOHE and Beta

Chapter 7 showed how framing conflicts arose from DOMM’s attempts to impose certain institutionalised practices on Alpha’s planning process: a rational-comprehensive style of planning; linear organisation of the process according to a standard plan format; ‘balanced’ roles for committee members; and treatment of public/stakeholder input as information. In the case of Beta, there was little evidence that such institutional constraints were enforced by the Shire of Harbourtown and Environ (SOHE). The committee was much freer to set its own directions, and members largely defined their own roles and relationships. Nonetheless, Beta was no less troubled by misunderstandings, tension and frustration than Alpha. This chapter explores why.

To do this, the chapter follows a similar format to that of Chapter 7: I analyse three meetings in which tensions between members were evident, relating these tensions to particular institutional/cultural practices. In Beta’s case differences emerged not only between bureaucrats and lay-participants, but also between bureaucrats from within and outside of the practice of planning. In particular, this chapter examines struggles over the meanings of particular planning conventions such as ‘objectives’ (Meeting 2), over lay-members’ participation in bureaucratic negotiations (Meeting 6) and over the delegation of their work to a consultant (Meeting 10). In each case, the source of tension appears to relate not to explicit institutional structures and functions, as in Alpha’s case, but to divergent habits, understandings and inclinations – that is, from participants’ embodiment (as habitus) of conventions associated with different institutional cultures. Thus, Beta’s interaction shows that, even when national and/or ethnic difference is not at issue, cultural tensions can be deeper than the formal dimensions of planning and governance.

8.1 Meeting 2: When is an objective not an objective?

The context for Beta’s second meeting included a good deal of tension carried over from the shocks of the first: for members of the Lumbervale Action Group (LAG), the port’s objection to residential uses in Lumbervale; for the port manager, the constraints posed by existing dwellings in Lumbervale and the fact that Lumbervale’s future zoning was still in question. There was also tension resulting
from the presence of SOHE's CEO and mayor, who had been active in the earlier
dispute over Lumbervale's zoning and whom LAG members mistrusted deeply.

The only substantive item on the agenda was the review and/or confirmation of the
objectives that Beta had devised for itself at its first meeting. LAG members had, in
the interim, decided that those objectives did not accord well with their
understanding of the committee's aims, and prepared a revised set. Through this
meeting, they hoped to authorise their new objectives with the added power of the
mayor's and CEO's enrolment. This item dominated three hours of discussion, as
members simultaneously tried to ensure their interests were met and performed
reconciliation. As they did so, there surfaced underlying differences regarding the
nature and purpose of planning 'objectives' as a passage point.

Council's original objectives for Beta, and the committee's objectives from the first
meeting are reproduced opposite for the sake of comparison.

Understanding objectives
A key concern of the CEO, Len, and mayor, Cr Bob, at this meeting was that the new
objectives should not contradict the intentions of the SOHE Council in establishing
Beta. They make this point strongly, causing project manager Larry to defend the
committee (Fragment 8.1). Larry's discomfort with his superiors' implicit criticism
is obvious in this fragment, which is long, repetitive, and barely coherent. However,
it is also revealing. Larry's point (as I understand it) reflects a conception of the
committee as a planning group, requiring 'strategic direction' in the form of
'objectives' – a central feature of planning as a cultural institution and of plans as
texts (Chapter 7, 7.1) – rather than being 'task-oriented'. It seems, though, that the
non-planners who were present at the first meeting, when the objectives were
devised, have not internalised this requirement and, when the committee is later
questioned on the matter, it falls to another planner to explain it (Fragment 8.2).
Sue's explanation – 'they're not really objectives; they're tasks' – contains a range of
embedded assumptions: that 'objectives' and 'tasks' are different; that the features of
Council's terms of reference are not those of 'objectives'; that 'objectives' are
necessary to the committee's work; and – as no interpretation is provided – that
others share the definitions underlying these assumptions. In spite of her obvious
SOHE Council's original resolution (November 1999)

That further investigations be undertaken within the next eighteen months (subject to budget considerations and the timing of relevant strategic planning initiatives by the Department of Planning) into strategic options for industrial location, including the feasibility of zoning Lumbervale for light industry, in consultation with the community independent from the finalisation of the Zoning Scheme comprising the following:

- Defining the preferred strategic roles for existing and new industrial areas in the entire municipality,
- Comparing the comparative investment by the community in dwellings and light, general and other industrial developments in Lumbervale,
- Studying the economic and financial implications, for both individuals and the community, from the selection of options for the future of Lumbervale,
- Modelling and mapping the off-site impacts of existing industry in Lumbervale in relation to the location of dwellings,
- Identifying management options for limiting off-site impacts of industrial activity;
- Defining a strategic future for Lumbervale,
- Preparing statutory policy and design responses for managing long term land use changes and development in Lumbervale, and
- Establishing a program of implementation and monitoring.

Committee Objectives, Meeting 1 (September 2000):

1 Develop an integrated industrial land strategy.
   1.1 Protect strategic industrial interests of the key stakeholders in the municipality.
   1.2 Limit future residential/caretakers dwellings in Lumbervale and examine the feasibility of zoning Lumbervale for light industry.
   1.3 Provide suitable area for general industry in the municipality.
   1.4 Provide suitable land for light industry in the municipality.
2 Develop implementation strategies and management options (statutory/policy) for the above objectives.

Fragment 8.1: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Larry: Ah, I think ah, as part of the ah, committee member was represented at the meeting itself, I think what we intended to do was look at where the original, initial resolution was. And part of the committee recommendation was one: we've sort of established the objectives, we see as part of the ah, requirements ah, to fulfil some of the parts, ah, set up as part of the resolution of Council is to create much more clearer objectives, which then the task itself can be taken on board as part of fulfilling that requirement.

At the moment it's very task-oriented, from what we can get as part of committee. Or why we spelt out exactly what's needs to be done, as part of the overall process, so we as committee then take this further, and say 'alright, let's have a bit of objectives in terms of how we can further, I guess, meet this ob, ah, er ah, goals or task-oriented set up by Council resolution, but to more strategic direction in terms of fulfilling that requirement.' I mean when you look at the ah, resolu', resolution itself, it's very specific in terms of what needs to be done. And we as committee then took it further, and said 'right, this is what we see as the main objectives to fulfilling, taking into consideration what is ah required at, as per Council's resolution.' I think when you look at the objective, objectives itself, ah, it takes into consideration some of the task identified as part of the re', resolution, to fulfil the objectives. ::

Ah, is there any further comments that the committee wants to add on?
effort to be clear and inclusive, Sue is using a planning discourse rather unreflectively.

This discourse is not unproblematic. A crucial difference between the committee objectives in Meeting 1 and LAG’s ‘second set’ (opposite) is that the material processes given thematic position the first set (‘develop’, ‘protect’, ‘limit’, ‘provide’) have mostly been replaced in LAG’s by mental processes (‘identify’, ‘examine’, ‘investigate’).\(^1\) This suggests to me that the planners’ requirement for what Larry describes as ‘strategic direction’ (Fragment 8.1) – ultimate goals to work towards – is not shared; LAG members have reframed the objectives as things that the committee can do through reflection and talk; in Sue’s language, it is ‘tasks’ that they want, not ‘objectives’.

The exception to this pattern is Objective 2, in which ‘Develop implementation strategies …’ has been replaced by ‘Implement strategies …’: ‘strategies’ and so on are no longer framed as ends in themselves. This relates to another significant shift in LAG’s set of objectives: they have reframed the committee’s primary focus as the identification of land, rather than the development of a strategic plan. A LAG member complained in an interview in November 2000 that at the first meeting they had been pressed by the bureaucrats:

\[\text{into wild and obscure ah, ah wossnames which ah, had no bearing – or we didn’t feel, like it certainly didn’t in, address the crux of the matter.}\]

That ‘crux’ was:

\[\text{what it was set up for, it, it really is an issue of um, : for the committee, you know the industrial land ....}\]

The strategic plan, a crucial element of planning procedures (Chapter 6, 6.2.5), was apparently not seen as a relevant part of the process by LAG members – an issue which was to have major ramifications later in the process. However, the bureaucrats did not challenge either the reframing of the objectives as tasks or the elimination of the strategic plan. Rather, they worked with these features of the ‘second set’ (Chapter 11, 11.1), raising a range of issues surrounding the committee’s scope of authority.
Fragment 8.2: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Len: Barry, can I ask um, why you've, you've put together some aah, some different group objectives, rather than the objectives, terms of reference that Council promulgated on its ... November meeting? In other words, were there aspects of the terms of reference that you weren't happy with?

Barry: No Len, it was {um, the objectives that were --
Sue: {It was the whole project. { It was the whole {group.
Cr Bill: {Whole --
Barbara: {The whole group did that.

Sue: Yeh. At the, at the first meeting, the objectives that Council endorsed at its, at its meeting, ah, I guess round table discussion we said they're not really objectives; they're tasks. And maybe it would be best for the committee to revisit the objectives as a whole, and then put them back up to Council to see if they're okay with the objectives that the group came up with. So that's, that's the background to that.

LAG's revision of the Committee Objectives, presented at Meeting 2 (November 2001)

1 Identify land suitable for general industry use in the municipality of the Shire of Harbourtown and Environs for those industries that are not suitable to be located in Lumbervale.
   1.1 Identify and protect strategic industrial interests of the key stakeholders in the shire.
   1.2 Examine the feasibility of zoning Lumbervale for Light Industry.
   1.3 Investigate the availability of land for the expansion of Lumbervale.
   1.4 Implement strategies, management options and statutory policy for the above objectives.

2 Notes to 1.1: Identify key stakeholders.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
Fragment 8.3 is one example from the discussion of ‘Objective 2’, in which the exception noted above (‘implement strategies’) is reversed. Len actually uses the word ‘task’ in relation to the objectives – the committee’s discussion has comprehensively reframed ‘objectives’ as ‘tasks’ (things that Beta can do), not strategic outcomes. This means, as Len suggests, that all of the objectives need to be expressed as mental and/or verbal processes. Fragment 8.3 lies towards the end of the discussion on the objectives, and the time and effort they have put into the detail of what, from a planner’s point of view, can be seen as a standard but relatively minor element of procedure is evidently beginning to frustrate Sue, whose last utterance is flippant. Fragment 8.4, from Beta’s following meeting (in December 2000) suggests that for Barbara, in contrast, the key issue is the enrolment of the councillors to that program – an important political achievement. Sue’s view, as a planner, is that the objectives are a necessary step towards focussing the ‘real work’, but they are ‘nothing real(ly)’ in themselves. The objectives, as a passage point within a larger strategic project, represented quite different achievements for the planners and the LAG members.

Focus …

In Chapter 7 (7.1), I outlined lexical content and reference analyses of a segment from Alpha’s third meeting, showing that when DOMM first attempted to introduce ‘Objectives’ to Alpha, the response was a lack of attention to the agenda item and a shift of focus onto DOMM’s management of the process. As Fragments 8.1-4 might suggest, the dynamics of Beta’s second meeting were quite different. It is Barry, a LAG member, who first reads a set of proposed ‘objectives’ to the committee, explaining each as it is read. The principle reference chains generated by this exposition – chains that span the entire discussion – concern: the objectives themselves (collectively and individually); the Council resolution to which they are being compared; the committee (‘we’) and the objectives’ main object of concern – Lumbervale.

The lexical strings similarly show a focus on the objectives. Table 8.1 summarises a lexical content analysis of the talk from Barry’s exposition to the final vote. It suggests two key conclusions: that the bureaucrats and councillors (who are included under ‘local government’ here) did most of the talking and that, unlike Alpha at its
Fragment 8.3: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Barbara: {You're right. You're (right.
Len: {I suppose it's not (this committee's ah --
Sue: {Hm. Making it sound complicated.

Cr Bob: {No, we need --
Len: {I suppose it's not the committee's task to implement the policy, but certainly to ah, to identify appro priate policy.
Cr Bob: {'Identify' would be the word.

Sam: How about 'recommend'? 

Belle: I would have thought 'recommend' too. : 'Identify and recommend.'

Sue: Ha. Hm. : Now, our objectives are our foundations as a group. [exaggerated intonation; high pitched voice]

Fragment 8.4: Beta Meeting 3, Land Availability

Sue: And, ah in all fairness, like, nothing really happened at the last meeting much, apart from going over the objectives. ...

... 

Sue: {Seriously --
Barbara: {I thought that was major!

Sue: To go over {the objec {tives?
Barbara: {To Cou-- {No! It went to Council!

Table 8.1: numbers of words in the sample for the eleven most frequently occurring semantic categories

| Words to do with ... | Spoken by ... |  |
|----------------------|---------------|
|                      | Non-gov't     | Local govt | State govt | Total |
| Communication        | 34            | 61         | 55         | 150   |
| Industry             | 22            | 30         | 82         | 148   |
| Location in space (places) | 29        | 36         | 74         | 139   |
| Thought/knowledge    | 28            | 46         | 54         | 128   |
| Land                 | 34            | 48         | 45         | 127   |
| Progress/movement    | 16            | 49         | 33         | 125   |
| Planning regulations | 11            | 33         | 72         | 124   |
| Time                 | 14            | 37         | 38         | 120   |
| The objectives       | 16            | 27         | 38         | 81    |
| Judgements/feelings  | 17            | 31         | 28         | 76    |
| Decision-making authorities | 10        | 31         | 24         | 65    |
third meeting, the committee was generally focussed on the objectives. Their conversation revolved around the regulation of industry in particular places (particularly Lumbervale, which accounts for more than half of the entries under 'location in space') – exactly the issue that the objectives were intended to address.

The other notable thing about Table 8.1 is that at this level there are few significant differences between the non-bureaucrats and the local and state government representatives. The main exception to this is the state officers’ more frequent invocation of planning regulations. While this relates largely to Sue’s and Sam’s domination of discussion about how to reword Objective 2, it also suggests a possible tendency to draw upon such reifications of practice for authority. Fragment 8.5 illustrates this. Sean, a Department of Environment (DOE) officer who is not a planner, asks how residences came to be in Lumbervale and receives three responses, reflecting three different framings of 'reasons'. Barbara’s answer draws on an identification of Lumbervale as ‘light industry’, a framing central to LAG’s identity: LAG members’ interviews repeatedly complained that the ‘general industry’ zoning undermined the community’s historical understanding of Lumbervale as the town’s light industrial area, an understanding that both SOHE and the state were seen to have participated in constructing. Len, in contrast, attempts to explain the ‘public interest’ rationale for Council’s approval of such development. And Sue sees the reason as related to ‘previous zoning schemes’ – reflecting an emphasis on formal institutional inscriptions.

On closer inspection of the lexical content, a further interesting pattern emerges. ‘Progress’ and ‘movement’ lexis are merged as a single string, because the overwhelming majority of the ‘movement’ words appear as metaphors for progress through planning processes (principally the Beta process, but also related development approval processes). These metaphors are sometimes fairly general ('move', 'shift', 'go', 'away', and so on), but at other times they relate to linear motion in a particular direction ('proceed', 'forward', 'back', and so on). These directional words account for well over half the movement metaphors used by state employees (18/33), for over 45% of those by local government representatives (21/49), and for only one quarter of those by non-bureaucrats (2/16). While hardly conclusive, this trend does suggest a bureaucratic orientation to linearity. The establishment of ‘objectives’ for the Beta planners – as for the DOMM staff – is part
**Fragment 8.5: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>But the reasons that, that residents are there in Lumbervale, and caretakers are there? Wh, why, wh, how come they've, they've, they've come there? What are the reasons that they've, they've come?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Cos it was light industry originally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Schemes permitted it. Previous zoning schemes permitted caretakers' dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>And that, the reason that that was permitted originally aahm, probably a number of factors, but one would've been the ah, the fact that it was easier to get people with those sorts of services and, and skills to offer to come to a place like Harbouertown ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of a linear procedure: a 'first step' towards an outcome, which can be treated as self-contained, requiring little or no detailed interrogation of the world outside the planning process (this comes later, in the research stages).

... and refocussing

In Meeting 2, however, the discussion of the objectives was used to explore a range of 'external' issues and information; as a consequence the focus of discussion shifted constantly, with various issues being raised repeatedly, generally without resolution. This was, by her own account, a primary source of Sue's frustration with the meeting (Fragments 8.3-4).

In Fragment 8.6, Cr Bill inserts his voice into a discussion between Len and Sue regarding the need for a non-residential buffer zone around the port, raising a concern which is unrelated to the previous discussion. The reaction of the public servants, to my mind, is rather dismissive. Len's reframing of 'a huge amount of ... mangroves' as the 'greenie' formula 'sensitive wetland ecosystem' is clearly ironic⁴ – stress is exaggerated, his eyes are smiling and looking at Sam rather than Bill, and reflexive laughter follows. Following Cr Bill's rejection of this irony, Len makes explicit a view that Bill's values are relative rather than universal ('it's a matter of what's sacred ... I suppose'). The planners, Larry and Sue, are even more dismissive, invoking institutional reifications – jurisdiction, another state policy – to suggest that the issue is either none of the committee's business (Larry's turn) or that Bill's – local – worry about the mangroves has already been pronounced unimportant by a higher authority (Sue: 'not regionally significant').

Cr Bill does not have an opportunity to respond to this, as Barry enters immediately with another, unrelated issue. In Fragment 8.7, Barry rehearses an argument in favour of allowing caretaker residences in Lumbervale: that, as other regional towns allow caretaker residences in light industrial areas, SOHE would be 'cut[ting] off ... business ...' by not doing so. This argument, as its lack of endophoric reference shows, bears no relation to the discussion about mangroves which it interrupts, nor to what follows. The pattern is typical of the debate about substantive issues during Meeting 2, which constantly shifted from one topic to the next without resolution, as
Fragment 8.6: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Cr Bill: Through the chair, what's never been made clear though is what buffer zones currently would exist if ah -- Y'know from the air there's a huge amount of, of mangroves; it's not just a -- If, {if ah, what what, {what buffer zones --
Barry: {No, --
Len: {Sensitive wetland ecosystem! [[laughs]
Sam: {[laughs]
Cr Bill: Yes.
Sean: What, { what would you make --
Len: {Well, {it's a matter of what's sacred as well, I suppose, but what, what buffer zones could currently exist across the top of those wetlands?
Larry: Yeh, I think at the ah, moment the ah port boundary itself is under the jurisdiction of the port management and, therefore, anything that falls within that category it's up to them to decide. Whether the wetland would be ah, is part of {the s, environmental impact statement ah, the part, process for development ah, proposals.
Sue: {Yeh.
Sue: There's also -- sorry -- the DOE have released Guidelines for Mangrove Protection, and that, that's a draft policy, but it, they, DOE consider that the mangroves within the Harbortown area are not regionally significant. : So they're accepting development as something that could easily occur there.

Fragment 8.7: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Barry: I think also that we should um, consider the desirability and um, the necessity, in a lot of cases, where caretakers' quarters and ah, and light industry aah, go together. Umm, I think it's starting to be recognised by the state government that it's a unique situation here, and ummm, : perhaps at some time we've got to revisit it. Umm, you can't just cut off ah, any business that's coming to town -- a panel beater, a builder or what have you -- and no longer live on ah, the premises when you can go to [town 1], they can aah, go y'know [town 2] or --

[interrupted by Len]
various members tried to raise their own concerns and government officers responded.

Eventually, Barbara, motivated by this apparently directionless pattern, attempts to stop the 'substance talk' and refocus the committee on the objectives (Fragment 8.8). After this point, however, a new pattern emerges, in which the committee's focus on the wording of the objectives is continually interrupted by (re)statements of particular arguments. For example, in Fragment 8.9, the textual cohesion between Barry's turn and what precedes it is again rather strained: there is no endophoric reference, ellipsis or textual conjunction linking them. Rather, he draws his (hyper)theme from his own previous turns (Fragment 8.7), rather than from those to which he initially appears to be responding. That is, he is not following the debate, but, as discussion turns to substantive matters, interspersing into it a monologue in which he rehearses LAG's arguments in favour of its position. This strange behaviour, not unique to Barry but evident from most of the non-bureaucrats (including councillors), led to a rather disjointed and repetitive pattern of (non-)cohesion throughout the meeting (Barbara's 'going around and around and around the table', Fragment 8.8). The repetitiveness and shifting focus was a source of frustration to at least one of the public servants, Sue, whose approach to planning was more linear and justified principally in terms of inscribed (already decided) institutional positions – policy, strategy and statutory documents endorsed by state and local government.

**Summary**

Beta's second meeting, unlike the first, saw very little overt antagonism. Members' awareness of the potential for conflict, and the fact that the mayor and the CEO were present, appear to have encouraged them to seek consensus on an obligatory passage point for their work: their tasks, framed as 'objectives'. They were successful in this aim: once established, the new objectives provided a constant frame of reference for the rest of the process, with members recalling them whenever conflict threatened. Through the enrolment of all Beta's members and also of Council, the objectives became a (symbolically) powerful actor in their own right.
Fragment 8.8: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Barbara: And I think we're - through the chair - I think we're wasting our time going around and around and around the table. Why not define, we have to define the objectives first, solid.

Fragment 8.9: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Sean: What about the security issue – is that, will that likely come up with the new area? The company that (says that --
Cr Bob: (They give them any other area in the [inaudible]
Sue: {Yeh, it'll come up, but it's not a argument for variation.

Sean: Well --

Barry: I know this is not unique to ah, to Harbourtown either. We have the situation up in [town 1] where you have a light industry area where caretakers are approved, and ah heavy industry. You did have it down at [town 2] at one stage, ah, and I think there's other areas as well. ...
However, at the same time there was tension resulting from different underlying perceptions of the purpose of objectives. First, the ‘strategic’ framing of the planners was at odds with the more practical ‘tasks’ framing of the lay-members, which led to a complete reworking of the committee’s previous efforts. Second, various participants used the discussion not only to fix their starting point, but also to build up their own stocks of cultural and ethical capital by attempting to enrol other members to positions on the substantive issues (Lumbervale’s zoning, protection of the port’s development potential, mangroves in the harbour): to present rationales for those positions in order to establish them as in the public (rather than a personal) interest. This use of the ‘objectives’ debate – both exploratory and strategic – led to a disjointed and meandering logogenesis which contrasted sharply with a more ‘conventional’, linear model of planning, in which institutional reifications/inscriptions fix certain positions as starting points, and discussion is generally directed towards a specific end. As such, the discussion was frustrating to the professional planners.

8.2 Meeting 6: doing development

Meeting 6 occurred during Phase 2 of the project, with Len acting as chairperson and the committee’s attention on implementing the decisions that they had made during Phase 1. The sixth meeting was attended by Scott, an officer from the Department of Industry (DOI), whose support would be necessary for the release of new industrial land. The purpose of this meeting was to convince Scott of the need to release their industrial sites, especially ‘Export Estate’, a site previously identified by the state for future port-using industries, which Beta had identified as their preferred general industry area. It was a special type of negotiation in which services were being requested of a powerful government department. As the meeting progressed, clear differences emerged between the negotiation styles of the bureaucrats and the non-bureaucrats. These differences were highlighted in a context where the stakes were high, and became a significant source of tension, reinforcing relations of mistrust and anxiety.
Face protection

For the first twenty minutes of the meeting, local government officers explained the committee’s background to Scott, and nobody else made any significant utterances. Scott’s first substantive contribution was to outline, on DOI’s behalf, the position that, because the state wanted to attract investment in export industries, Beta should be careful not to implement any actions that might constrain such investment. Fragment 8.10 shows Len’s response, in which he notes that the committee has already considered the issues Scott has raised (that is, those issues are redundant to the current discussion) – a rebound, in Eggins’ and Slade’s (1997: 212) terms, and potentially a rather damaging point to make. Len makes the point indirectly, disguising it as a form of agreement, emphatically conferring positive value on Scott’s statement (*Yeh, and that’s a very important point* v. *We know that*), and giving credit for having worked the issues out not to the committee, but to one of Scott’s state-level colleagues, Sue. Thus the potential insult is transformed into a kind of compliment.

Len’s strategy in Fragment 8.10 is a ‘face-protecting’ strategy (Sarangi and Slembrouck 1996, drawing on Goffman 1959): by reversing the potential negative impact of the utterance, Scott’s status is maintained. Len goes on to restate the committee’s problem – they need to find an area for general industry, and they think that Export Estate is the best site for it – and to ask Scott for his opinion (Fragment 8.11). I interpret Len’s turn as consisting of two strategic moves: a statement of opinion on behalf of the committee (*We think that Export Estate should be made available for general industry*), and a request for Scott’s opinion on the matter (*Would the state support this proposition?*). An alternative interpretation would be to see these two moves together as a request for service (*Make Export Estate available for general industry*!); however I have not done so for empirical reasons. First, Scott is a junior officer with no authority to make such a decision, and Len knows this. Second, Len is an experienced negotiator in bureaucratic contexts. I have observed him in a variety of fora, and I have never seen him make direct requests unless a positive response is assured. Rather, I see the two moves outlined above as constituting the preparation for such a request, clarifying the conditions under which it might be made, and protecting both Scott’s and Len’s own status by allowing a retreat before a face-threatening refusal becomes necessary. Even the
Fragment 8.10: Beta Meeting 6, General Business

Scott: ... Cos I think that is very important to ah, make sure that they're not constrained: um, in any way from perhaps stopping industries and (port facilities.

Len: {Yeh! And that, that's a very important point. And, and certainly Sue Smith ah, has done a, a lot of work in ah, in ah, in assessing those sorts of issues. And of course Sue was intimately involved in, in the preparation of the um, ah, Harbourtown Planning Study, which was done a few years ago and which, which really gave a broad brush ah, concept of, of where those industry development and infrastructure corridor needs might be.

Fragment 8.11: Beta Meeting 6, General Business

Len: ... And ah, [sighs] ah, really that's er - as far as the item 3.5, which is, this is leading onto - ah, the, the most favoured site for that er, sort of industry area (is the site that's currently identified Export Estate.

Scott: {Mm.

Len: And ah, what we need ah, and what we're seeking at the moment from, ah, s er, Realty Australia, and from the Department of Industry, is an indication of where that is, and how the ah, they might view ah, the (establish (ment of that general industry zoning there,

Belinda: {Mm hm.

Scott: {Oh right.

Len: in the context of the original, the original concept of ah, of ah (Export Estate.

Scott: {Yeh.
relatively benign request for Scott’s opinion is expressed incongruently as a statement rather than a question, is framed in general and modalised terms, and avoids the confronting second person *you* (‘What we need ... is an indication of how they might view ...’). Thus, Scott can ‘escape’ the need to utter a face-threatening challenge to Len’s opinion, and he does so, by saying that DOI have no detailed plans as yet.

Following – actually, interrupting – Scott’s reply to Len, one of the non-bureaucrats on the committee makes a very similar point to Len’s in Fragment 8.10 (Fragment 8.12): that the committee has already worked through the issues that Scott has been expounding, and is now *looking for progress*. However, unlike Len, Belinda makes no attempt to reverse her negative interpersonal meanings: the interruption is explicitly made (‘Can I just say ...’); there is no attempt to distance the agency of ‘we’ and ‘you’ by referring to Scott’s agency in the third person; unambiguous appraisal positions the committee ‘ahead’ of the state. Belinda is treating Scott as an equal partner, rather than showing deference to his status as the decision maker in a sensitive negotiation, and she assumes a shared commitment to local interests.

In this context, such an assumption is face-threatening – even without the direct criticism, it would expose Scott to the possibility of having to deny it – and Len steps in immediately to mitigate. Len’s turn in Fragment 8.13 interrupts Belinda and stops her from continuing. It also ‘repairs’ her assumption of mutual interests, by shifting that assumption from the interpersonal dimension (expressed as appraisal) into the ideational – explicitly stating that Belinda’s ‘what we need’ is in the state’s interests as well. Once again, any negative implications in Len’s statement are discursively reversed. Instead of *You need to recognise that it’s in the state’s interests*, obligation is placed on the committee: *We ... need to look at it on ... a statewide basis*. And the implied request in this statement is not left naked, but quickly justified with reference to generally accepted ‘facts’ about international competition. Such ‘facts’ are a central part of the state’s own economic discourse, and as such not open to dispute.

However, Belinda and Barbara continue to explain their demands with reference to local interests (Fragment 8.14), and to make explicit judgements in their lexical choices (‘backwards’, ‘passing us by’). While Belinda follows Len’s lead by
Fragment 8.12: Beta Meeting 6, General Business

Scott: {Um, ju'--
Belinda: {Can I just say that I think -- as Len said -- as a Council, and as a community, I think we're sort of ahead of you, and what we're saying is, we're looking further ahead. At this point in time we can see what we need as a community -- um, like as in a town-overall view -- and that we're looking for progress for it. Like we're waiting for sort of, like those sorts of things to happen, ... so that we can sort of move forward. And so I think that's probably where we're at!

Fragment 8.13: Beta Meeting 6, General Business

Belinda: {Cos --
Len: {We, we, we really do need to look at it on a, on a statewide basis too, because we, er,
y'know we're n, we're not just competing with, with Scrubfield down the road, ah,
{for the establishment of some of these plants. We're competing with other sites in, within
Belinda: {No.

Len: Australia, {and, and in many cases ah, in other sites within the ah, within the, the world!
Scott: {Mm.

Fragment 8.14: Beta Meeting 6, General Business

Belinda: This town needs to attract more industry. I mean it's, it's going backwards at the moment, because we can't provide --

Barbara: And they're passing us by!
Belinda: -- um, these sorts of op {portunities.
Scott: {Mm.

Belinda: And I think it's sort of not just from our point of view -- it's no good having a great tract of land there that's earmarked for something, um, that effectively can't be used unless you've got a big proponent {that's possibly not in the wings at the moment.
Scott: {Mm.

... 

Belinda: And, and, {and so, but there were, {No! It's --
Scott: {Mm. {Mm, no.
Len: {So it's not just a Harbourtown issue. {It's, it's, it really is a state {issue.
Barry: {Yeh.
Len: And the state needs to consider it seriously!
shifting the focus of the justification from the local to the state ('...it's not just from our point of view'), negatives continue to be expressed more directly than bureaucratic etiquette demands. The sense of obligation is not assumed by the first person; rather, the state's policy is emphatically criticised ('it's no good have a great tract of land ... that effectively can't be used ...'). When Belinda becomes tongue-tied, Len takes the opportunity to interrupt again, this time categorically closing the discussion. 'The state needs to consider it seriously' is his first explicitly powerful move, though it still avoids confronting Scott with a direct imperative (*Consider it seriously!*) or the second person *you.*

The short phase outlined above demonstrates an important contrast between Len's face-protecting style - as I maintain, a typically bureaucratic style - and the more direct style of Belinda and Barbara, who make explicit complaints and generally treat Scott as an equal. This contrast is sustained throughout the meeting, and leads to an increasing assertion of control by the bureaucrats and an accompanying sense of unease on the part of the non-bureaucrats.

There follows a lengthy discussion about planning technicalities, in which the non-bureaucrats play very little part. When the theme of timing is introduced, Belinda and Barbara find an opening to express their frustration about the lack of progress to date, in quite strong terms. However, Belinda then 'softens' her approach, demonstrating an increasing sensitivity to the face-saving mode of negotiation. In Fragment 8.15, Belinda makes a request for service, but follows Len's lead by beginning with an agreement ('I think you're right') and placing obligation with 'we', the committee. In spite of this, she still displays an assumption that the state is interested in 'dragging the chain' for the sake of local interests, and the associated face-threatening risk that Scott will have to disagree.

At this point, another bureaucrat, Sam, steps in to mitigate, by clarifying the nature of the request (Fragment 8.16). Sam's institutional rank as a state public servant is more senior than Scott's, and he assumes the position of one whose opinions ought to be listened to ('I agree'; 'I think'). However, Sam has no direct authority over Scott (being from a different department), and uses a series of mitigating tactics in presenting the request to move the Export Estate 'Native Title claim' up the priority lists a bit'. Firstly, the request is prepared for by justifying/clarifying moves ('if it's
Fragment 8.17: Beta Meeting 6, General Business

Scott: Ah, we have been doing something that probably hasn't been done for Export Estate, we've done, been doing that for the Scrubfield areas. And that is preliminary structure plans --

Belinda: {Mm.
Scott: -- {for industrial areas, so rather than just showing the proponents um, big chunks, we've actually, well my job ah, has been previously to design industrial areas, and subdivide in hectarage amongst the proponents, and allowance for service trade-offs.

Belinda: {Well! {So you understand what we're talking about!

Belinda: Yes! {So, so that's what we're after! {That's what we're saying, isn't it!
Lance: {That would be an integral point here.
Scott: {So that, I think that's what you're after, is a, is a structure plan for Export Estate?
Belinda: {Yes! {Yes!
Scott: Something that can be done, with the right resources of course, --
Barbara: For general industry.
Scott: Ah, for general industry. And also ah, for the heavy industry. Because, I mean, {on your --
Sam: together. Yep.

Fragment 8.18: Beta Meeting 6, General Business

Sam: You really need to work it out in the not too distant future, because ah, just something like {company} wants to put their facilities in that general area. Mm? : {So. : Yeh.
Scott: {Mm. {Mm. {Mm. {Yeh. Yeh. {Yep.
Barbara: It's a priority!


Fragment 8.19: Beta Meeting 6, General Business

Belinda: {laughs lightly}
Sam: {Well it's, it's need, it needs to be moved up {the priority list a bit.
Scott: {Well, we do -- {Mm!
Barbara: {Top!

Scott: {Yes.
Sam: {That's, I guess that's the s, essence of what I'm saying. It needs to, I'm sure that there's heaps of things that your office is, is charged with doing.
Scott: Mm.
Sam: And I, and I appreciate that to date it's been down there somewhere. [gesturing]
Scott: Mm.
Sam: But I, I think that there's pressure from this area, saying, 'can you move it up there please?'
Belinda: Mm. Thank you!
your role ... and if that role includes ... ’). Secondly, it is expressed not as a request – which would expose Scott to the risk of a face-threatening refusal or disavowal – but as an observation about the (factual) state of the world (‘I think there’s an opportunity for ... ’), giving him a relatively benign set of response choices: acknowledgement or disagreement on factual grounds.

In this case, Scott responds to the underlying request. In Fragment 8.17, he prepares to make an offer. Not only do requests need to be prepared for in bureaucratic negotiation; so too can offers, especially when, as in Scott’s case, the rank of the offerer does not authorise him to make a promise. Here, he makes four pre-offer moves: a justification (‘...we’ve ... been doing it [elsewhere]’); a clarification (‘I think that’s what you’re after’); and two qualifications (‘with the right resources of course’; ‘and also ... for heavy industry’), one in response to Barbara’s direct and unmitigated request that Export Estate be for general industry (to cater for local needs). Also notable in Fragment 8.17 is Belinda’s excitement that an actual offer appears to be imminent.

Although there has not yet been a direct offer made, Scott’s preparatory moves are so obvious than Sam feels able to push the issue further (Fragment 8.18). Congruent imperatives (*Work it out!) rarely appear in bureaucratic negotiation, but the modulated advice ‘You... need to ...’ is unusually direct and forceful. It is mitigated by the vagueness of ‘the not-too-distant future’, which allows for fairly open interpretation, and by the justification drawing on external authorities (‘[company] wants to put their facilities ... ’). Barbara’s move builds upon Sam’s confidence, but removes his hedging. While it appears to be a confident statement of fact, it is in fact a projection of an opinion onto Scott’s agency, an extremely high status realisation of the request *Treat it as a priority! This status positioning is a breach of bureaucratic etiquette and, once again, Sam steps in to mitigate (Fragment 8.19). He qualifies Barbara’s statement (‘it needs to be moved up ... a bit’), treats it as an interpretation of his own advice (‘that’s ... the essence of what I’m saying’), and clarifies his understanding of Scott’s position, before shifting the interpersonal dimension of Barbara’s demand – her (metaphorical) mood choice – into the ideational (‘there’s pressure from this area’). This move allows Sam to state the request very directly, by projecting it (‘saying: “can you move it up there please?”’), while still – grammatically – appearing merely to provide Scott with information. Belinda’s
'thank you', as I understand it, is for the congruent expression of the demand. At this stage, the non-bureaucrats have sat through approximately forty-five minutes of hedged, indirect and unresolved exchanges, and all their attempts to communicate directly with Scott have been interrupted by either Len or Sam.

In sum, bureaucratic negotiation seems to be characterised by a face-protecting dynamic enabled by some specific discursive strategies, including: mood metaphors that provide a potential retreat (by reframing) from face-threatening moves such as requests and offers; rhetorical preparation for or mitigation of such moves (through strategic clarification, justification and qualification moves); reversal of agency and/or cliency (placing obligation on the speaker, positioning the respondent as the beneficiary); and ideationalising the interpersonal dimension (so that risky exchanges and opinions can be framed as information). However, this dynamic contrasts with the orientation of the non-bureaucrats at this meeting— all small business proprietors— to efficiency (and, concomitantly, directness and speediness) rather than to institutional rank and status. This led to a tension in this meeting that was evident on both sides: the bureaucrats’ anxiety about the others’ interactions with Scott, and the non-bureaucrats frustration and impatience. This may have exacerbated the already high level of mistrust between the non-bureaucrats and the meeting’s chairperson, Len, which showed in their unwillingness to allow him to close the debate.

**Closure?**

Len appears to have considered his role to include summarising parts of the discussion. For example, in his turn in Fragment 8.14 ('So it's not just a Harbournown issue! ...It really is a state issue. And the state needs to consider it seriously'), the textual conjunction 'so' signals this, implying a logical connection with Belinda’s previous turn. All the foregoing opinions (about the need for the state to hurry up) are packaged into the generalised, semantically dense 'a state issue', which, combined with the refusal to be interrupted ('It's, it's, it's ...' as others try to enter), disinvites further input. Rhetorically, the parallel clause structure and the repetition of 'state' as theme in the ultimate opinion/demand leave no doubt in any listener’s mind that this is a concluding statement. In spite of this, the non-bureaucrats do not allow the ‘issue’ (the need to progress the release of Export Estate) to rest, opening it again at the first opportunity and several times thereafter.
Fragment 8.20: Beta Meeting 6, General Business

Belinda: So do we sit down and write a set of objectives and set, send you away with, not only do you find out whether you've got support {from the upper levels, but if you have got, if you get the 'yes',}
Lance: {Mm hm, the ones who get some work?}

Belinda: then {this is the next level, straight away?} {Is that alright?}
Scott: {Yes.} {The next step. Yeh. Yeh. : Yeh. Don't have to wait to come back here and say 'yes! I've got sup port.' And then -- mm.}
Belinda: {And then we wait a another two months?}
Barry: {And give you,} {inaudible}
Lance: {Precisely. And then,} {then write a list away --}
Scott: {No, no. I --}

Lance: I think, yeh. If we have a, a s, the objectives spelt out by the committee, um, then getting the support; getting the structure plan; and working through those things; um then we report back to a mee ting {ting with the --}
Belinda: {Might add more weight to your request, too! Because if they c--}
Lance: {Er, and I think it, I think it will help with the support, because they can say, 'well what do they want you to do?'} {'This is what they want me to do.'}
Belinda: {‘This is exactly what they want!’} {But -- Oh, yeh!}
Lance: {Mm.}
Scott: {Yeh.}

Fragment 8.21: Beta Meeting 6, General Business

Belinda: But -- {Oh, yeh!}
Lance: {Mm.}
Scott: {Yeh.}
Sam: {Scott, er er, are you in a position to er, say that ah, your agency can work on a structure plan? Or, or do you need to go back and check with {people?}
Scott: {I need, I will need to go back} {and check.}
Sam: {Make sure the ah, er, resources can be allocated to it, and so forth. So it might help you to have a bit more definition as to what we're asking for! So a, a letter from us --
Scott: Yes.
Sam: -- as a, as er, a committee, asking Council to write to you on, on the ah - because this is a committee of Council --
Scott: Yeh,
Sam: -- um, Council to write to you, indicating what the committee is ah, suggesting?
Scott: Mm hm.
Another issue which evades closure is developed in Fragment 8.20. Belinda initiates the phase by shifting from abstract to action talk, signalling her intent with the textual conjunction 'so'.\textsuperscript{10} The two junior public servants – Scott and the town planner Lance – are quick to join in, cooperating to develop a justification for the request. Although they constantly interrupt and talk over each other, all their moves are supportive: repetitions, elaborations and enhancements of each other's turns, largely signalled by explicit agreements such as 'mm hm', 'yes', and so on.\textsuperscript{11} The overlapping talk, therefore, appears to be a sign that the participants are jointly constructing an ideational consensus and, at the same time, building interpersonal solidarity (see Eggins and Slade 1997: 276-78 on gossip).

Immediately following, Sam reconstructs this consensus. What I find striking about Fragment 8.21 is that, although the ideational content of Sam's talk is almost precisely that of the preceding phase, there is no textual cohesion (anaphoric reference, ellipsis, textual conjunction, thematic development) at all linking it to that phase. Sam appears to be completely ignoring the chaotic solidarity talk, and reinitiating the action-talk phase (signalled by the attend move 'Scott, ...'), reorganising it in a more formal mode. The suggestion is posed as an offer from one negotiating party to the other rather than jointly constructed; and the clarification ('you need to go back and check ...') and justification ('So it might help ...') precede the offer. Further, Sam 'corrects' a matter of protocol ('asking Council ... because this is a committee of Council'). Sam states the committee's request in vague and general terms ('what the committee is suggesting') thus eliminating the specifics demanded by Belinda's 'list of objectives'.

The proposal becomes even vaguer when Len, the expert in Council protocol, reinterprets the suggestion again (Fragment 8.22). Len is clearly having the last word on this matter. His use of the past tense ('I'd envisaged that that was ...going to be contained in the letter ...') rather than the irrealis ('that could be ...') places the proposal beyond debate. Even more pronounced is his recapitulation of the previous phase, which is organised by nominalisations more suited to written than spoken English ('formal support'; 'a level of commitment'; 'a structure by which we do that'). Len appears to be dictating the minutes rather than inviting any response.
Len: Well that was going to tha', er ah, I'd envisaged that that was ah, going to be contained in the letter to [name], --

Sam: {Yeh.
Lance: {Yep.

Len: -- seeking formal support and ah, and, and ah, and a level of commitment to, to working within a ah, particular ah, structure --

Scott: Mm.

Len: -- to further progress all of these areas, and answer some questions, as well as mm, ; and proposing a, a structure by which we do that.
Through this abstracting, dedifferentiating language, the key idea motivating the earlier consensus-building talk – that the committee write some objectives now, to enable a speedy start on the work – has vanished. Moreover, Len, as the senior SOHE representative, has assumed the responsibility for interpreting such abstracts as 'these areas'; 'some questions'; 'a structure' on behalf of the committee. Because some of the other members do not trust Len, they are reluctant to leave things to his discretion. Later in the meeting, whenever the talk diverts from technicalities, Belinda and Barbara return to the issue of the objectives, eventually persuading the committee to write a list at the meeting while they were themselves present.

Thus, although the LAG members were expressly eager to progress the committee’s proposals, they were reluctant at this meeting to permit the chairperson to perform the closure that, in conventional bureaucratic practice, fixes meanings and allows discussion or procedure to move on. This is likely to relate to both interpersonal and ideational considerations – they were resisting SOHE’s exercise of the power that rests in controlling closure, and also the generalisation of input that may have originally been local, personal, and specific. Therefore, Belinda and Barbara kept returning to meanings (urgency, state culpability, ‘objectives’) that they felt had been lost in the process of resemiotisation, continually reopening conversations that had been bureaucratically ‘wrapped up’.

**Summary**

Beta’s Meeting 6 was atypical, in that its focus was on negotiating the implementation, rather than the development, of planning decisions – a task usually undertaken by public servants without the direct input of ‘stakeholders’ (other than those who may be contributing financially, for instance in development partnerships [Skelcher et al. 1996; Atkinson 1999; Raco 2000]). Therefore, the role of the non-bureaucrats was underdetermined by the institutional context. They found themselves in the position of having to perform in an institutional field to whose cultural norms – such as face protection and power relationships defined by rank – they were not habituated. This led to a growing tension between the lay-members and the local and state bureaucrats. The non-bureaucrats’ attempts to negotiate directly with their visitor, Scott, were continually resisted by Len and Sam; in turn Belinda and Barbara resisted Len’s attempts to translate and fix their meanings as
| Sam: | Yeh. I, I, I had a read of it ..., and I thought that the study objectives were aligned er, to what should we do with Lumbervale, rather than what we need in terms of alternative industrial areas. Like ah, we've been talking to ah, DOI about Export Estate, and we've been looking at ah, an alternative ah light industry area um, round the water tank out there. Er, the objectives er, I actually made a comment: this brief almost seems like the brief of our committee; it's ah, y'know. And, and it starts off talking about Lumbervale er um, |
| Belinda: | {Mm! |
| Barry: | {Mm. |
| Sam: | er, in the, in the first, well it's the fourth word, {first line of background! |
| Lance: | {Mm. Yep. |
| Sam: | And ah, that's what I say: it seems to be aligned with that; whereas I thought we were needing to address how do we get ah, Export Estate up as ... a general industry area and that. : So that was -- |
inscriptions for later interpretation. As a consequence, I believe that this meeting served to reproduce and exacerbate the mistrust that already characterised relations between the Lumbervale residents and their local public servants. Cultural difference can be a key source of tension in participatory fora: even though participants may share an ethnic and national background, institutional culture shapes the habitus.

8.3 Meeting 10: doing planning?

By the tenth meeting, Beta had entered Phase 3: having agreed to engage a consultant to write an industrial strategy, they were taking the necessary steps through the tendering process, starting with consideration of a consultant brief. On the table for discussion at Meeting 10 was a brief that had been developed at the start of the process by the project manager, Larry, and a consultant, Chris (who had drafted SOHE’s previous zoning amendments). This brief was based on Council’s original ‘objectives’ for the committee. As members read through it, it reminded them of how they had changed the nature of their tasks, and raised questions about the point of what they were doing. As those questions surfaced, the professional knowledge of the planners was exposed and challenged in strange terms: new meanings were poured into the proposed planning document (the industrial strategy) via the intermediary of the consultant brief.

Delegation

When Lance, who chaired Meeting 10, opened discussion for comments on the draft brief, Sam was the first to speak, voicing a concern that the draft brief did not appear to be ‘aligned to’ his understanding of Beta’s task(s) (Fragment 8.23). In making this concern specific, he recalls what the committee have already achieved: the brief is about Lumbervale (which Beta has not yet addressed) rather than Export Estate and the ‘alternative light industry area ...’, which represent the land decisions that they have been trying to implement (‘we’ve been talking to DOI’; ‘we’ve been looking at ...’). This point is made in keeping with Sam’s face-saving orientation, without recourse to negatives.

Sam’s apparent desire to eliminate the question ‘what should we do with Lumbervale’ from the brief relates to Beta’s prior decision to defer consideration of
Fragment 8.24: Beta Meeting 10, Consultant brief

Sam: Can we, we talk, can we talk about that? What, what are we wanting the consultant for? I, I, let's just talk about that, without worrying about the, detailed {words in there!
Lance: {Yep.
Lance: Okay. Well, what we g, I see the t, the stud, strategy's there for, industrial strategy: um, or the study is to set a scene to inform the decisions that Council've been making in relation to the future of industrial land within this town, in relation to what its decisions are to existing land, i.e. the future of Lumbervale: the whole issue of is it gonna stay industry; is it going to swap to a different type; what's gonna happen with the caretakers; are they gonna stay in this list; --
Sam: Can I, can I stop you there? What's ah, who's, who's the, who's the ah, report going to go to? : Cos I, I d, : you're, you're talking about a different report to the one I thought we were aiming at. : I think you are.
Lance: Okay. The report, as far as we're aware -- and we discussed last week with -- Larry and myself would oversee the report per se, {but it would come back --
Sam: {No. Who who who g, who's, {does it go to? Barbara: {Who's it coming --
Sam: I mean, we, we're going to arrange for a consultant to do this report -- what are we gonna do with it? Who {is it for? What's it to establish?
Barbara: {Ym.
Lance: It's for two things: one is to establish a decision that Council's gonna make; and two, that will also be justification for that, when it goes to the state government, as to how we came about to that decision.

Fragment 8.24A: Reorganisation of Lance’s list (Fragment 8.24)

...to inform the decisions that Council've been making in relation to:

1. The future of industrial land within this town, in relation to:
   1.1. What its decisions are to existing land (i.e. the future of Lumbervale) – the whole issue of:
      1.1.1. Is it going to stay industry?
      1.1.2. Is it going to swap to a different type?
      1.1.3. What’s going to happen with the caretakers?
         1.1.3.1. Are they going to stay in this list?
         1.1.3.2. ...
this issue: a contrast is established (partly by means of intonation) between ‘the brief of our committee’ and ‘talking about Lumbervale’. Sam, as the port manager, may have a strategic purpose here: the reason for the deferral was to wait for the delivery of the port’s planning study, and the identification of the port’s buffer needs. However, it is not only this ‘vested interest’ that is at stake, but the committee’s ‘unfinished business’, which Sam is reluctant to delegate. LAG members support Sam’s views throughout Meeting 10, protecting both the work that the committee has already completed and their ongoing role.

At the same time, a struggle ensues to reconcile this aim with the requirements of the consultant’s task as a strategic planning task. In Fragment 8.24, Sam attempts to take control of the meeting by getting back to first principles. He assumes an authoritative role in setting the direction of the discussion, asking direct questions (‘what are we wanting the consultant for?’ and so on) and making direct requests (‘let’s just talk about that ... ’). Lance, who is nominally chairing the meeting, consistently accepts this direction with no struggle (‘Okay’), but fails to satisfy Sam’s demands, leading to growing tension in which neither party seems to be able to understand the other’s concerns.

Lance’s response to Sam’s first question includes the point that, to properly ‘set a scene’, the industrial strategy will need to consider the future of existing industrial land (Lumbervale) as well as other sites. However, this point is framed in terms of the planning document (rather than of the consultant’s relationship to the committee) and is, I think, lost on Sam. The organisation of Lance’s utterance – as I believe it is intended – is as a series of embedded lists, which is typical of a plan’s list of objectives, and which would work more effectively in print (Fragment 8.24A). However, transferred to oral mode, such organisation becomes merely a string of paratactic elaborations (‘... is it ...; is it ...; what’s ...; are they ...’) with no overt embedding, and it is not, apparently, clear to Sam that the study Lance is proposing goes any further than an ‘alignment to’ Lumbervale. Indeed, Lance does not get the chance to include any other points before being interrupted.

The misunderstanding continues as Lance interprets Sam’s question ‘Who’s the ... report going to go to?’ as a concern about consultation (‘but it would come back -- ’), rather than as a return to first principles: Lance, in his professional role as a planner,
Sam: Is the consultant going to... redo all of our work, or is... the consultant going to... take --
Belinda: No.
Lance: Nuh.

Belinda: Which is --

Lance: Some of this stuff--and we mentioned this before--has already been done.

Sam: Right. Okay.
Lance: And what the consultant would be doing is just collating it. We've got the information; they'll just be putting it all in one document.
Sam: So they collate it and write it. Okay.

... Sam: So you just, er, you really want somebody to document the work that we've done!

Lance: Definitely. Because when we go to state government, that's the major concern that [name] I know's raised--and I know other people within the DOP have--about any rezonings or changes to the scheme: is we need to explain our decision. We can't just seem to pick an arbitrary decision out of the air. There needs to be something justifying that. And this study--
Sam: Mm. So, but, but you, you're really saying er, er, accepting that we've done all that work, and all that justification, and--
Lance: It, the vast majority of the work we have done.
...

Sam: You could almost, you've almost no need to get a planner. You could almost get somebody who can just write a, a report!

Barry: Mm. Basically, yeh.

Sam: Yeh.

Lance: It could definitely be that. It doesn't necessarily need to go to a planner. This is a consultant brief.

Barry: Mm.

Lance: Um, and that's to discuss too--who's it gonna go out to? There probably is some need for some studies to be done, to justify the things we've talked about anecdotally--about this need for this future land--Um but yes, er a lot of the work could just potentially be done by a, a report company. If there is such a thing as a report company.
is taking the need for the document as self-evident. By this point, Sam’s frustration is starting to appear in overt negativity (‘No’) and forceful interruption (repeating the theme until Lance stops talking – ‘Who who who who ...’). The string of simple (single-clause) questions (‘What are we gonna do with it? Who is it for? What’s it to establish?’) also suggests impatience with Lance – Sam is no longer explaining demands (‘cos ... you’re talking about a different report ...’), but reducing them to their basics. There are some face-threatening implications here: that Lance is unable to cope with complex questions; and that demands have been made (‘we’re going to arrange...’) with no justification. For perhaps the first time since the committee’s first meeting, Sam’s normal bureaucratic politeness has faded.  

In response, Lance’s talk becomes generic (‘establish a decision’; ‘justification’), removing reference to substantive issues, places and actions. The word ‘justification’ here establishes a string of lexical cohesion in Lance’s talk that continues throughout the rest of the meeting, associating the consultant’s work and the proposed strategy with words such as ‘justify’, ‘explain’, ‘rationale’, and so on, as illustrated below.

At this stage, though, most of the other members – not planners themselves – do not understand the nature of that ‘justification’. They feel that the decisions they have made are ‘justified’ – by the systematic work they put into making them, and by the fact that they reached consensus. That is, they frame justification in local, processual terms, rather than those of rationalist public accountability. Lance’s difficulty in imposing the planning frame is, I think, exacerbated by his desire not to offend. In Fragment 8.25, Lance’s reluctance to directly counter Sam’s claims causes him to repeatedly reframe them, leading to continuing confusion about the scope of the consultant’s task. In Sam’s first question, the word ‘document’ is stressed, indicating that this is the new idea. This only makes sense in the context of a contrast with previous ideas about what the committee wants ‘someone’ to do – ‘You really want someone to document [as opposed to redo] the work that we’ve done’. The question is answered elliptically, but the justification Lance provides makes his meaning clear – ‘Definitely. [I really want someone to document, as opposed to not-document]’.

When Sam attempts to clarify – ‘you’re ... accepting that we’ve done all that work ...’ – Lance again answers positively, but alters the goal to ‘the vast majority of the
Fragment 8.26: Beta Meeting 10, Consultant brief

Sam: Um, if the consultant, you could need to go on and say the consultant ah, has got enough flexibility to question ahm, er, judgements of the group where the consultant, and resolve that where the consultant has a different view.

Lance: Yep.

Sam: So that gives the consultant some chance to ah, {play the part of professional,
Lance: {Involved in the process.

Sam: ah be part of the process, and satisfy themselves that what they're documenting for us ah, is, is justified in their own mind as well. So there's the chance to resolve that with the group. ...

Belinda: {Mm.

Lance: {No!

Fragment 8.27: Beta Meeting 10, Consultant brief

Barry: Yeh. Well, th these objectives that Council um, passed: 'identify and recommend strategies to seek provision for land suitable for general industry use in Harbourtown.' We already done that, with the Export Estate. ...

Lance: Yep.

Barry: So we've done that particular --

Belinda: But there's a project team now working on that; and that's Department (of Industry, and --
Lance: {W, we are. We have been looking at y'know {how that's actually gonna --
Belinda: {That's right. So that's already streamed off. So there's that project {team now working on that.

Lance: -- {that's gonna lay on the ground. And you are right, Barry. There are, there are two things on that: um, yes, that decision has been made, um, but -- like I said -- what the government is gonna want is a land strategy which outlines the rationale behind that decision. We've got some minutes, and we've got a few other things we've collated together, but nothing which cohesively shows the evolution of our thought from when we started to coming to that decision.

Barry: In which case then it requires either officers of council or a consultant to put that particular:
Lance: {Yep.

Barry: {ahm --
Lance: {Item together. {Correct.
work’. His marked syntax in this turn – mood at the end of the clause and goal as theme – downplays how Sam’s meaning has been changed, by placing the changed part in the position of given, stressing the unchanged part, ‘done’. Thus, Sam receives no discouragement from considering the consultant’s task as involving only documentation rather than planning, as his tentative suggestion (that a planner is ‘almost’ not needed) indicates. Lance’s reply to this suggestion again reframes it as about whether the decision has been made, rather than about the nature of the task (‘This is a consultant brief. ... And that’s to discuss too ... ’). The need for further study to ‘justify’ (quantify) their claims is modalised and placed in an inconspicuous position in the middle of the turn (neither hyper-theme, nor hyper-new), eliciting no response. The brief is a crucial intermediary between the committee, their previous work, and the unknown consultant. However, the role of that intermediary is understood very differently: to the planner, it is an obligatory passage point to translate desires into policy; to the others, it is a direct inscription to empower their prior decisions.

It is not until later, after the committee has agreed to remodel the consultant brief according to the committee objectives, that Sam concedes that there may still be work for ‘a planner’ to ‘play the part of professional’ (Fragment 8.26). But he is careful to qualify that concession, by limiting the consultant’s creative scope to evaluating and renegotiating the committee’s prior work, rather than engaging with new problems such as ‘what should we do with Lumbervale’. When the non-bureaucrats enter the conversation, it is to recall the work the committee has done on their objectives, at last providing an explicit framing for evaluating the consultant brief. Fragment 8.27 is a typical illustration of the non-bureaucrats’ overriding concern with implementation, rather than with the planning process. LAG’s revision of the committee objectives (8.1) shifted the project’s focus from the development of a plan to the identification of land; now those revised objectives are being invoked in terms of the committee’s achievement (‘We already done that...’; ‘So we’ve done that ... ’; ‘So that’s already streamed off’), in an attempt to find what remains for the consultant to do.
Stan: I suppose in terms of the, from ahm, from from, the department's point of view would be that you'd wanna have it justified in terms of the whole of, or a holistic view of how everything should fit together, and then you'd work out the details. But you've gotta have the big picture sorted out first. So as, and I think that's what you're heading with the brief now {is.

Belinda: {So we're heading in the right direction, {with hindsight?

Stan: {You're heading in the right direction, because any rezoning – or at, at the end of the day you're gonna have to rezone some land, potentially.

Belinda: Mm!

Stan: For any rezoning application, there's gotta be some sort of {justification as to {how, Larry: {Justification.

Lance: {Yep.

Stan: how it all fits in together; and how it relates to the surrounding land uses; and: where the demand comes from; and what, what you're trying to get at; and where, where you're going, I suppose.

Belinda: So did you write all those things down? [to the secretary]
**Rationale and rationalisation**

Fragment 8.27 also represents a key moment for the tenth meeting; it is here that the industrial strategy is successfully reframed for the non-planners as a necessary step to achieving the release of the land (that is, it is subsumed to the committee’s Objective 1, rather than being an end in itself). Lance’s and ‘the government[’s]’ concern with ‘rationale’ – culturally, I maintain, a planner’s concern – is not shared by Barry and Belinda; however, they come to rationalise a commitment to writing an industrial strategy as an implementation step (‘In which case then it requires ... ’). This set of framings surfaces again towards the end of the meeting, in an exchange between Stan (a DOP planner) and Belinda. In Fragment 8.28, Stan responds to a pragmatic query about what ‘the department’ would expect the industrial strategy to look like. His reply is generic (‘the department’s point of view would be ... ’; ‘For any rezoning’). It fleshes out the (cultural) idea of ‘justification’: first, by outlining a particular form of logic in which details should follow from having ‘the big picture sorted out first’; and then by detailing what that ‘big picture’ should include. As might be expected, he emphasises logical relations between elements (‘how it all fits ... how it relates’) and empirical evidence (‘where the demand comes from ... ’). Stan is attempting to make explicit the features of a plan as an instituted practice: to perform, in this ‘cross-cultural’ context, his own professional habitus (Iedema 2003a; Iedema and Scheeres 2003).

However, Belinda does not engage with this performance on its own terms. Rather, her concern remains local and practical: ensuring that they are ‘heading in the right direction’ and that in this case the brief is written according to the relevant criteria (‘So did you write all those things down?’). The small business proprietors’ general orientation to efficiency, and to local rather than generic issues, again surfaces as discursive difference.

**Summary**

In the tenth meeting, Beta’s members were forced to confront the institution of planning itself, due to the imposition of DOP’s requirement that land release and rezoning be justified according to a reified ‘big picture’ strategy. This interrupted the committee’s direction, just at a time when members were feeling confident about being able to progress their first outcomes, the achievement of their Objectives 1 and
1.3. Neither the small business proprietors nor the port manager shared the planners’ logic of accountability, and it took the better part of an hour to gain everyone’s acceptance of the need for the strategy – and consequently for the consultant brief – at all. In addition, and in part due to the fact that the brief had been written before the committee’s establishment, members displayed anxiety about the possibility that a planning consultant would either undermine work that they had already done, or appropriate tasks that they had not yet addressed. This fear of losing control of the work led to a struggle over the scope and nature of delegation that the brief represented.

The brief was an important document, whose role was to mediate between Beta’s past – work already done and decisions made – and its future – translation of that work and those decisions through the passage point of a consultant’s program. As such, members recognised their endorsement of the brief as a voluntary surrender of power: a point through which their agency would be subsumed to another actor’s. Their struggle to reduce the scope of this surrender became a power struggle between planning and non-planning networks of meaning.

The planners’ power came from their institutional knowledge, and the committee’s recognition that that knowledge would enable them to achieve their strategic aims (Friedmann 1987; Krumholz and Forester 1990; Healey 1992; Sandercock 1998b; Forester 1999b; Phelps and Tewdwr-Jones 2000). However, this form of cultural capital was in direct symbolic competition with Sam’s superior bureaucratic rank, which allowed him to assert control over the meeting when Lance’s performance failed to satisfy. Moreover, generic planning knowledge needed to be reinterpreted according to the small business proprietors’ orientation to getting things done. The planning and non-planning frames were never fully reconciled, in spite of Lance’s and Stan’s efforts to explain. Nonetheless, a contingent reframing of the industrial strategy as a necessary implementation step allowed the committee to move on in spite of their institutional/cultural differences (see Chapter 11).
Belinda: I think you're right. I think we need to keep pushing! And we have to keep – and this a ha', part of the whole process – we have to get everyone who's involved in this whole process at the table, so that they can see our reasoning, and what we're looking, and where we're going, and um, get them to sort of start dragging the chain!

Barbara: {We have to be proactive!

Sam: {I agree with you. I think you're right. And I think the way to move it forward is – if I can just make a couple of suggestions – I, I think er, I think there's an opportunity, as I said, for ah, probably your agency ah, if er, it's your role um, to ah, provide a, er an industrial estate that's ready to go, and hand it over to Realty Australia to flog --

Scott: Mm.

Sam: -- um, then ah, I, I th, and if, if your role includes getting clearance of Native Title, then I think there's an opportunity for your agency to pursue that Native Title claim, and ah, try and get that moved up the priority lists er, a bit. And {I think, I think at the same time,

Scott: {Mm. {Yeh.

Belinda: {Great.

Sam: [Goes on to suggest how DOI could progress things by developing a subdivision plan and getting the necessary approvals for Export Estate]
8.4 Conclusion: cultural difference, disagreement, disquiet

Like Alpha, Beta was troubled by intermittent tension and frustration, which formed a crucial element of the ergogenesis of the committee’s project. However, Alpha’s (non-substantive) tensions were often clearly ideationalised in debate about procedure, and can largely be attributed to the imposition of well defined (though not universally accepted) institutional constraints. Beta’s tensions were more subtle. They were not usually realised as explicit topics of discussion, but rather as strange lexicogrammatical and discourse-semantic syndromes in the talk of participants. That is, the types of difference played out in Beta’s meetings represented not formal institutional conventions, but cultural mores whose ‘reification’ rested in participants’ habitus, rather than official inscriptions. Moreover, Beta’s case highlights the position of planning as a specialist practice, with its own cultural conventions not necessarily shared throughout the rest of the bureaucracy.

Patterns of transitivity in the non-bureaucrats’ reframing of the committee’s key passage points (such as the objectives and consultant brief) suggest a pragmatic, rather than procedural, interpretation of the planning process: ‘objectives’ were to provide concrete, here-and-now tasks, rather than generalised and long term expressions of values. The non-planners (including those who were themselves public servants) showed little interest in engaging with such planning intermediaries on their own terms; they did not share the planners’ pleasure in understanding the logical form and purpose of an industrial strategy as a rationale for action. In short, their embodied orientation was to practicality, rather than professional practice.

This orientation was manifest in other strange behaviours. Particularly important to the interpersonal environment was the non-bureaucrats’ use of (contextually) face-threatening discourse. Though Beta rarely displayed the open hostility that at times characterised Alpha’s debate, their talk did realise unmitigated negative appraisal, congruent and unqualified demands, blame and openly self-interested assumptions. Such discursive behaviour is an anathema in bureaucratic negotiation, whose typical face-protecting dynamic reflects a widely recognised discursive orientation to eliminating personal involvement and responsibility. However, it also engenders an indirectness which the non-bureaucrats found frustrating, because they saw it as responsible for retarding the committee’s achievement of its aims. They also saw
that indirectness, paradoxically, as both impolite and strategically motivated, exacerbating already low levels of trust between LAG, SOHE and the port management.

Further, like Alpha’s members, Beta’s non-bureaucrat members resisted closure, refusing to permit the chairperson to synthesise and resemiotise the ‘outcomes’ of discussion as required by the meeting genre, and continually reopening past discussions or shifting from one issue to another. This resulted in recurring patterns of ‘talking in circles’, a phrase used by bureaucrats and non-bureaucrats alike when speaking of their frustration with meetings. As one of the Beta planners pointed out in an interview, the continual return to prior issues and arguments reflects a particular ‘expertise’ of lay-participants: an emphasis on local knowledge and support for local claims, rather than technical analysis. But, equally importantly, this behaviour was driven by an interpersonal dynamic of mistrust. The non-bureaucrats were simply reluctant to give public servants control over implementation of the committee’s outcomes.

In both Alpha’s and Beta’s cases, the strange behaviours of some members were in tension with the conventional mode and tenor of the meeting genre, and with planning and wider bureaucratic practice more generally. They suggest different institutional framings of the process in which the meetings play a part: orientations to different discourses/intertexts (administration, science, democracy, local politics, business) and forms of capital (institutional rank, impartiality, technique, knowledge, social connections, economic power, achievements in other fields, charisma). Moreover, manifestations of difference in the case studies (particularly in Beta) were at times associated not overtly with official institutional structure, but with embodied culture as habitus.

Participants gave different implicit meanings to common intermediaries, and drew practical guidance from different reifications: planners tended to look to established, documented policy, statutes and land use plans; other state bureaucrats tended to invoke intertexts associated with their own mandates (ecological protection agreements and management plans, trade facilitation agreements, economic development discourses); and local stakeholders used Council and other collective decisions (for example, those of fishing clubs or LAG) as constant points of
reference. And, in both cases, planners consistently organised their own contributions (in Alpha’s case, that of other participants as well) around the linear logic of the plan, in which details follow logically from analysis of ‘big picture’ facts and values. Other participants often tried to go straight to the details (where to put certain zones, where to release land), shifted randomly from one issue to another, and constantly revisited issues and agendas that, procedurally, had been ‘closed’.

In sum, the ‘strange’ behaviour of participants provides evidence of cultural difference, and of the potential barriers that this implies for participatory planning. In Part 3 of the thesis, I examine how these potential barriers are handled by the executive agencies and by the committees themselves. The key question underwriting the analysis is how substantive disputes can be resolved in the face of such cultural difference: the effects of the agencies’ procedural choices; whether or not differing practices/discourses need to be reconciled; and how this might be achieved if so.
Part 3: Adaptation
9 Adjusting to strangeness

Part 2 concluded that there are both formal institutional and informal 'cultural' differences to be overcome in collaborative planning. In this chapter, I look at how the two planning agencies adapted to these differences, commenting on how their choices enacted discourses of participation. After a brief contextualisation of each case study, I discuss how each committee was initially set up to incorporate diverse meanings and practices. I then examine the ongoing management of difference and conflict as these emerged during the projects. Finally, I look at the translation problem identified in Chapter 6 (6.2.4): the 'fixing' of meanings – particularly in the minutes and the final plan – that may facilitate the transfer of decisions, relations and practices to other arenas. The chapter concludes with a brief discussion about why neither committee has succeeded in producing a consensus, relating this outcome to issues of power and institutional creativity.

Institutional capacities

Planning is nominally concerned with material problems: in this enquiry's case studies, how to protect ecological assets and where to provide land for industrial investment. However, recent debate about participatory/collaborative planning (Chapter 2) is equally concerned with institutional problems: how to create planning arenas that are open and sensitive to diverse lifeworlds; how to manage conflict, power and strategic action; how to sort various claims and stakes; and how collaborative planning relates to institutional capacity building (see Healey 1996: 222-24). The managers of a collaborative process might be concerned not only with substantive outcomes, but with building and maintaining knowledge, relational and mobilisation resources for governance (Healey et al. 2002: 14).

From the perspective of a public sector agency, there are at least two aspects to such capacity building. One concerns the agency's ability to implement the plans and strategies produced by a process: to mobilise new policy and associated discourses across arenas and practices – of regulation and investment, for instance – which are grounded in different discursive frames and (actor-)networks of influence (Healey 2006). The second aspect relates to the agency's future capacity for collaborative planning: institutional resources for tapping into and articulating diverse knowledges,
practices and relational networks within new planning contexts. Both aspects are positioned in the relationship between governance practices and planning events, though the need to develop such capacities is driven also by broader socio-political trends, as noted in Chapters 2 and 6 (Coaffee and Healey 2003; Healey 2004a). This enquiry’s case studies were positioned at particular moments in the executive agencies’ histories, which had important implications for those agencies’ institutional culture and capacity.

**DOMM**

The adoption of participatory planning practices by DOMM was compelled by a review of the state’s policy framework for marine management, in response to specific political disputes about commercial activities – especially oil drilling and fishing – in marine reserves. Fallout from the disputes was contained in significant amendments to DOMM’s policies, which institutionalised an interesting enmeshing of corporatist, populist and democratic discourses. Of particular relevance to this enquiry were two changes. First, the nominal purpose of marine reserves shifted from nature conservation to ‘multiple use management’, an idea promoted in this context to provide flexibility for commercial uses. Second, proclamation of marine reserves now required prior publication of management plans and evidence of ‘full consultation’ with the community, something DOMM decided to achieve through the establishment of ‘community-based’ planning committees. The new policies represented significant institutional change, including the sudden extension of customary ‘scientific’ modes of governance to include participatory modes. However, in spite of the conceptual reframing of ‘marine reserves’, there were few associated changes to DOMM’s statutory mandate, or to the practices by which it actually managed (as distinct from planned) reserves. Therefore, staff’s understandings of the requirements for the management plan – the outcome of Alpha’s process – remained relatively static.

Moreover, while the policy required participation, it provided little guidance, to officers accustomed to a rationalist approach, about how to cope with the ‘strangeness’ inherent in participatory processes. In interviews with the officers involved, procedural decisions were usually credited to officers’ ongoing experience and reflection. Alpha was DOMM’s second participatory planning committee; the
first had been fraught with conflicts and other problems that officers were anxious to avoid repeating. Moreover, staff explicitly used the Alpha process as a learning experience, critically reflecting upon and documenting their decisions and experiences in order to build up DOMM’s corporate knowledge and practices.

**SOHE**

In the case of SOHE, the state had imposed various participation requirements on all local government agencies several years earlier, and SOHE had responded to these requirements by establishing a number of consultative committees to oversee ongoing planning tasks. However, the adoption of participatory methods for industrial land planning was a reaction to a more immediate situation: LAG’s protests regarding Council’s amendments to the zoning scheme. The newly non-permissible status of caretaker dwellings in Lumbervale remained a local problem: little interest was attracted from those not directly affected. No state- or national-level non-government organisations, and no globally circulating discourses were enrolled to support the Lumbervale residents’ desire to preserve the permanent legitimacy of their homes.

The protests were conducted by a small, cohesive community and, in addition to written submissions, took the form of direct personal engagement with councillors and SOHE staff. LAG’s members (with their consultant, Colin) made regular calls or visits to senior staff about the matter, while one group of Lumbervale residents held twice-weekly drinks, inviting councillors to hear and discuss their views. Thus, within a few weeks, LAG members altered their status from ‘outsider’ lobbyists to ‘insider’ negotiators (Hillier 2002b: 156): their meetings with councillors and staff became geared to reaching a mutually acceptable outcome. In the event, that outcome included:

- ongoing rights for the existing residences in Lumbervale, commensurate with those of permissible uses;
- a moratorium on further dwellings in Lumbervale;
- a commitment by Council to undertake further strategic planning for industry in Harbourtown, including a review of Lumbervale’s zoning and, concomitantly, the status of the residences; and
a promise to involve LAG in that planning. When the time came to initiate the project, Beta was set up to honour that promise.

This promise reflected an acceptance of the value of participation. Throughout many of the written submissions on the zoning scheme amendment and later reports of the events outlined above, there was a clear underlying assumption that SOHE’s ‘to-the-letter’ interpretation of its consultation obligations for the zoning change was morally and ethically – if not legally – inadequate. That even councillors and some SOHE staff claimed to share this view suggests that the controversy may have effected some change in (performed) institutional values. However, the decisions to undertake the Beta project and to use participatory methods to do so were reactive, and did not represent the adoption of new practices; the establishment of committees was already a well instituted process at SOHE. Moreover, in contrast to Alpha, throughout the Beta project procedural decisions were reportedly made according to the planner’s (and others’) perception of immediate political or administrative need, and were not formally reified in such a way as to allow them to travel into other arenas.

The management of both Alpha and Beta reflected an orientation to immediate consensus building rather than lasting institutional change. Consensus building theory combines participation discourses with negotiation techniques, both of which have been successfully popularised in widely circulating metaphors, thereby providing accessible conceptual ‘tools’ for resolving disputes (‘Arnstein’s Ladder’ [1969]; ‘Getting to Yes’ [Fisher et al. 1999] – DOMM explicitly invoked both these texts during Alpha’s planning process). In the following discussions, therefore, consensus building theory usually provides the framework for explaining and/or evaluating officers’ choices. I also reflect, at the end of the chapter, on some institutional implications of those choices.

9.2 Meeting with strangers: setting up the committees

As suggested in Chapter 6, opening planning processes to broader participation necessarily affects planning practice. At the most concrete level, it formally introduces new actors, new forms of social and cultural capital, new logistical requirements. Discourses of participation also establish specific ‘goods’ – inclusiveness; broad access to the process; respect for all views, knowledges and claims; decentralisation of power; ‘good faith’ in negotiations – as givens.³ This
creates a social field in which performance of such principles becomes a kind of symbolic capital. Two important aspects of an agency’s response to ‘strangeness’, therefore, are how it manages a process according to these principles – largely a logistical matter – and how it demonstrates that management.

9.2.1 DOMM

As the second process under DOMM’s new policy, Alpha represented an early stage in the agency’s implementation of participatory planning. Officers, supported by considerable administrative infrastructure (including dedicated staff and a significant budget allocation), made conscious efforts to work according to a ‘best practice’ informed by consensus-building theory, and to use their experiences as Alpha’s executive to improve their practice. In establishing Alpha, DOMM staff explicitly considered principles of inclusiveness, access and empowerment.

**Inclusiveness**

The Alpha process combined a participatory approach – a stakeholder committee – with broader consultation in two complementary procedures. Formally, the committee was the focus for the consultation effort, the site where competing claims and interests were sorted, and had nominal decision-making power over the proposal to be put to DOMM’s minister. As such, Alpha could be seen as an elite among ‘stakeholders’, raising questions about how it represented ‘broad participation’ (Weeks 2000). In practice, a key issue for deliberative groups tends to be representativeness as a proxy for inclusiveness (O’Neill 2001; Little et al. 2002; Margerum 2002; Hopkins 2004).

In DOMM’s first participatory planning committee, members had acted as representatives of particular organisations. Staff felt that this had led to problems because some members had been bound by the broader agendas of the groups they represented, and had not been free to compromise or to negotiate in good faith. For Alpha, therefore, it was decided that the principle of representation should be more abstract: the committee should represent the community as a whole, rather than individuals their sectors. This raised its own issues. How a procedure construes ‘the community’ is a choice with both practical and moral implications. Some commentators consider the key imperative to be giving voice to sections of the
community that are marginalised by traditional political processes (Young 1990, 2000; Bollens 2002), an ideal that places identity politics centre-stage (Gould 1996). On the other hand, there is a persuasive argument that participatory practice should target those most affected by the decisions at stake (Stocker and Moore 1999; Margerum 2002; Nichols 2002). It was the latter consideration that dictated DOMM’s path. It was pragmatically appealing, because ‘stakeholders’ can be expected to self-select, to be most ‘knowledgeable’, and to complain most loudly if excluded. The inevitable exclusion of players whose stakes are only indirect, or who cannot be personally involved (such as non-humans and future generations [O'Neill 2001]) was seen as a lesser risk both politically and in terms of a focussed outcome.

Prior to establishing the committee, an extensive scoping exercise was undertaken, which identified a range of concerns and interest sectors, as well as a high level of general cynicism about the planning process due to perceptions of power inequalities, conflict between recreational and commercial users, and ‘previous poor community consultation processes’ (DOMM report, 2000). This suggested to DOMM staff that the composition of the committee would be critical to its success. The selection process emphasised inclusion of a number of specific sectors: ‘local government, conservation, recreation and tourism, recreational and commercial fishing, indigenous interests, science and education, industry, pearling and aquaculture’ (call for nominations, Scrubfield local newspaper, 1999). DOMM went beyond the nominations received to ensure that all the above sectors were included, appointing a number of public or peak-body administrators to ‘fill the gaps’. These appointments were in apparent tension with some of DOMM’s own principles – in particular that of individual non-representation – but were seen as necessary to ensure the committee’s legitimacy. The most conspicuous result of the process, from another perspective on representation, was a committee that was overwhelmingly male (12/13 members), Anglo-Celtic (11/13), and middle-aged, in noteworthy contrast to the broader demographic of the region.

To further perform inclusiveness, DOMM provided for an unusually comprehensive consultation program and, as Chapter 7 shows, there was continual pressure on DOMM to ‘prove itself’ in this regard. Central to the program was the establishment of ‘sector consultation groups’ (SCGs), originally conceived as deliberative fora in their own right, through which sector representatives could formally feed their views
into Alpha’s meetings. The intent seemed to be that the SCGs would be self-organising, forming from existing clubs and peak bodies. However, this did not happen, and the ‘SCGs’ instead became a list of organisations and individuals (growing from about 50 to over 120) to whom a summary of committee decisions was sent after each meeting, with an invitation to comment. The input thus received, therefore, did not represent ‘consensus’ on the part of any sector, as many members had hoped, and DOMM was criticised as the committee found itself having to synthesise a range of conflicting comments into a position to which members could commit – a bureaucratic task that some recognised as difficult, if not impossible:

The challenge is, when you have a process which is based on individual interviews, how you actually amalgamate that in a responsible fashion, without stamping your own desires, beliefs, myths right across the top of it?

(Alpha member, February 2001)

From my perspective, a key issue with the consultation program (including both the SCGs and additional methods used during the zoning phase [Chapter 4, 4.3.1]) is that the focus was always on encouraging written input – input with a material form that could be presented to the committee and thus act at a distance. While this provided for DOMM’s translations to be checked against the originals, it also placed constraints on the discourse: written submissions are by nature monologic and associated with certain expected/acceptable register choices. Further, DOMM’s summaries reduced each submission to its key substantive points, altering much of the originals’ interpersonal content and, at times, separating those points from their supporting arguments. This presentation reflected a particular view of how submissions were to be understood and considered – as ‘issues’ for consideration – and this led to considerable tension between DOMM and some members (Chapter 7, 7.3). While the Alpha process was opened up to an increasing diversity of actors, then, the processes for giving those actors voice remained relatively limited.
Access

The first Alpha meeting was held at DOMM’s local office in Scrubfield. However, staff decided at that meeting that this venue was too small: they were concerned that members might feel constrained by close proximity to each other from expressing their views candidly. Moreover, it was felt that there was a need for both members and observers to be able to come and go without drawing too much attention to themselves. That is, the deliberative space (Forester 1999b: 64) was seen as crucial to creating an arena that was comfortable (physically and culturally) and conducive to open debate. To this end, and to remove Alpha’s interaction from DOMM’s own territory, all subsequent meetings were held in a ‘neutral’ venue at a local hotel. The hotel also provided for lunch together, one of a number of opportunities provided by DOMM for members to build relationships. However, deep divisions remained, with a number of members declining to participate in all ‘extra-curricular’ social events.

More generally, poor attendance was a major problem for Alpha, leading once to cancellation of a meeting and at other times to allegations that some members had not been fully involved in decisions. In interviews, members identified three main reasons for poor attendance: the timing of meetings, occasional poor communication regarding meeting dates, and boredom.

All meetings were held during the working week, and took one or two full days. Some members claimed that this made it difficult for people (both members and observers) to attend if the project was unrelated to their normal work. It appeared particularly to affect those members from the recreational angling sector, who raised the problem several times when Alpha was setting its meeting dates. However, in every case the issue vanished without resolution, and the status quo – DOMM’s preference – was maintained. In Fragment 9.1, Morrie and Murray remind the committee of earlier claims by other members (Matt, Mark and Mary, who have since left) that two-day meetings during the week would present access problems, implicitly suggesting that a one-day meeting would be more appropriate. Mitch supports that suggestion with a new point: the content of the meetings is too ‘similar’ to be sustained for two days in a row. However, as Dick takes up that point, the focus of the conversation shifts. Dick defends DOMM’s text-focused agenda by
Chair: The other, the other comment was made earlier on was whether or not ah, you'd have a two-day meeting? Are you --

Morrie: I'm, I'm always happy to do that, but I know, {I think Matt would,
Murray: {Mark, and Mary.

Morrie: I think Matt mentioned he would find it very difficult ah from a business point of view. And Mark would be {an, possible --
Murray: {Yeh. Mark's, wouldn't be able to unless it was on the weekend.

Mitch: One of the things I'd raise, in terms of a couple-of-day meeting, is in the nature of the work we're doing at the moment, we're just sort of getting through a process of spending a whole day going through a whole pile of 'Ecological Values', 'Social Values'. I wouldn't wanna be fronting up to something next day {laughing}.

Dick: Mm.

Mitch: It's, it's very similar work.

Dick: Yeh.

Mitch: And I think we'll be given the lion's share, and the next thing we go to it. And whether there's a need to actually break that work up?

Dick: I think you'll find though y'know that : {you can see, y'know like today you were speeding up.
Mitch: {That I'm wrong.

Dick: After you got, we got the initial issues out in the first one or two, it was starting to speed up, because y'know it becomes quite, quite {[inaudible] in a [sense.
Chair: {But, but, : {but the comment, Dick,
that I'd make, er to my, to my mind, being a lay person in this area, I would prefer to have y'know the experts put the information with before me and, and me to have a bit of time to think about it, and then, y'know come in here and sort of go through that ....
saying that the work becomes easier as the committee progresses through it, and the chairperson's turn completes the shift: the field of discussion has become how best to manage the texting, and nobody ever responds to the access issue raised by Morrie and Murray.

In later meetings, where Matt and Mark themselves requested one-day and/or weekend meetings, the access issue was similarly suppressed as incidental matters were thematised and, in every case, Matt and Mark submitted to the status quo without much protest. It is possible that this was deliberate: paradoxically, a position of procedural or social disadvantage can be strategically favourable to a group (Wagle 2000; Margerum 2002), enabling them to claim a right to greater policy benefits and also to challenge the legitimacy of decisions on the basis of access. This phenomenon is well known and often exploited by stakeholders who see themselves as inadequately endowed with other forms of power. Alpha – Matt and Mark in particular – invoked it in valorising the submissions they received on the zoning (Chapter 7, 7.3).

Apart from inflexibility with respect to two-day meetings, DOMM tried hard to ensure full participation, frequently postponing and manoeuvring meeting dates as other commitments interfered with members’ attendance. This seems to be the basis of claims regarding poor communication. It also seems to have been unsuccessful (attendance continued to be a problem), and begs the question of why members so often found other priorities.

One answer to this appears to have been boredom, which was at least partly a result of the structure of the procedure. As Mitch points out in Fragment 9.1, during Phase 2 of the process whole days were spent ‘going through a whole pile of [text]’, an activity that was not how most members would have chosen to spend their time. The chief purpose underlying DOMM’s organisation of the process was to deal with non-contentious items first, allowing members to establish constructive working relationships before progressing to the more controversial zoning. It was also hoped that by progressing through the plan’s structure, its logic would come to be understood and accepted by participants. However, the agendas’ dedication to the plan-as-outcome left little scope to pay attention to issues that may, superficially, have seemed tangential to that outcome, and precluded opportunities for free
exploration of members’ visions for the area. The process lacked the ‘structured unpredictability’ (Forester 1999b: 141-42) that allows new questions to be asked, new solutions to be found and new understandings, relationships and skills to be developed. Further, most members’ primary concern was the potential for the marine reserve to impose restrictions on their activities through such measures as zoning. By delaying discussion on this matter for a full year, DOMM put participants’ interest at risk. Access is not simply a question of logistics, but also of style: the rigidity of agendas meant that they did not cater to the focus of many of Alpha’s members.

Even more alarmingly for some members, the consistent foregrounding of their task as the production of a planning document privileged the skills of some – including DOMM staff – at the expense of others, and controlled the entry of non-technical discourses. Similarly, the committee’s often-repeated instructions to act as ‘experts’ rather than sector representatives created restrictions on the range of acceptable claims that committee members could make:

there is a need for members to take an expansive view of issues rather than a narrow personal or sectoral view. Members have been chosen for their knowledge and expertise and general standing in the community and as such they are expected to take a considered position of the issues and actively promote balanced outcomes. (DOMM, Alpha’s administrative framework, 2000)

The establishment of the committee as a non-representative team of experts was intended to equalise power relations, making irrelevant the power of numbers and economic resources and allowing the power of the best argument to prevail. However, the need to ‘take an expansive view of issues’, and the admitted dispositions of many Alpha members, conferred particular power on scientific and institutional discourse, undermining the symbolic capital normally associated with discourses of natural justice, rights and political representation. Though these discourses were given voice, it generally held more weight to speak for nature (as a scientist) or the system (as a bureaucrat or decision maker) than it did to speak for identifiable people. Those on the committee who saw themselves as community representatives, and who were accustomed to drawing on that status for their
authority, felt disadvantaged by the ‘expert’ framing, and resisted it throughout the process.

**Empowerment**

To assist the committee with their ‘expert’ task, the process drew on an enormous amount of empirical information. Talk alone, without instrumental rationality, was not considered enough to provide faith in the outcome (Voogd and Woltjer 1999). Alpha, adopting this orientation and not wishing to miss anything important, continued to request more information and technical reports at every meeting. This was in contrast to members’ general distrust of technical planning (Campbell and Marshall 2000: 337) and in spite of the fact that eventually many said that the volume of information had become overwhelming, and stopped trying to read it all.

There was a fine line to tread between empowering the committee to make ‘informed’ decisions and intimidating some of its members. The presentation of information as maps, however, was of benefit to everyone. There were disagreements as to specifics, but the use of spatial representations and GIS technology was unanimously appreciated. One member described a day when the technology was not working properly: *'it was like having our arms and legs cut off'* (Alpha member, July 2003).

Nominally, DOMM devolved decision-making power over the details of the management plan to Alpha. DOMM itself had no formal representation on the committee and officers were not granted voting rights, a point frequently emphasised in their statements to the committee (9.2.1), and to me in interviews:

*DOMM’s not actually running the thing um, as such; we’re facilitating it. ... So the committee actually makes the recommendations I suppose; we just um, come up with some of the words and, and that sort of thing. But, and we, we get that from pe’, what people are saying to us, in part, and what the committee’s saying as well. So everything goes through the committee. So I guess it’s an attempt also to get away from the thing that, that DOMM’s driving it all, and that this is what DOMM wants, and y’know it’s that Big Brother sort of government thing again.* (DOMM officer, February 2001)
Further, the CEO of the local government authority was appointed as an 'independent' chairperson, a careful choice distancing the position from DOMM while giving it undeniable legitimacy as a local stakeholder. The appointee, Marshall, lacked any expertise in marine management planning; the advantages of his 'neutral-but-interested' status were considered to outweigh this lack, especially as DOMM could provide such expertise as part of their executive support.

Formally, then, the committee was constructed as powerful in their relationship with DOMM, the latter playing a subordinate 'support and information' role. At the same time, though, DOMM retained control over Alpha’s membership; organisation of the meetings; expenditure of resources; structure and content of agendas; mode of expression of interests; range of acceptable claims; presentation of information; provision of 'expert' advice in substantive matters; and synthesis of deliberations into an 'outcome'. It is common knowledge – frequently invoked in popular culture, as well as in the academy – that the executive’s/advisor’s position (the eminence grise) is one of enormous power.

9.2.2 SOHE

Beta was different: it arose from a specific dispute and was established at the request of stakeholders from Lumbervale who wished to participate. Therefore, in spite of Council’s desire to place the dispute in a broader context, inclusiveness and access were lesser issues for SOHE than for DOMM. Rather, the key problem facing SOHE at the start of the process was the deep conflict and ill feeling that existed between LAG and the shire, described by one participant as:

_It was virtually a war situation back then._ (Beta member, November 2000)

Consequently, SOHE’s main concern in constructing Beta was to demonstrate Council’s good faith towards this group of constituents.

_Good faith_

Council delegated no decision-making authority to Beta. Rather, the committee’s role was to assist SOHE staff, who would ultimately be responsible for the reports and recommendations that resulted. The resolution to establish such a committee, therefore, amounted to an instruction to staff to work with specific people in
pursuing the issue – an assurance to stakeholders who felt that they had been wrongly excluded from previous planning (Lumbervale’s zoning amendment). Beta was chaired by a councillor and, in addition to LAG, included representatives of a number of state government departments (the port, DOP, DOE, and DRD) seen to have an interest in industrial land.\(^9\)\(^{10}\) In contrast to Alpha, members were treated as representatives of their organisations, and were invited to contribute their ‘views’ rather than their ‘expertise’.

Also in contrast to Alpha, SOHE councillors and staff were considered ‘full’ members with the same ‘rights’ to contribute and (if necessary) to vote as the others. On the surface, this left the Lumbervale members severely outnumbered by public agencies, and when LAG sent not one but three representatives (Barry, Belinda and Barbara) to the first meeting, the chairperson, and later Council, accepted this without question.

Beta was an opportunity for SOHE to combat the negative views of LAG members by exposing them to realities and constraints faced by the Shire in planning matters:

*I think aah, the committee was set up ... to ... let them understand the process involved with making decision[s] ... and then to sort of ah, have them participate more, as opposed to sort of ah, I guess, pointing fingers without really understanding the process.* (Larry, November 2000)

Normative discourses of participation and dispute resolution, following Habermas, often stress the importance of reciprocity – providing opportunities for disputants to understand each others’ positions (Gutmann and Thompson 1990, 1996) – one of the recognised benefits of participation and a key component of ‘good faith’. The above statement, by the officer who managed the Beta project, seems to me to represent a special version of this benefit: to make our critics be clear about their position, and to help them to understand our position – reciprocity as a form of defence for the executive’s actions. Unlike many other participants, who in interviews emphasised substantive matters, Larry consistently framed Beta’s purpose in terms of conflict resolution. As such, SOHE’s procedure was oriented to communication rather than outcomes or technical analysis, in marked contrast to DOMM’s approach. For example, the first three meetings’ initial agendas were empty of any substantive items: other than housekeeping, the ‘items to be discussed’ were limited to the
committee’s membership, role, objectives and whether to engage a consultant to conduct the industrial land study. Larry was determined that Beta should be involved in such decisions: procedure (including constraints such as Council instructions and state policy) was seen as the site of justification for SOHE’s actions, and participants’ understanding of procedure might best be developed by their immersion in it. Moreover, like DOMM staff, Larry wished to allow the committee to settle into working relationships before dealing with contentious matters.

Such an orientation to process and relationship building suggests a concomitant orientation to reaching understanding and consensus, rather than to achieving strategic outcomes (Habermas 1970, 1984, 1987, 1990, 1998a, 1998b); that is, communicative action might be considered a suitable framework for instituting ‘good faith’ in Beta’s procedures. Larry was explicit regarding the need for consensus; it was Beta’s only overt discourse ‘rule’:

The committee can only take one path ... and the decision does not reflect any one persons [sic] decision but the committee as a whole(.] (Beta Minutes Meeting 1, September 2000: Evaluation of the Meeting)

This point, about unity of the committee’s decisions, was repeated whenever Beta was faced with the need to resolve two contrary positions (Fragment 9.2). The approach was characterised – both favourably and unfavourably – by some participants as ‘one in, all in’. That is, the ‘consensus’ requirement was equated with a right of veto, an understanding that perhaps contrasts with Habermas’ perspective on consensus as the result of practical discourse (1990): the underlying rights and norms for reaching decisions were not described as relevant; and the ‘rule’ that ‘everyone votes the same’ was not itself a norm whose ‘knowable consequences’ were acceptable to all those affected. However, in the early stages of the process, when contentious substantive decisions were not at stake, this rule was generally endorsed. Like SOHE staff, other stakeholders wished to demonstrate their faith in the capacity of the participatory process to reach a ‘mutually acceptable outcome’ (Fisher et al. 1999).

In sum, SOHE’s key concerns in setting up Beta were to resolve conflict with, and demonstrate ‘good faith’ towards, a group of disenfranchised stakeholders. As such, Larry avoided dictating the committee’s norms too strongly, limiting his explicit
Fragment 9.2: Beta Meeting 12, selection of consultants

Larry: By the way, ... any ah, I guess ah, voting we do – it, it is for the whole, everyone votes the same! And the outcome will be the same. ... We work as a team.

Lance: Yep.

Larry: And what the outcome is irrespective of what our personal views are. We'll go with {that actual {decision-making process.

Belinda: {No. {Yep, no, I agree.

* For non-Australian readers, 'yep, no' or 'yeah-no' is a common way of expressing strong agreement. The expression's range of alternative meanings and socio-cultural distribution are discussed in Burridge and Florey 2002.
instructions to enforcing consensual decision making and allowing flexibility on such matters as membership and agenda setting. Such a vaguely defined set up – open, fluid, and largely self-regulating – seemed to have the right qualities to facilitate ‘creativity’ (Healey 2004a): to hold potential for the negotiation of new institutional practices.

9.3 Working with strangers: negotiating difference

As Chapters 7 and 8 showed, difference cannot always be planned for – it is often subtle and can take unexpected forms. Agencies were confronted repeatedly with the need to negotiate difference under pressure: to react to the use of ‘strange’ (and sometimes face-threatening) discourse practices, to reconcile divergent understandings of the principles and practices involved, to find a path towards closure while demonstrating openness.

Consensus building approaches suggest that, through what Judith Innes and David Booher (2002, 2003) call ‘authentic dialogue’ based on Habermasian principles, difference can be channelled into institutional capacity building (also 1998, 1999) and/or it can be directed into the renegotiation/affirmation of shared moral frameworks for policy making (Gutmann and Thompson 1990, 1996; Benhabib 1995; Webler 1995; Chambers 1996; Campbell and Marshall 2000). Some recent theory suggests that difference and conflict are inherent to any democratic setting, providing the dynamic through which: social life is renewed and kept relevant (Young 2000; Hillier 2002b; Mouffe 2002); a local ‘relativised justice’ is developed (Hillier 1998a: 16); ‘multiplex’ place identities are realised (Graham and Healey 1999; Healey 2000, 2004b); and peace is attained (Dale et al. 1999). As Forester’s ‘transformative theory of social learning’ (1999b: 130) suggests, difference provides us with necessary surprises, allowing planners to learn ‘not only ... from what others say or do ... but ... from the way they do it’ (1999b: 131, emphasis in original).

DOMM and SOHE handled these challenges in very different ways. Though both were careful to perform a surrender of power to the stakeholders, their strategies for doing so, and their other responses to conflict and difference, suggested that they framed their processes in different ways. For DOMM, the Alpha process was central to their project, and staff directed their efforts towards ensuring that the committee
Fragment 9.3: Alpha Meeting 6, Day 2, consultation process

David: ... so that, that's one option – we can do that, if you're supportive of that. That we'd, y'know that DOMM develops up a very um, brief package, which basically has a map with these areas on it, with some rationale, justification ah, outline for it?

Mark: I would definitely like to see that. I wouldn't trust you buggers to put it past us out to the public! {laughs}

David: {Yeh. [laughs] {Fair enough.

Mark: {Being a cyni', being a cynical sort of person, [inaudible]!

Murray: They're putting it out on our behalf! So {we, we, we, ; {we, we have to go through it!

Dick: {That's right. {Yes.

David: {Yes, that would, that's {right, yeh.

Miles: {Been there; done that.

Murray: Not that we don't trust you. David, but --

Mark: Much!

David: Um, now the, the other thing we did: ...

Fragment 9.4: Alpha Meeting 4, acceptance of the minutes

Mitch: ... My read of the minutes is that because we went through in a sequential process, which somehow etched in stone behind us what each of these ah slides we saw um were, with, with minor changes. When in fact I think by the end of meeting we called for the need to actually go back through all of these .... And I don't think that that essence, or that flavour of our review of those values is reflected in any way in the minutes.

Morrie: In fact I could add to that: in the um, note that's gone out to the sectoral groups it actually says that a bunch of them were agreed in principle um, in one statement. And um, again I don't think we actually got to that point on any of those objectives. ... So I'm not sure if that's a message that is correct to send out to sectoral groups, ah that they actually, we have agreed those Objectives.

... 

David: Part, part of the -- If um, if you like, I'll just, just put the overhead up, which might help just with these, with this discussion, in terms of, where we're at. Um, I guess we we've, we've started sort of opening up this box here in terms of the um, y'know, the social values and the ecological values. We're working through all of these various points. ... And my suggestion would be that the, the issue of specifics of those, those issues that were raised for the management objectives, probably better off dealing with those when we come back to look at each section in total? : Because we, we could spend a lot of time talk ing about the specific objectives now, --

Mitch: {If -- My, my comment, David, would be if that's the process we're gonna move through, that's fine; however the record of the last meeting, I think, incorrectly reflects that by the end of meeting we'd agreed on all those {Objectives.

Right. Okay, yep.
guess ... sort of... my suggestion would be ... probably ...'). At the same time, he consistently uses the inclusive 'we' as the agent of all procedural actions, expressing a solidarity that is almost entirely absent in the utterances of members. David is enacting a decision that staff had made following Meeting 3 to reassure Alpha, first, that the procedure empowers the committee to make the decisions and, second, that decisions can be reviewed as they progress through the plan. The 'overhead' to which David refers is a flowchart overview of the reserve planning and gazetetal procedure, which explicitly emphasises those two points of reassurance.  

As part of their reassurance strategy, DOMM staff were careful to frame their role as 'facilitators' rather than as key stakeholders, strategically underplaying their vital interest as the end users of the management plan. This stance was particularly useful to them after the cancellation of the sixth meeting due to poor attendance:

*I mean psychology's interesting, where, y'know if, if you go to people, 'listen, DOMM thinks this is really important, ... and we're gonna make sure this happens', and people tend to push back and they go, 'well no! Maybe we don't want it!' You know? But then if you, if you turn around and go 'well, : : well y'know if you don't want this thing, we'll go down to [place], because ... quite frankly, we're not gonna waste our time y'know flogging a dead horse ... here if you, if you're not interested...!' And, and, and I, I think in a way the, the sort of failed meeting was a bit like that. (DOMM officer, April 2002)

That is, in seeking members' recommitment to the process, the proposal was presented as a response to local community desires, rather than as part of a broader government agenda, and DOMM presented as a servant to the locals who 'want this thing'. Nonetheless, DOMM's control of the committee's output was the issue most foregrounded in Alpha members' final interviews with me: most of the committee perceived that DOMM staff had an agenda from the start, including detail on the final form of the marine reserve, which they were unwilling to relinquish. Their constant efforts to convince members otherwise do not seem to have been successful.
Figure 9.2: Translation chains in Alpha’s process.
Promises

During the zoning period, DOMM conducted extra consultation exercises in order to reach as many local people as possible. They did this, according to their own statements, at the request of the committee, as a way of reassuring members that their output would properly represent a 'community' view (Fragment 9.5).

This matter was an explicit agenda item from the fourth meeting onwards – DOMM staff would report on their consultative actions, and Alpha would discuss ideas/needs for further consultation. Through this process, the range and scale of consultative techniques evolved and expanded and a relatively large number of public submissions was elicited. However, the concerns of some members were never completely allayed. Four main reasons emerged in the interviews: a failure to give certain submissions 'adequate' weight (Chapter 7, 7.3); the fact that the SCGs did not yield any consolidated/collective sectoral ‘positions’ (9.1.1); a lack of public meetings; and the absence of direct committee involvement.

DOMM’s reluctance to hold public meetings related to an assumption that such fora produce a skewed representation of public opinion (Brown 1988). As attendees perform dissatisfaction with what may be (from the administrators’ perspective) minor aspects of a proposal, negative views tend to ‘snowball’ – in their number, their relative importance and the vehemence with which they are expressed – and to suppress alternative perspectives (Healey and Hillier 1996; Campbell and Marshall 2000). On the other hand, some Alpha members felt that public meetings were a necessary part of a proper consultation program – they are popular, widely familiar, and provide opportunities for open deliberation; as such they serve as a symbol for public participation (Edelman 1964). Moreover, and crucially in this case, public meetings allow decision makers to face the ‘community’ and to be called to account in accordance with their responsibilities.

These reasons underlie Matt’s and Mark’s decision, through the Scrubfield Fishing and Diving Association (of which both were prominent members), to hold public meetings following Alpha’s seventh meeting, during the second draft of the zoning. The meetings had the nominal purpose of gaining input to an SFDA submission – to increase the power of the association as an actor-network (and, concomitantly, the power of Matt and Mark themselves) – but the organisers also wished to mobilise the
Miles: ... So I think the, your idea of putting that extra layer in that you had has been a very good one. : Because it's made us think more about it!

Dick: Well! {It was in response to {the committee saying, 'are we reflecting the community's
Miles: {Yeh. [[inaudible comment]

Dick: concerns here?’ And we need to do something and make sure we are. ...
recreational sector’s direct input to Alpha and increase its influence by sheer force of numbers. DOMM supported SFDA by sending at least one officer to each of the meetings, but it was made clear that this was not part of the formal planning or consultation processes. In the event, the meetings realised an almost univocal dynamic of negativity towards DOMM, reinforcing officers’ views that public meetings were not a worthwhile exercise.

However, the meetings were appreciated by Alpha members (including non-SFDA members) who attended, because they represented the only public consultation not mediated by DOMM: written submissions, workplace presentations, one-to-one conversations and input from the shopping centre stalls were all received by staff and reported with promises of accuracy and fairness. This was problematic, because a majority of members would have liked more direct contact with the ‘public’ that they were supposed to be collectively representing. This desire was not only a matter of not trusting DOMM, but also of needing to feel a level of control commensurate with the committee’s responsibility. While members’ authority to instruct staff had been established by the end of Meeting 3, their ownership of the process continued to be undermined by DOMM’s mediating role.

Moreover, that mediating role extended to the substantive product of the process – the management plan – itself. Frequently, when deliberation failed to resolve details (such as precise wording or zone boundaries), Alpha closed sessions by accepting an offer from staff to draft a conclusion reflecting the ‘general feel’ of discussion, for later consideration/adoption by the committee. This was a useful way of moving on when discussions had become ‘bogged down’, but eventually led to some discomfort on the part of members who perceived a tendency for the resolutions drafted by DOMM to become absorbed into the outcomes, as text or graphics amalgamated with others in the resemiotised material produced after each meeting. Moreover, members feared that drafted resolutions could be presented to stakeholders as though the committee had finalised them as decisions (Fragments 9.2-3).

The strategy of promising to draft resolutions out of session was also used by DOMM to retain control of matters about which officers did not feel confident. For example, Fragment 9.6 shows Alpha brainstorming ideas for further public consultation after the first draft of the zoning scheme. It seems to me that members
Chair: Alright, so an, anything more on that consultation process?

Murray: I think we should have : : a couple of meetings – community meetings.

Chair: Community meeting? :: In areas, obviously around the, up, up at West Scrubfield?

Murray: West Scrubfield, and, : : {and East Scrubfield, South Scrubfield, --

Chair: Okay.

Morrie: I think you need a whole bunch of posters like, like this to be put up : as a static --

Chair: Yes. : Just for comment.

Murray: Yep.

Martin: Is that what you described?

Monty: We need to hit the greenies. ... [interrupted, but continues through next several turns to suggest making and selling stubby holders]

Chair: Well when do you wanna start the --

Murray: Get one of the PR people in town to start the organising, and we'll --

Mark: I would suggest probably do it about November, December, January type thing. Cos there's no bugger in town, and you might just get away with it!

[laughter]

Murray: January! [laughs] : : Just before ... red alert!

Matt: Obviously needs to go inland as well, ah cos a lot of people in [town 1], [town 2], {obviously have an interest.

Mark: {I would suggest, I was suggesting that you, Marshall, go onto Four Corners, and do a half hour program on it. That's what we used to do.

... 

Chair: So you got posters, public meetings – we were looking at ah, at having those meetings in the three, our three suburbs – ....

David: We're not, obvious, obviously we've got to um, look at the resources that we've got to do this, because it, I mean doing, doing these sort of meetings is, is quite time consuming! : : I mean obviously, so we've gotta sort of balance that with what we've got available to do it.

... 

Morrie: (Can ah, --

David: {I mean we'll, we'll perhaps look at this and, and maybe come up with some ideas, y'know based on the discussion, and, and um, circulate round that with the, : with the rationale?

* To explain a few local references: 'stubby holders' are hollow foam cylinders designed to keep 'stubbies' – 375ml bottles of beer – cool in the hand, and they are often printed with company logos and given out in promotional exercises; 'red alert' is the final stage of public warning before an emergency, when all residents are requested to remain indoors; Four Corners is a long-running television current affairs program produced by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation.
were enacting ownership of this task, fully involving themselves in ‘solving’ a ‘problem’ that had concerned them throughout the process: the discussion was marked by full participation, collaborative enhancement of suggestions, and good humoured banter.

DOMM staff’s reaction to this chaotic but productive performance suggested a degree of alarm: rather than replying to suggestions, they remained silent except when incidental matters pertaining to their expertise – marine management or bureaucratic protocol – were raised. It was not until the chairperson attempted to summarise the discussion (about ten minutes after Fragment 9.6) that staff formed a response. David’s turn (Fragment 9.7) is an incongruent refusal to hold public meetings.

The committee ignored both David’s refusal and the chairperson’s attempt to close the discussion, continuing with their brainstorming session until David made another attempt to regain control. The suggestion in Fragment 9.8 contains several promises: to ‘come up with some ideas’; to base them ‘on the discussion’; to ‘circulate ... that’ and to provide a ‘rationale’. These combine to place the consultation process back within DOMM’s realm, to be planned and administered according to DOMM’s rationality, reducing Alpha’s role to the passive one of sighting and consenting to staff actions. In this context – not an unproductive, ‘bogged down’ conversation, but a fruitful and enthusiastic (albeit potentially lengthy) one – the purpose of David’s promise appears to be precisely to prevent the appropriation of procedural matters by the ‘strangers’ on the committee. Although they have been granted decision-making authority over the product, administration of the process and its budget remain DOMM’s responsibility. This may have been particularly important to staff, because DOMM was explicitly using this process to learn and consolidate methods for participatory planning; interference by non-staff could be seen to undermine that goal.

Education

Alpha’s resistance at the third meeting (Chapter 7, 7.1) was stressful to staff not only because it called the quality of their practice into question, but also because it interrupted DOMM’s agenda and threatened to delay the production of the plan.
Discussions among staff after the meeting identified as a key problem members' lack of understanding of the principles underlying the planning procedure. As such, an important element of DOMM's response to conflict was 'educational'.

The most immediate action was to revise the intended structure of the meeting agendas from that summarised in Table 9.1 to that in Table 9.2: instead of texting all the Objectives then progressing to all the Strategies and so on, the committee would address each of the Social and Ecological Values, covering the whole progression, in turn. The purpose of this revision was to underline the 'logical' relationship between the elements of the plan: 'Objectives' follow analytically from ecological 'Pressures' and 'Targets', or from social 'Requirements'; 'Strategies' follow as means to achieve 'Objectives' (Chapter 6, 6.2.4). It was hoped that, by repeating the full progression in each meeting session, members would internalise its rationality. Moreover, DOMM staff explicitly focussed on that rationality, explaining it at some length in the introduction to the texting sessions in Meeting 4. In Fragment 9.9, David draws on an example from outside the field of marine management, presumably on the assumption that the field of the 'human health model' would be more familiar and accessible to the majority of participants, but more importantly to demonstrate that their approach has a universal rationality: it is drawn from fundamental 'laws' of cause and effect, not simply from DOMM's current ideas.

The detailed introduction to potentially difficult agenda items became a central strategy in DOMM's repertoire. Staff anticipated framing differences, and attempted to mitigate their potential for creating conflict by 'educating' members according to a consistent frame, foregrounding that frame wherever the opportunity presented itself. When the zoning plan was first drafted, it was listed on the agenda as:

Reserve ... zoning to achieve Committee endorsed management objectives and strategies" (Alpha Agenda Meeting 6, December 2001, emphasis added)

Thus, the 'logical' link between the zoning and the text to which Alpha had already agreed – which included 'spatial controls' as a Strategy for all Ecological Values – was carefully emphasised. In the introduction to the item, David reminded members of all their previously agreed Strategies that had a spatial component, as a justification for creating zones restricting access or extractive activities.
Table 9.1: outline of Alpha's original agenda structure for texting management plan (Meeting 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Texting task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify Social and Ecological Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Objectives (for all Social Values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Objectives (for all Ecological Values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strategies (for all Social Values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strategies (for all Ecological Values)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2: outline of Alpha's revised agenda structure for texting management plan (Meetings 4-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Texting task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify Social and Ecological Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fragment 9.9: Alpha Meeting 4, introduction to Ecological Values

David: [at the front, using overheads] Okay. Um, the um, I'm just going to do a bit of an introduction to - before we start talking about the ah, Ecological Values sections - and ah, just, I'll talk about two things: I'll run through the, the, the health model as an example of what we will do um, this afternoon, and talk about the relationship of the, the Pressures to the Management Objectives to the Strategies and Targets - how it all slots together. ... And then I'll just then talk a bit about the strategies, and how um, how we should look at the, the development of the strategies, um, and how we can use different approaches, ah, depending on what the actual issues are! : : I'll just run through um, y'know, basically today we'll be, we'll be looking to identify um, y'know, the, the existing um, potential pressures? We'll then have a bit of a discussion as to what is - based with the expertise round the table - um, what is, we think is the current major pressure, if there is any, for that value. Um, based on that, we will then look at um, development of a, a a management um, goal, or objective. ... ...

Now in the case of the, just running through this human health model, ... essentially we, we eith, y'know we have this guy who's um, doesn't have a particularly healthy life. And so we'd have a number of existing and potential pressures, sort of that: (A) smoking, overeating, unbalanced diet, whatever. And then from those, basically the, we say 'what are the most critical things in terms of his current level of health?' And we say 'well s, excessive smoking and overeating are the major ones that, the critical things that y'know we'd need to look at'.

... ...

And, the process that we'll go through is, is very similar to that, that health example, where we'll look at all the ecological values and say well 'what are the, what, what are the things we're trying to achieve, and what are the targets?' And then, and then once we, once we know that, we can then say 'well, how are we going to achieve that; i.e. what are the management strategies?': : : Is that, is that fairly clear, how that all sits – that sort of structure?

::: [There is no visible reaction.]
Moreover, throughout the zoning phase, 'education' as to the importance/benefits of zoning was a recurring theme. David’s introduction went on to present a set of ‘rigorous criteria’ (developed by marine management specialists for another location) as a ‘scientifically valid’ basis for the selection of sanctuary zones. Later, guest presentations included summaries of research projects whose ‘scientific’ findings emphasised the need to control regional recreational fishing take and the positive effects of sanctuary zones on fish populations. These presentations were scheduled in explicit contrast to the position statements/appeals by ‘stakeholders’ – presenters were there at DOMM’s request rather than their own, and the material was treated as objective information rather than as demands. The presentations consistently reinforced the symbolic value of scientific method, and emphasised the alliance between that paradigm and the ‘best practice’ of zoning representative areas as sanctuaries.16

Participants’ learning is commonly seen as an important – indeed, a central – benefit of participation in planning (Sarkissian et al. 1986; Susskind and Field 1996; Susskind et al. 2000). However, formal education has also been extensively analysed as a form of social control, a key contributor to the reproduction of (class/structural) power (Willis 1977; Bourdieu 1984). DOMM’s efforts to educate the committee were equally efforts to impose a specific ‘field of power’ (Bourdieu 1994: 5) which preserved the institutional framework for DOMM’s governance practices: a field in which staff’s marine management expertise (scientific, bureaucratic and procedural) carried symbolic value, and in which an institutionally appropriate outcome – a management plan meeting DOMM’s policy requirements – could be expected.

Overall, DOMM’s key adaptations to Alpha’s ‘strangeness’ were oriented to bringing the committee’s discourse under control and to reinforcing DOMM’s framing of the process as product. In particular, by identifying the central needs as being to ‘educate’ – to rehabilitate – members and to provide resolution whenever completion of the product was at risk, DOMM staff avoided renegotiating their basic assumptions about where the process was leading, and maintained the power to ensure that their institutional requirements were met. In spite of staff’s efforts to disguise the agency’s essential interest in the proposal, other participants sometimes perceived this power as manipulative and conspiratorial, aimed at ensuring a specific outcome (described by more than one member as a ‘land/water grab’) rather than
genuine community participation. The emergence of diversity and agonism, then, was treated as a problem, not an opportunity; established institutions tend not to be able to cope with conflict, and work to eliminate it rather than embracing it (Pløger 2004).

9.3.2 SOHE

Compared to DOMM's careful, strategic management of strangeness, SOHE's adaptations were relatively ad hoc. The Beta process was administered by one officer (at a time) rather than a coordinated team, as in Alpha's case; there was both less opportunity and less need to discuss strategy or to establish a mutual approach and position. Further, unavoidable disruptions (such as Larry's accident) and high turnover of personnel (three different councillors, three town planners and three secretaries over the course of the project) meant that SOHE's administration of the process was constantly in flux. The themes discussed in this subsection reflect this. SOHE's management appeared to vary between extremes of submissiveness and dominance.

Entrustment

Larry, Beta's project manager, was a qualified town planner and a senior employee of SOHE. In spite of these advantages, he assumed little authority to shape the committee's discourse or position. Rather, he limited his input mostly to administrative matters (scheduling meetings; reporting to/from Council), usually entrusting both decisions and the exposition of planning knowledge to other participants (in the case of the latter, to other planners). He appeared to see his role as being to ask for stakeholders' opinions, rather than to provide his own views either as a planning expert or as a stakeholder in his own right (Fragment 9.10).17

Larry also welcomed any input—opinions, stories, facts, queries, demands—without challenge, regardless of their apparent relevance, their accuracy or whether they had already been addressed.18 Committee motions were accepted even when they contradicted known stakeholder positions or institutional constraints. The most striking example of this was at Beta's final meeting, where only LAG and SOHE were represented. A resolution to initiate an amendment to the zoning scheme, making dwellings permissible in Lumbervale, was duly minuted without question, in
Larry: Where do we want to head with Lumbervale? Do we want to sort of change the use of the land from industry to something else? Or do we want to still retain that industry, with the additional component of residential, of a caretakers' dwelling? And depending on where we want to go with this, we need to be: decision! And we need to make a decision on that as well. Because if we don't, the same issue will be raised: --

Barbara: Yes.

Larry: -- what are we going to do with Lumbervale?

::

Barbara: {Well we --
Barry: {Right. {Well, --
Larry: {My, can I get some guidance from you people?
Len: Yeh, it's very timely! Did, did you want to move a motion along those lines, Barry?

Barry: Yeh, I'd move a motion {that we --
Len: {Okay! { Ah, that ah, the committee aah, ah er --

Cr Bob: Request Council support? {Or --
Len: {Yeh! Request Council's ah, support in principle to the ah, options that've been identified for light industry an, ah, general in {dustry.
Cr Bob: {Yeh.

Barry: Yeh. And en, en {dorse the, the action --
Len: {And, and endorse the plan of action to progress {it.
Cr Bob: {Yes.

Barry: And that we whatsiname, we try and push it along. But --

Len: I'm sure we'll have a seconder for that motion? : Thanks, Sam.
spite of the fact that the port management’s opposition to such an action was known to all parties, and in spite of the state’s previous refusals to consider such an amendment. In Fragment 9.11, Larry’s response to LAG’s resolution (‘Can I have that?’) implies that he intends to use it without significantly changing it. His discomfort with initiating such an amendment for Lumbervale – an amendment with almost no chance of succeeding – is not evident until later, following a long conversation about a range of planning matters during which he speaks very little.

In Fragments 9.12-13, Larry somewhat obliquely tells the committee that he intends to prioritise the release of ‘those two areas’ and not pursue the Lumbervale amendment at this stage. His report to Council did not endorse the Lumbervale amendment, recommending instead:

‘that future zoning amendments to the Lumbervale area be undertaken as part of the review of the current zoning scheme which is due for review from August 2005’ (SOHE Council Agenda, March 2005).

That report was the first explicit indication that Larry did not support the resolution from Beta’s final meeting. During the meeting itself he consistently expressed his views positively (‘we’ll make it a priority for those two areas ... ’; ‘I would still like to follow that ... avenue initially’), avoiding negatives (*I won’t prioritise Lumbervale) in keeping with bureaucratic discourse (Chapter 8, 8.2), and avoiding conflict with the stakeholders on Beta, one of whom, Barry, was currently a SOHE councillor.

Larry’s openness to apparently supporting any suggestion extended to procedural matters. Any member of the committee was allowed to add to the meeting agendas, and frequently did. For Meetings 2-4, all substantive agenda items were suggested and led by members from outside of SOHE: the review of the objectives by LAG; the assessments of land availability by Sue from DOP. Decisions about the timing of meetings, especially during the consultant phases of the process, were also often delegated to the participants, in particular to Cr Barry. It is possible that, at such times, Larry saw timing as a political decision rather than a purely administrative one: meeting dates affected attendance and, with views on the committee polarised, attendance was politically significant (Chapter 4, 4.3.2).
Fragment 9.11: Beta Meeting 19, response to HIS submissions

Bruce: This is the amen, oh well I'd like to put forward a motion that [reading]: an amendment to the zoning scheme be prepared, for the purpose of identifying a new zone – to be known as ... Lumbervale Industrial Precinct – with a strong, well defined policy framework, for Lumbervale to exist as a live-work environment.

... Point 3: that the recommendations regarding light industrial land, at least, be implemented. And number 4: that the recommendations regarding Export Estate be implemented.

Larry: Can I have that? [referring to the written resolution that Bruce has been reading]

Bruce: Yep.

Fragment 9.12: Beta Meeting 19, response to HIS submissions

Larry: So, that'll be part of the ah, committee resolution, recommendation, which is that plus that. [referring to the written resolution]

Belinda: You can reword it, but that's a bout, that's the nuts and bolts of it.

Larry: Yep. Yeh, n' -- That's right. Yep. :

: And what I'll do there, in terms of the release of land, we'll make it priority for those two areas that we've identified prev, previously ...

Fragment 9.13: Beta Meeting 19, response to HIS submissions

Larry: Ah, based on the ah, recommendations we've put forward, I need to look at the previous one – the previous resolution – ah, in terms of ah, ins, initiating that amendment for those two areas. I s, I would still like to follow that particular avenue initially.
Moreover, at critical moments – when conflict surfaced and upon achievement of ‘milestones’ – external parties were often invited by stakeholder members of the committee, rather than by the project manager. The fraught debate at Beta’s first meeting, for example, was brought to the attention of SOHE’s senior management by the port manager, with the result that the CEO and mayor attended Meeting 2. Later in the process, the LAG president asked the mayor to attend a Beta meeting to confirm Council’s support for the committee’s initial recommendations about land release. The attendance of these senior players from SOHE, therefore, was not a strategy of control on SOHE’s part, but a result of the stakeholders’ desire to enrol them as actors and thus strengthen the authority of their jointly developed positions. Following the simultaneous release of the conflicting port planning study (PPS) and Stage 2 of the Harbortown Industrial Strategy (HIS), the attendance of a senior DOP planner to mediate was not at SOHE’s request but that of DRD, who saw a need for the state’s enrolment and a measure of state control over the direction the process was taking.

Overall, Larry performed a classic facilitator role, underplaying his own expertise, performing a ‘neutral’ position and assuming a passive role in the meetings, trusting the other members to negotiate their own meanings and to develop a position that could be called independent of his influence:

... I'm relying on the ah: ah, I guess decision from the committee. Ah, and ... it's not my recommendation – it's the recommendation of the committee, based on the information that's been received from the ah, participants, in this case the stakeholders. ... (Larry, March 2005)

In adopting this role – which might be labelled the ‘uncritical friend’ (see Forester 1999b: 193-97) – Larry performed his own good faith, and by the end of the process had established highly sympathetic relationships with LAG, an impressive achievement given the hostility that LAG members showed towards him at the start. He also, as Chapter 11 will show, created space for the evolution of situated decision-making practices. However, by not placing his own knowledge and opinions at risk, he reduced a participation exercise to one of ‘mere’ consultation, separating his professional role from the relational networks whose articulation the project facilitated:
Ah, I think we've ah, made it clear from the start of where, what good planning principles are. And we've made that stand. However, we need to also: give the ah, committee the opportunity to provide the impact in terms of what's best for the community. And then Council must decide exactly what the ah, request or the comments from the community will have on the future: ah, responsibility of the Shire – as Council.

Ah, to a certain extent, in terms of this report, I have to admit in terms of the planning principles, if Council was to go with the decision, these are some of the impact and implications ... from the professional officer's point of view. So I've taken on board all that information, and then provide an assessment as to what ah: the impact will have: ah to Council, if this was received. (Larry, March 2005)

Larry is proposing here to report Beta’s recommendations (the ‘Lumbervale amendment’ from the final meeting) and to provide his separate professional assessment of those recommendations’ implications. This is an unusual interpretation of participation, whose purpose is generally thought to include the construction of agreed meanings, with the planner an interested participant in the discourse (Sarkissian et al. 1986; Gyford 1991; Innes 1995, 1996b, 1998; Healey 1997, 2004a, 2004b, 2005a; Sandercock 1998b, 2003; Forester 1999a, 1999b; Susskind et al. 1999; Booher and Innes 2002; Innes and Booher 2003) – an active member of an ‘interpretive community’ (Fischer 2000: 253). Larry’s idiosyncratic version of the planner’s role was a reaction to pressure from two competing normative frames: one political, the other professional (Tewdwr-Jones 2002). His personal inclinations (including, I suspect, a desire to be liked by everyone) led him to separate the two, relegating each to its own discursive arena: a consultative forum; a Council report.

Theatre

While the strategy of entrustment served to demonstrate openness to stakeholder views and discourses, there was also a need to demonstrate substantive progress – it is well-known that stakeholders can become disillusioned and cynical if the outcomes of their participation lead nowhere (Hillier 2000b). Chapter 8 showed that the businesspersons’ orientation to efficiency positioned them as critics of the
slowness of bureaucratic practice, placing pressure on SOHE to show that its methods were capable of producing timely outcomes. Before the consultant was engaged, Beta’s project lacked the formal structure to provide clear milestones (‘Stage 1 report’, and so on); it therefore fell to staff to invent alternative assurances. This need was addressed by the CEO, Len, in his position as chairperson during Phase 2 of the process: through the staged recontextualisation of the committee’s decisions, the meetings became a form of theatre in which progress was performed.

In contrast with Larry, Len retained tight control of proceedings, adhering to Robert’s Rules and taking charge of outcomes. He took it upon himself, as chairperson, to dictate the minutes, disallowing such moves by other participants even when he had invited them (Fragment 9.14). A meeting resolution is a morphogenetic resemiotisation of the discussion leading up to it, a ‘fixing’ of the committee’s intent which allows them to move on. Len, here and elsewhere, interrupts other members’ attempts to perform such resemiotisations, appropriating that responsibility on behalf of SOHE. By dictating the resolution in front of the members, he demonstrates SOHE’s willingness and intention to implement Beta’s decisions.

During the period of Len’s involvement, implementation was the key concern of the committee, and discussion centred on the enlistment of state agencies responsible for planning, developing and releasing industrial land. Representatives of those agencies were invited to Beta meetings, or contacted for lengthy teleconference calls, so that negotiations could take place in full view of the stakeholder members, although those negotiations were nonetheless treated as bureaucratic ones and non-bureaucrats allowed little input (Chapter 8, 8.2). This led to some confusion over the role of the LAG members, who knew that ‘stakeholders’ were rarely involved in such implementation actions; that they had become enmeshed in additional layers of bureaucratic procedure:

Well I sort of wondered whether we were being finished up now, because um, from now on we’ve sort of gone to this other little, we’re going up another level again. Like now we’re back up into sort of governmental um, you know up the top level there again obviously. (Beta member, January 2002)

One member perceptively concluded that their job had become to applaud:
I mean what was the point of that teleconference the other day? ... It was just to show us that something’s happening? (Beta member, January 2002)

The setting for Len’s performances diminished the role of the non-bureaucrats, reframing it from that of ‘participants’ to ‘audience’ (Hajer 2005; also Grant 1994: 168-75 on participants’ potential roles in the ‘drama’ of planning). In spite of this, the Phase 2 period was a dynamic and exciting time for Beta. Stakeholders were impressed to see action on the decisions they had made, and found the process of enrolling influential actors from SOHE and the state positive and empowering. It was a disappointment to them when, finally, implementation stalled for want of a strategic planning document.

Avoidance

When DOP raised the need for a strategic document, Beta was made to return to its original goal of producing an industrial strategy (see Chapter 8, 8.1). Due to different framing rationalities, there was little understanding on the part of the non-planners of the strategy’s purpose or requirements. They saw it as a tedious but necessary step towards implementing their previous decisions, and did not expect it to go further than those decisions, for instance by addressing the question of Lumbervale (Chapter 8, 8.3).

Up to that time, the issue of Lumbervale’s future had been avoided, although LAG members had attempted to bring it to the table at times. In Fragment 9.15, for example, Barry puts forward an argument in favour of reinstating the permissibility of caretaker dwellings in Lumbervale. It is an argument he has made before and Len, recognising this, changes the subject by developing the incidental theme of block size before the issue can generate further discourse or conflict. Earlier in the process, the Lumbervale issue – framed as ‘Objective 1.2’ (Chapter 8, 8.1) – had been deferred in favour of ‘Objective 1.3’, identifying alternative light industry sites.

However, because the strategy (HIS) had to comprehensively justify its recommendations, it also had to deal with Lumbervale’s zoning; DOP could not be expected to endorse the release of further industrial land while there were still vacancies in Lumbervale. Thus, Beta was forced into confrontation with the issue that had been dividing its members. However, avoidance was still possible: rather
**Fragment 9.15: Beta Meeting 7, General business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barry</th>
<th>Yeh! Of course our concern, from ah, from Lumbervale, is um, : : basically the future of Lumbervale and caretakers' quarters ahm, hinges round the port's um, basically what youse guys come up with.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>And um : ah, I know that we do have ah, a light industry area : in other areas of the town, but there are, there are a lot of businesses that are a little bit too big to fit in those areas, and would fit in Lumbervale. And ahm, and currently we're, : there's blocks available, ah, but they don't have a caretaker's quarters allowed on em. And that's {um --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>{It's an interesting point, Barry! Obviously when we're doing the structure planning for the light industry zone, we need to take account of the variety of lot sizes to accommodate those sorts of businesses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 'General business', in Beta's agenda, might be translated as 'any other matters members wish to raise'.
than undertake to develop the HIS internally, the committee decided to delegate the task to a consultant. Thus, the process of developing a position on Lumbervale was removed from the committee’s deliberations – the consultant would present a consolidated position for consideration and endorsement. In the event, the committee was presented simultaneously with two contradictory recommendations – those of the HIS and PPS. Those recommendations did not morphogenetically resemiotise any shared discourse on Beta’s part; rather, they represented ‘raw’ adversarial positions, each supported by its own rationale and ‘fixed’ by non-negotiable epistemic claims. As individual members adopted one or the other of those positions, they were (re)placed in antagonistic relation to each other. Thus, the positive relationship building that had been facilitated in the earlier stages of the project was undone.

Confronted with strangeness and conflict, SOHE’s approach was as different from DOMM’s as I can imagine. Instead of trying to ‘tame’ strangeness, the project manager gave it free rein, valorising any forms of capital that were realised and relying on the participants themselves to negotiate leadership and to find their own ways of doing things. Senior SOHE staff generally limited their active role to performing ‘doing a good job’, and did not take any opportunity to reflect upon or to document their practice. Unfortunately, attempts to overcome conflict in the meetings meant avoidance of the key contentious issue (Lapintie 1998; Neuman 2000; Gregory et al. 2001), which ultimately led to profound reinforcement of the conflict itself.

9.4 Meaning with strangers: presenting the outcomes

Planning for and negotiating difference in meetings is only part of the challenge of participatory planning. Planning decisions also need to be made meaningful to a wider audience. This is achieved through resemiotisation: outcomes are synthesised and repackaged in forms (principally written forms) that can act at a distance. As such, the written synthesis of planning outcomes is one mechanism through which the qualities of specific episodes might enter other arenas. In this section, I explore how the minutes and reports/plans produced by the agencies (and, in the case of Beta, the consultant) incorporate/resemiotise strangeness and its management.
In Chapter 6 (6.2.4) I argued that one of the chief means by which the ‘outcomes’ of planning processes such as these – plans – are made broadly meaningful is a generic schema that presents proposals for action (‘Strategies’; ‘Actions’) as the logical response to the ‘facts’ (‘Issues’), given certain explicit ‘values’ (‘Aims’). That is, the structure of a plan is a rhetorical metaphor, an important aspect of its persuasive function (Throgmorton 1991). The rhetoric is founded on an instrumental ‘means-ends’ rationality which is increasingly being questioned as the basis of procedural quality (Chapter 2).

In Australia at the time of this enquiry, most published strategic plans conform to some version of the generic schema outlined in Chapter 4 (Figure 9.1). The plan genre appears to be a conservative element of planning; in spite of some significant adjustments that open planning processes to new voices and rationalities, those adjustments seem not generally to extend to the re-presentation of those processes.  

9.4.1 DOMM

Outcomes to process

The explicit goal of Alpha from its inception was to produce a management plan. As Sections 9.1.1 and 9.2.1 make clear, DOMM put considerable effort into ensuring that the committee did not waver from this goal, structuring each agenda according to the plan’s proposed table of contents and providing, through overheads and use of the GIS, for the production of precise text and zoning maps within the meetings. Thus, the collaborative process was pressed through the logic of the plan, and the translation of talk to a written or diagrammatic ‘outcome’ was made simple by placing that outcome at the centre of the field of talk. The minuted resolutions of the committee mostly took similar forms to the following:

The Committee agreed to the draft management objectives for scientific research with some amendments as noted. (Alpha minutes Meeting 3, February 2001)

The Committee resolved to move the western boundary of the proposed Rocky Island sanctuary zone ... to accommodate recreational fishing, spearfishing and crayfishing: (Alpha minutes Meeting 9, February 2003)
Figure 9.1: Generic schema of the plan, showing logical connections
The referents of such resolutions – text or zoning maps considered at the meetings – were not embedded in the minutes, but kept as separate attachments to be transferred directly into the draft management plan.

Thus, DOMM overcame the translation problem by beginning with the outcome and fitting the process to it. This simplified the resemiotisation process; it also served a rhetorical/educational purpose (9.2.1) – to clarify for Alpha members the logic of DOMM’s management plans, facilitating their understanding of the agency’s accountability requirements and also giving them a common framing within which to defend the legitimacy of their decisions (as members did at SFDA’s meetings). However, the strictly linear organisation of the procedure disguised the reality of a much more complex process, in which information, constraints and the desires of stakeholders often became known and/or relevant at the ‘wrong’ moments. In practice, moreover, a plan is rarely written from beginning to end according to the logic embedded in its structure: decisions about strategies and actions (such as the inclusion of spatial controls) are frequently taken before the identification of issues, and the planning document is written ‘backwards’ to meet the need for rational accountability (Flyvbjerg 1998; McRae 2005; see Edelman 1988).

In Alpha’s case, contingent meanings from ‘elsewhere’ (consultation, ministerial and legal advice, ‘scientific consensus’, ‘best practice’ in other jurisdictions, relevant current events, and so on) were brought to the committee by DOMM staff. In the early part of the process, these were resemiotised as the text drafted by staff, pre-sorted and ready for endorsement. As Chapter 7 (7.1) and Section 9.2.1 have shown, this strategy imposed the high cost of reinforcing members’ mistrust, followed by boredom with their ‘rubber stamping’ role. During the zoning phase, Alpha performed crucial resemiotisations itself, sorting through the meanings (re-)presented in the written reports and translating them into a spatial semiotic. Only the last few sections of the plan, concerning management actions other than zoning (including enforcement and monitoring), did not involve the committee in the texting.

Figure 9.2 represents the overall shape of the translation chains underlying Alpha’s management plan, showing ‘clean’ transferral (with or without minor amendments) as straight black lines and ‘messy’ translation, involving extra sorting and reframing of claims, as scribbled red lines. Loops in the scribbled lines loosely imply external
Figure 9.2: Translation chains in Alpha’s process.
influences/intertexts. The messy translations largely happened externally to the committee’s procedure, and the relationship between Alpha’s deliberations and the final presentation of the outcomes (the plan) is straightforward and clear.

Framing strangeness

The structure and content of the management plan were constrained by strict institutional requirements: it was intended as a document for DOMM’s future use and, as such, could not include recommendations that overstepped DOMM’s statutory mandate. This became clear at the final meeting when Alpha considered the plan as a whole: several amendments suggested by members were deemed inappropriate to the document’s official purpose. For example, Fragment 9.16 occurred during a discussion about whether or not the management plan should specify management targets for social values. The current draft of the management plan simply stated that such targets are ‘to be developed as required’, which some members felt suggested that Alpha had not done its job. Staff replies to this concern emphasised that most of the social values fell outside of DOMM’s responsibilities. 24

DOMM’s management plans follow a standard format, from which template Alpha’s proposed table of contents was taken. There was little scope to alter it to incorporate members’ alternative understandings, which reflected different conceptions of the document’s intended audience. Fragment 9.17 concerns the management plan’s performance indicators. Morrie’s suggestion is explicitly related to his understanding of the concerns of the public – the management plan is seen as a means, first, to display the committee’s observance of the input they have received and, second, to place pressure on government to respond to the detail of that input (‘Does that assist …’). David, on the other hand, is concerned with DOMM’s obligation to implement the plan through internal procedures (audits and work programs) and officer decisions as to the ‘better way to ... achieve the outcome’. In spite of the fact that many of Alpha’s public submissions expressed an interest in the detail of implementation, particularly with respect to ‘polic[ing] it’, the plan contained very little such detail, which was apparently still considered an internal matter.
Fragment 9.16: Alpha Meeting 9, Day 2, Draft Management Plan

Morrie: Marine parks do seem to at; try to attract visitors – they provide all the facilities, they do the ah, the information centres ....

Monty: That could {maybe --
Morrie: {For more than just that purpose. The purpose is to provide a, a r, a, a recreational oppor {unity!
Monty: {Opportunity! Right?

Morrie: And on that basis ... perhaps those um, um sort of human interaction values: could have a sensible target on there. So you don't put the rest out of, you put a few boxes {out of it, but --

David: {Yeh. The only thing is, if you written, I mean as a marine conservation agency we, {w--
Morrie: {Youlre multiple-use managing now!

David: Yeh. But, but primarily as a conservation arm. W, we have a tourism department which obviously promote tourism! It's not, it's not the department's job to promote tourism! ...

Fragment 9.17: Alpha Meeting 9, Day 2, Draft Management Plan

Morrie: ... But there's no ... indicators, 'are we, are we implementing our management plan?' ... ‘Did we get our um, : our education material out?’ You know? ...

David: That, : tho, those sort of things would come under, within the internal DOMM audit, and with anything to do with -- We would monitor. But there's not --

Morrie: Yeh. In a way, given y'know a lot of the comment we've, we've heard is, 'how are you gonna manage it? How are you gonna police it?' There is a, I imagine a fairly um, high : ah kind of interest in that, and it would seem some key p, points indicate that government should be looking y'know, ... that, to see that, whether those, those things are, are being done.

David: We um, ah, there is actually, part of the process is being that the government ah endorse this each year. The um, the department produces a set of work programs for all of the reserves?

Morrie: If we said, so e.g. patrol, number of patrol boats as a key performance indicator in this plan, does that assist when you go to ah, look at the ah, the costings? Does that assist in getting someone out there, {for the --

David: {Un, no! I don't think it does. And I, and I think the only th, the problem with that is that um, y, your'e better off setting your key performance indicators as outcomes rather than process! Because purely driving around and spending hours in a boat ah, may be very ineffectual! And there may be other ways of actually ah, getting a high level of compliance, through say education. ... You don't wanna really s, specify in, in here exactly the detail of how that should be implemented, because you may find there's a much better way to do it, and achieve the outcome that you want.
Similarly, the draft plan did not explicitly present processual aspects of Alpha’s decision making, which were not seen as relevant to future implementation. For members, however, the plan represented an opportunity to communicate to the public their effort, the reasonableness of their decisions, and the value that they placed on the consultation. In Fragment 9.18, Martin expresses a desire that the management plan do ‘justice’ to their decision making process: the document’s audience is ‘the public out there’ rather than the agency with responsibility for implementing it. Similarly, in Fragment 9.19, Martin and Murray (with the agreement of all others present) wish to use the plan to defend their zoning decisions by including specific reasons for each zone; the document’s audience is specified as ‘the community in Scrubfield’.

The result of the committee’s discussion about the draft plan was a number of amendments to the version that would eventually be released for public comment. As well as providing more detail about the rationale for zones and other measures, several changes were made to foreground the role of the committee (by explicitly attributing decisions to it) and the additional consultations undertaken in developing the plan. For example, the section on the zoning was amended to begin:

The zoning scheme for the proposed reserves was derived primarily through an interactive consultative process with [Alpha] and with key community stakeholder groups. (draft management plan, 2005)

In such small but important ways, DOMM set members’ ‘strange’ interpersonal needs within the management plan. However, for staff, the plan – a document for future implementation within an institutional context – was not the principal site for presenting strangeness or difference. Rather, they used the minutes of each meeting to outline in unusual detail the committee’s arguments, performing attention to members’ contributions. At the very least, the minutes included a summary of the issues raised, leading to a specific justification for the resolution:

Discussion ensued regarding the land-based access to the western end of the passage, the original reason for this zone (to represent mangrove ... communities) and the possibility of moving the western boundary of this zone.
**Fragment 9.18: Alpha Meeting 9, Draft Management Plan**

Martin: ... If you could tell me then where it, how it's explained to the average reader – to the, ;, to the public out there – when they pick up this document, how are they gonna understand what we've done in the context of that ... component --

David: Yeh.

Martin: -- why it's been done? Ah, I think it should be reflected on the maps, which it isn't at, this point in time. I'm sure {it will be!

David: {Yeh.

David: We, yeh. We've, we will be doing a um, y'know, redraw all the {maps, y'know --

Miles: {Are you talk {ing more about a definition, Martin? Of --

Martin: {Yeh! I mean it, w, we talked about it at some length last meeting, and I m, I just feel like we haven't really done that discussion or decision process any justice in the documentation here!

**Fragment 9.19: Alpha Meeting 9, Draft Management Plan**

Martin: I think specifically for the community in Scrubfield, it's gonna be important. Because, as you say, they're not, they're gonna struggle to identify: specific issues to these : zones within the document. Y'know I think you'd need to pull that out, and just succinctly put it into a, a nice little summary document.

{: Er it doesn't even, it could be appended at the back. {Er um --

Murray: {Yeh. {I think it still needs to be part of this!

Martin: Yeh.

Murray: Just, people are going to get, heaps, some people are gonna r, gonna grab this straight away, and say 'why is Sandy Island a sanctuary zone?'

Martin: That's right.
The Committee noted that comments received suggested both increases and decreases in the size of the zone. On the balance of discussion it was decided to maintain the original boundary of this zone. (Alpha minutes Meeting 7, May 2002).

Often, the minutes went further, showing arguments as they unfolded:

... David advised that the permitted activities must be consistent with the legislation .... Marshall asked for the Committee members [sic] views on this matter. The Committee agreed that this activity was not appropriate in sanctuary zones. Murray and Miles had concerns about allowing this activity in mangrove protection, benthic protection and intertidal reef protection zones. Morrie felt that petroleum drilling and mineral production should be [permissible] in all zones (except sanctuary zones) as this would provide the necessary flexibility for future developments. Mitch and Monty agreed that for consistency it should be [permissible] in all zones (except sanctuary zones). Merv felt that this activity should not be permitted in mangrove protection zones given the target for mangroves is ‘no loss of biomass’ and felt the [zoning] table should reflect this commitment to mangrove protection.

... (Alpha minutes Meeting 9, February 2003)

A clear delineation of roles is evident in the way such discussions are presented in the minutes: committee member statements are almost always projected by mental processes (‘agreed’; ‘had concerns’; ‘felt’), while input from the DOMM officers and from Marshall, the chairperson, is consistently projected by verbal processes (‘advised’; ‘asked’). The strangeness of members is framed by their role as ‘opinion holders’ – as those consulted – in contrast to the neutral/objective positioning of the bureaucracy-habituated administrators. Thus, DOMM’s governance processes and culture, in their presentation to the public, sustained a modernist separation of stakeholders and planners, of values and facts, of personal and public interests.

**Institutionalising adaptation**

Finally, DOMM officers documented, for internal use only, their own procedural adaptations, formally reifying their learning about how to manage strangeness and conflict in collaborative planning. After DOMM’s first participatory planning
Stan: You've just gotta document it and say how it: I suppose had a logical progression to how you've thought about it - what the issues were, and how you got to this point.

Lance: {Yep.
Similarly, subsequent projects have included innovations resulting from reflection on the Alpha process: reframing of ‘sector consultation groups’ (with added organisational support); incorporation of some ‘public’ fora into committee procedures; ‘logical’ restructure of agendas; and extensive ‘educational’ components. Thus, these choices were able to ‘travel’ into new planning arenas in spite of personnel changes within DOMM (Coaffee and Healey 2003; Healey 2004a, 2005b).

9.4.2 SOHE

Process to outcomes

As Chapter 8 (8.1, 8.3) showed, Beta removed the strategic plan from their objectives shortly after they began meeting. The task of producing such a document was imposed by DOP to meet a need for (instrumentally) rational accountability: to explain and justify their proposed land release. The document was to communicate Beta’s decision-making process as a ‘logical progression’, as the planners explained (Fragment 9.20; Chapter 8, Fragment 8.28).

The committee delegated the production of the HIS to a planning consultant, Colin, who had produced many strategic plans in the past and had his own standard format/structure which generally met DOP’s requirements, a version of the generic schema outlined in Chapter 6 and above. However, this template did not cater for translation of some crucial meanings constructed by the committee, including in particular the work that they had done on the objectives and site evaluations – both of which represented not only substantive achievement, but also the development of shared values (Chapter 11, 11.3) – and acknowledgement of participants’ legal and moral ‘rights’.

Following presentation of Colin’s Stage 1 report – a summary of a desktop review – some of the above concerns were raised. First, Colin had taken as his study direction the objectives adopted at Beta’s first meeting, which the committee had worked so hard to replace at its second. Members requested that the revised objectives be used instead, citing in particular the fact that the revised objectives had been adopted by Council. In the event, this – to Colin – minor amendment was never made, as more significant and controversial issues overtook the process following Stage 2.26
Second, in outlining the strategic planning context, the Stage 1 report quoted from the latest version of DOP’s *Harbourtown Planning Study* (HPS), a document that most members had not yet seen. The quote included:

Lumbervale was established as a general industry area and permitted the establishment of caretakers’ dwellings. (HPS, 2002)

The description of Lumbervale as ‘general industry’ was a contentious matter and, to LAG members, a deeply felt one. LAG members pointed out to Colin that their copy of the HPS (an earlier draft from 1998) consistently referred to Lumbervale as a *light industrial area* (Chapter 8, note 3), and that the above quote contradicted the public’s long-term understanding of the area – a question at the heart of LAG’s identity. The source of this confusion (two different documents) was not understood by participants at the time, but the committee identified a solution: to include in the strategy background a historical account demonstrating the legitimacy of popular perception and the Lumbervale residents’ right to be there. Such an account – rather briefer than members had intended – was added to the final HIS.

Also at this meeting, the committee reiterated a key requirement of the brief:

... The consultant must be mindful of previous decisions of the Committee. (Beta’s consultant brief, 2001)

They drew attention to their ‘opportunities and constraints’ matrix for potential light industry sites (Chapter 11, 11.3), and requested that Colin include a similar matrix in the HIS, which led to a ‘site assessment matrix’ being included as a table via the Stage 2 report. Thus, members’ ‘strange’ concerns were catered for with minimal interference to the planning template.

Following the presentation of the Stage 2 report, members’ attention was redirected. Because of the contradictory positions in the report and the PPS, and most members’ affiliation with one or the other position, the substantive conflict, rather than the HIS text, became the focus of their efforts. Indeed, the majority of utterances at the meeting Beta held to comment on the Stage 2 report concerned the PPS recommendations for Lumbervale, rather than the HIS. After the meeting, Larry circulated draft comments on Stage 2 by email. These comments were restricted to the few matters on which the committee had reached consensus – endorsement of
their agreed general industrial site (Export Estate), and a request that the recommendations include an alternative light industrial site (Chapter 11, 11.4.2) – and did not mention Lumbervale’s future. However, the message eventually forwarded to Colin included a number of additional comments provided by the port manager, questioning the identification of Lumbervale as a light industry/live-work area. That message did not represent a consensus: Beta’s unity, and also that of its output, had broken down.

After presentation of the Stage 3 report, with its unaltered recommendation for Lumbervale, Larry did not even attempt to achieve consensus on Beta’s response, instead sending the HIS directly to Council for public release (Chapter 4, 4.3.2). Thus, from Stage 2 onwards, the committee’s disunity – and Larry’s reactions to it – prevented them from having significant influence over the recommendations or final format of their ‘own’ report, and the traditional rationality of the plan was preserved.

Figure 9.3 represents the translation chains involved in the HIS. In comparison to Alpha’s process it is evident that, first, relatively little of the text was processed through committee meetings and, second, what did emerge from Beta’s own work was subject to much messier translation – Colin, as the author of the HIS, sorted and reframed the committee’s meanings, and brought in a range of additional intertexts. Incorporation of committee understandings involved additions to strategy template and messy translation processes in the early stages. Later, when conflict divided the group, non-consensual queries and comments were answered in the document with justification for, rather than alteration of, the recommendations (broken red arrows).

Unity and fragmentation

In spite of Beta’s explicit orientation to process and the relative messiness of the translation chains, their ‘outcome’ – the HIS – is formatted and packaged in technical planning discourse for its intended audience (planners at DOP), and carries only minor vestiges of the ‘strange’ conversations underlying it. The site for documentation of Beta’s dynamics, like Alpha’s, was not the plan but the minutes.

As Beta moved through its different phases – initial conflict, working together, negotiating with the state, delegating the planning task, then back to conflict – their minutes changed markedly in style and content. The changes were in part a result of
I have not included Colin’s Stage 1 and Stage 2 reports in the translation chains, because it would have made the diagram even messier than it is. Translation processes leading to the Chapters ‘Introduction’, ‘Study Area’ and ‘Planning Context’ should be shown via Stage 1, and those leading to ‘Candidate Sites’ and ‘Recommended Strategy’ should be shown via Stage 2. The exceptions to this are any red lines whose arrows point ‘upwards’ – these represent translations from the working group’s comments on those Stage 1 and 2 reports.
changing personnel (different secretaries in particular), but also seemed to reflect the project manager’s desire to maintain and present Beta as a consensual forum: the more fragmented the committee became, the more unified they appeared in the minutes.

In Phase I of Beta’s meetings, the minutes, like Alpha’s, tended to present the unfolding of discussions, with specific statements listed and attributed to individual participants, for example:

Sue mentioned that we should have Department of Land involved in the meetings for the purpose of both land negotiations and marketing.

Larry sought a decision as to whether Department of Land should be involved ... or just be used as a referral body ....

Steve also indicated that perhaps Department of Industry should be a part of the Committee, as they would provide a holistic approach to the meeting.

Sam of the port agreed that we should use these agencies as referral bodies ....

[and so on.] (Beta Minutes Meeting 1, September 2000)

In part, this style of presentation reflects the chairperson’s and project manager’s desire to show good faith by accepting any input, regardless of its relevance. Even tangential conversations or, as below, conversations arising from misunderstanding of technical terms were often recorded:

Sue suggested looking at infill opportunities in Lumbervale and Harboutown. ....

Barbara asked if any proposals had been made in regards to Sea Barriers to prevent flooding of the low lying land. Sue answered that Sea Barriers would most probably be more dangerous ....

Sam clarified that a Sea Wall will heed the pressure of breaking waves ....

Steve suggested awaiting state Government’s decision on inputting sea walls, levy banks etc before going through with any plans to alter the land.

Sue clarified that what she meant by infilling was resubdivision, not raising the level of the land. (Beta Minutes Meeting 3, December 2000)
Here, Beta is presented as made up of individuals, each of whom takes an equal part in the conversation: all utterances are projected by verbal processes. Later in the process, when the committee was negotiating (as a collective) with the state, minutes tend to present it as a single subject, for example:

The committee noted the following constraints associated with this land parcel: .... (Beta minutes Meeting 5, October 2001)

The committee noted that the ‘dry’ part of this area was located adjacent to [road]. (Beta minutes Meeting 5, October 2001).

The use of ‘the committee’ as subject was particularly useful in presenting opinions: the results of debate and (in two instances) voting could be expressed as agreement on a single position:

The committee agreed unanimously to object in principal [sic] to Dianna’s [sic] request .... (Beta minutes Meeting 11, July 2002)²⁹

The committee felt that Colin [should] outline more specifically .... (Beta minutes Meeting 12, September 2002)

Still later, when the committee’s solidarity had broken down, minutes became very formal, and agency tended to be deleted altogether from any utterances where appraisal could be inferred, for example:

It was requested that an alternative site ... be considered .... (Beta minutes Meeting 17, October 2003)

Moreover, these later minutes were very brief, showing only the planner’s advice to the committee and the consensual decisions. The lengthy and passionate discussions about the future of Lumbervale were simply not recorded. The committee, in disarray, was no longer to be shown as a collection of individuals. Difference and subjectivity – presented positively when people were working well together – had become negatives to be hidden from the public’s – and from Council’s – view.

Similarly, apart from the instruction regarding consensual decision making, there was no formal documentation of procedural decisions in Beta’s case. As indicated above (9.1.2; 9.2.2), such decisions were often made unreflectively and/or in informal discussions between staff, members and councillors. Often, too, those
discussions enacted SOHE’s lack of professional input, members’ underlying conflicts and individuals’ ‘extra-curricular’ political strategy, the very aspects of the process that SOHE staff least wished to be made public.

9.5 What went wrong?

Neither Alpha nor Beta succeeded in producing a plan acceptable to all its members. In Alpha’s case, two members joined their recreational angling colleagues to lobby (successfully) for significant changes to the management plan before it was released for public comment. Beta, more than six months after the public comment period for the HIS was closed, endorsed their plan via a recommendation that would not have been supported by any members who were absent from the final meeting. Neither plan has yet, in September 2006, been ratified by the relevant (local or state) government.

It could be said of both cases that conditions for consensus building (Innes and Booher 2003; Innes 2004) were not met. Although both agencies made an effort to perform openness and respect, to encourage mutual understanding and to ‘avoid positional bargaining’ (Innes 2004: 7) by orienting the committees’ decision making to consensus, they were unable to remove intrinsic power inequalities. As a result, neither has succeeded in taming the agencies’ ‘warrior clients’ (Sarangi and Slembrouck 1996: 183): members who began the process antagonistic to the bureaucracy remained so, continuing to prioritise their substantive challenges to government decisions over the agencies’ procedural integrity.

In Alpha’s case, the final decision on the marine reserve and its management plan rested with the state government, which left committee decisions open to lobbying. Early in the process (before the committee began to meet), the project’s scope was limited by demands from the resources and fishing industries. Towards the end, recreational anglers who felt that their sector had not been properly recognised withdrew their support for the committee’s proposal, and pursued their ‘best alternative to a negotiated agreement’ (BATNA [Fisher et al. 1999: 104]) by pressuring the government in the persons of their local member and the Minister for Fishing. They had been unsuccessful in adjusting the planning field to capitalise their own actor-worlds (Chapter 7), and decided directly to enrol actors whose
institutional power exceeded all bureaucratic rank. This option was particularly attractive to them as experienced lobbyists whose habitus was well attuned to such political ‘games’.

Similarly, in Beta’s case, the power of the state ultimately to determine whether or not SOHE’s proposals would be implemented meant that state public servants could pursue a satisfactory BATNA outside of the collaborative process. The port manager, Sam, delayed the committee’s discussion of Lumbervale for almost three years while he commissioned the port’s own planning study, fully expecting that the HIS would take the PPS recommendations as given. When this failed to happen, Sam distanced himself from Beta’s output, submitting detailed objections to the HIS during its public comment period. The statements about Lumbervale in the report from the Minister for Planning’s Harbortown community workshop (Chapter 4, 4.3.2) were initially drafted not in the workshop sessions but by a technical support group at the insistence of the port manager and planners from SOHE and DOP, all of whom had been involved in Beta at various stages. In the face of these strategic moves by the state, some LAG members have resorted to overtly political strategies, playing ‘numbers games’ on Council and developing close relationships with relevant state politicians. Even more than in Alpha’s case, Beta’s planning process, the field(s) in which it took place, and the associated capitals (especially ‘stake’ and planning expertise) have become subordinated to political networks.

The issue of power networks interfering with the negotiation process is hardly unique to my case studies. Indeed, if the conditions for consensus building include a requirement that no party has a satisfactory BATNA (Innes 2004), it seems to me that, at least in the context of government policy making in Australia, those conditions are rarely likely to be met. Consequently, consensus building may not always be the most appropriate model for collaborative planning when conflict exists. I prefer to see collaboration as a potential for mutual learning (Friedmann 1973), for developing a new community of practice – perhaps with its own conditions for success – on the boundaries between the bureaucracy and its stakeholders (Chapter 6). Such a model might apply not only to substantive disputes, but also where conflicting rationalities and ethical frameworks are at stake (Watson 2003) – a situation that, I argue, may be more the norm than the exception.
In both case studies, creative mutual learning was constrained by decisions and positioning of executive staff. DOMM’s ‘learning’ was processed through officers’ strategic efforts to ensure an institutionally appropriate outcome from the process, and their adaptations to ‘strangeness’ were framed by this aim. The power they developed and enacted was that of redundancy (Iedema 1997a) – maintenance of the status quo – rather than of creating new meanings from interaction (morphogenesis, in Iedema’s [1997a] terms). As such, staff’s dedication to enacting ‘good’ participatory practice, while representing a significant change in governance culture, was limited in its institutional effects because it manifested only in small alterations to meeting procedure, leaving most dimensions of governance practice – issues framing, routines for acting, formal reifications – intact (Healey 2004a).

Beta, though much freer in its discourse, was prevented from engaging with the key issue that divided its members. By delegating the plan’s documentation to a consultant, members lost an opportunity to work with/through their differences, to experiment with solutions and to create new meanings for themselves.32 Equally importantly, while Beta’s meetings had many creative qualities – diversity, flexibility, openness, experimentality (Healey 2004a) – their potential to influence SOHE’s governance practices was undermined by their segregation from the planner’s professional role and his relationship with the decision makers on Council, which Larry consciously maintained as conservative ones (‘speaking truth to power’).

In Chapters 10 and 11, I focus more closely on the meeting discourse to identify what each committee’s lost opportunities for mutual learning might have meant. In particular, I look for evidence of the ‘metaprocesses’ flagged in Chapter 6 – the development from boundary encounter to community of practice – which, if given ‘capacity to travel’, may hold potential for institutional change (Coaffee and Healey 2003; Healey 2006).
Deliberative ideals: Alpha’s decision making

Chapter 9 discussed a range of conscious adaptations to the ‘strangeness’ problem as manifest in my two case studies, noting the stark choices that agencies made between increasing and relinquishing their control over the process. In this chapter and the next, I examine adaptation at another level – the emergence of each committee as a local community of practice. In particular, I focus on a specific area of practice: making decisions. The analysis shows that, in spite of being troubled by strangeness/difference at the institutional and cultural levels, each committee developed its own cohesive modes of decision making.

I begin this analysis from the positioned assumption that making decisions is necessary (though not sufficient) for the success of a collaborative planning exercise: that decisions constitute the basis for substantive achievement, and that substantive achievement (whether it changes or sustains the status quo) is the aim of most (if not all) participants. I recognise that this assumption is not incontestable, and that at a holistic level outcomes other than substantive decisions may also be considered ‘successes’: learning; exploration of individual, group or place identity; construction of new knowledge and practices; participants’ satisfaction with the opportunity to be heard, or to hear other voices (Innes 2004). Such outcomes are usually understood, in institutional terms, as capacity building – as resources which may be mobilised towards future substantive achievements either within the planning system or outside it (Innes et al. 1994; Healey 1998, 2003). Alternatively, local processual achievements may be seen as more or less self-contained, as performative moments whose influence need not extend beyond the event – as shooting stars.

I will return to these normative questions in Chapter 12. For the purposes of Chapters 10 and 11, my position is influenced by my case studies, during which (in spite of an apparently lesser orientation of non-bureaucrats to linearity, noted in Chapters 7 and 8) ‘moving on’ was – always and by all participants – spoken of in positive terms, while ‘talking in circles’ was always negative. Under the conventions of committee meetings, it is decisions (whether consensual or not) that provide the closure that allows groups to move on (see Garfinkel 1967 on interactional accomplishment more generally): ‘working together’ in this context means making...
decisions together. How, then, in the face of both conflict and strangeness, did these two committees manage to do so?

**Making decisions**

When a group of equal individuals are to make a decision on a matter that concerns them all and the initial distribution of opinion falls short of consensus, they can go about it in three different ways: arguing, bargaining, and voting. I believe that for modern societies this is an exhaustive list. ...

Groups can reach a decision by using one of the three procedures, two of them in combination, or all three. (Elster 1998b: 5)

I find this claim by Jon Elster extremely seductive. For policy makers faced with pluralism and framing conflicts, being able to exhaustively list the decision-making options suggests a high potential for control over the process of reaching an agreed outcome. When those options are both small in number and (at least as folk categories) well understood, control appears even more within reach. However, the categories are complicated by the 'strange' framing differences discussed in Part 2 of this thesis: argument and bargaining, as communicative processes, are usually understood as predicated on a shared worldview, and voting, while it might be considered exempt from this condition (1998b: 6), at least requires that participants respect the institution of voting. This suggests, to many authors, a 'layered' model of decision making/consensus building, in which the principles underlying deliberation themselves become 'embedded in understandings, practices and institutions' by deliberative means (Innes 1998: 52). That is, before decisions can be made on substantive matters, a series of 'meta-decisions' on 'decision premises' (Weiss 2000: 118) need to be made regarding, for example, problem definitions, participant roles, and procedures for dealing with conflict. Following Habermas, deliberative norms need to be consensual before final agreements can be considered meaningful (MacCallum 2005: 352-53; Renn et al. 1995b; Benhabib 1996b; Chambers 1996; Lapintie 1998; Susskind et al. 1999; Pellizzoni 2001b).

This 'layering' introduces a second dimension to decision making, without challenging Elster's typical categories. In Chapters 10 and 11 I focus on details of decision making in each case study through a metafunctional and logogenetic/ergogenetic lens (particularly focussing on the interpersonal dimension) rather than
from a claims-based Habermasian perspective, in order to examine how the two theoretical dimensions – of ‘type’ and ‘level’ – are played out in the event (Putnam 2001). The analysis identifies ‘strategies’ for decision making by their discourse-semantic and lexicogrammatical features, rather than by intuitive norms. In this chapter, I examine several ‘consensual’ decisions made by Alpha to show that this committee, under the tight control of their executive and chairperson, generally conformed to a deliberative democracy framework.

Alpha did not receive explicit instructions regarding how decisions should be finalised, although there was an implicit orientation towards consensus in their instructions to act as ‘experts’, rather than sector representatives. As experts working together on the technical work of developing a management plan, all of Alpha’s members were to sign off as contributors/authors on the product of their deliberations. Often, this was very difficult to achieve – Scrubfield had a long history of conflict over resources, especially over fishing country. Nonetheless, they achieved a kind of consensus on several controversial substantive issues, usually relying on standard conflict resolution approaches: voting and negotiation. As the meetings progressed, the committee members themselves problematised and found their own interpretations of the ambiguous and contested notions of consensus and consensus building.

10.1 Voting: agonistic consensus problematised

Alpha resorted several times to voting on matters of apparently intractable conflict. As they did so, they not only established substantive ‘agreements’ but also developed local, ‘procedurally just’ strategies for ensuring that the implied ‘consensus’ was meaningful even in an environment of agonism. To illustrate this, this section summarises my analysis of three of Alpha’s decisions: to exclude the port from their area of influence (‘the study area’); to accept the exclusion of Muddy Bay from the study area; and to retain a particular sanctuary zone in the face of stakeholder objections.

10.1.1 Meeting 3: exclusion of the port from the study area

The issue of the port’s inclusion in the study area had dominated Alpha’s second meeting, following presentations by the port management and its major clients. It
had been a difficult meeting, throughout which the presenters remained as observers and interjected frequently in the committee's discussion. No resolution resulted from the second meeting; rather, the committee requested that DOMM obtain legal advice on the issue and deferred the decision until that advice was received.

At the third meeting, DOMM presented legal advice that the seabed within the port boundary was vested with the port management, and that this precluded vesting for a different purpose with another authority (such as DOMM). Staff therefore recommended that Alpha accept the port's exclusion from the marine reserve. At the same time, they indicated that the port management had agreed to discuss amendments to their boundary (to include certain areas of ecological significance in the proposed marine reserve) and a review of management mechanisms (to improve management consistency between the port and the reserve). In response, though not before a lot of complaints, a member, Mitch, proposed a motion to conditionally exclude the port (Fragment 10.1). This action was according to formal meeting procedure — mobilisation of a proposal followed by debate and then a vote — and this was the decision-making procedure subsequently followed by the acting chairperson throughout this meeting.

Deus ex machina

The solution to the port issue was imposed from outside, by legal constraints. Nonetheless, the committee were not immediately prepared to accept it, and following Mitch's motion debate continued for over an hour until the meeting broke for morning tea. The debate ranged across a number of implications, substantially repeating the arguments of the previous meeting. Discussion never reached a point at which the committee either accepted the motion or agreed to vote on it; it was not until after the break that a solution began to appear. The suggestion that Monty makes in Fragment 10.2 was a crucial moment which shifted the discussion from factual, legal and 'public perception' issues — that is, from factors originating outside of the committee — to the values and preferences of the members themselves ('not our preferred option'). Suddenly, conflict over the issue of the port's exclusion evaporated, and from this point, debate centred on procedural matters: principally about whether the suggestion was an 'amendment', a new motion, or simply a comment.
Mitch: So, based on Crown Law’s advice, I’d like to propose a motion that we accept exclusion of the port boundary on the proviso that the port boundary gets reviewed.

Chair: We have a mover and a seconder. Do we need more discussion? Monty?

Monty: What about an amendment that the area should be all integrated under one body?

Chair: Would you like to propose an amendment?

Monty: I’d like to propose an amendment that suggests integrating the whole area including the port, but if that’s not an option then the exclusion is okay. ...

Morrie: We’ve already established that we can’t! We got legal advice.

Monty: Yes, but we need to note that that’s not our preferred option.

---

* Audio-recording of this meeting did not begin until shortly after morning tea.
Fragment 10.3 typifies much of the discussion following Monty's suggestion. Interpersonally, there was: a high level of participation (conversation tended to include several members at once, rather than just one or two); a high frequency of agreements and supporting moves, often interrupting each other; frequent modulation ('should'); and other forms of 'authentic' appraisal ('wants', 'happy', 'objections', 'strongly'). Ideationally, the discussion was dominated by verbal ('say'; 'proposing'; 'registering'; 'talking'; 'recommend') and mental ('want'; 'think') processes, and nominalisations of such processes ('advice'; 'objections'; 'statement'; 'motion'), with other nominal groups mainly invoking people present at the table ('the committee'; 'members').

The patterns noted above, and the absence of external referents, suggest that what is at issue is no longer a substantive dispute but evaluation of procedure. The key point of controversy – producing unsupportive moves such as disagreements and counters – was whether recording the committee's 'preferred option' was a useful thing to do if that option was not feasible. For example, Fragments 10.4 and 10.5, while they include disagreement, are still firmly centred ideationally on evaluating procedure.

To me, what the committee has achieved here is to develop a local notion of procedural justice: unhappy with having had their decision made for them – the deus ex machina of the legal advice – they enabled themselves to accept it and 'get off the subject' by establishing a mechanism for that unhappiness to be recorded. The 'consensus' that Alpha reached through this debate, therefore, was complex. It was explicitly agonistic: at least in terms of the port exclusion, it did not represent agreement or reciprocity, but reluctant acceptance in the face of persistent disagreement and domination (Mouffe 1996; Hillier 2002b, 2003; Pløger 2004) – in this case, by external institutions. Further, because of this agonism, their 'consensus' had both a substantive and a procedural dimension. Through this phase, the committee committed to a conflict resolution procedure that did not rely on persuasion or bargaining, but on the explicit statement of members' values. That statement achieved, voting was able to become a key decision-making mechanism.

At subsequent meetings, under Alpha's regular chairperson, this procedural commitment took a very specific form: where 'consensus' was not reached by other means, each member was asked to state their opinion and the implied votes counted.
Fragment 10.3: Alpha Meeting 3, exclusion of the port

Dick: So what you're trying to say is 'we accept it, cos we've got the Crown Law advice.' That's the position. There's no, we're not going back to Crown Law to say 'give us some more advice'; they'll say 'you've got the matter'. But what you, what, my understanding is the committee wants to say 'we're not happy with that, and as a result of that we want that registered'.

Matt: Yes, I agree. That some of us, what members are proposing is really registering our objections!

Dick: But you c, a strongly worded statement is, that's what you're talking about, isn't it? {Yes, yeh, that's,}

Miles: Yeh. Just registering our objections.

Miles: Yeh, but I think that should be a strongly worded statement or something from the committee, not a motion on the actual what we're talking about - the, {which is that --}

Monty: {You're right. Maybe it shouldn't be a mo-- Mr Chairman, I withdraw my motion, and ha, {recommend that ah we register --}

{{[interrupted]}

Fragment 10.4: Alpha Meeting 3, exclusion of the port

Morrie: I, I believe we're just making a non-decision. Obviously with that motion, I think to make a comment - whether personal or as a group - on that is, is a, is a wise thing. But really it's important to move forward, and that motion doesn't move us forward.

Mark: I I think it does; I think it does it in a couple of ways. ... Um, the the most important way is is, as I said earlier, if, if somebody along the line doesn't bring this to the attention one way or another to DOMM that we have a problem ... then you will never ever get this problem solved. ...

Fragment 10.5: Alpha Meeting 3, exclusion of the port (following passage of Monty's motion)

Mitch: Just, well, I, I think we've just done a whole lot of nothing.

Matt: I disagree with that.

Mitch: I think we have, what we have got is a, is a fundamental gap we're trying to cover. And the way we've covered that is to pass both motions. And in my view that, that's not going to move us forward!

Murray: Mm. [nods]

::

Mark: It, it is, because we can get off the subject! ...

* All further fragments are transcribed from audio-recordings.
10.1.2 Meeting 7: exclusion of Muddy Bay from the study area

In contrast to the port, Muddy Bay – a key productive area for a local commercial fishery – had been excluded from the study area before Alpha began to meet. This left a conspicuous visual ‘hole’ in the study area map (Figure 4.1), drawing attention to the exclusion, and to the implied concession to the commercial fishing industry. Early in the process the committee received a number of requests, from members and others, to consider including Muddy Bay in the reserve. Several members supported this idea but there was also strong opposition from others, and no agreement could be reached. Because extending the study area was outside their formal terms of reference, Alpha asked DOMM to approach the Minister for Fishing to ascertain whether he would support the inclusion. The minister’s reply was presented at the seventh meeting in May 2002. It stated that not only would he oppose the inclusion of the bay; he would request that the study/reserve area be reduced to exclude all of the commercial fishing grounds, part of which had originally been included only by accident. Once again, the committee was faced with a deus ex machina decision imposed from outside.

Intractability

The Muddy Bay question was a particularly intractable one. It appeared to me that it became the symbol of a deep historical dispute between commercial and recreational fishing interests. Initially the debate that followed DOMM’s presentation of the minister’s advice was dominated by this dispute, beginning with two unequivocal conflicting statements of opinion (Fragment 10.6). Such an opening – staking positions in a zero-sum game – might be expected to lead to a bargaining process. However, in this case, it was apparently the symbolism of the issue that mattered, rather than its resolution. This surfaced in a number of exchanges between Max, a commercial fisher, and the recreational anglers Mark and Matt, who used the discussion to perform their knowledge and positions on commercial and recreational fishing rights, with frequent non-supportive interruptions (Fragment 10.7).

In Fragment 10.8, Max and Matt review the basis of their long-standing dispute. Although it is, for a time, framed in terms of the marine reserve’s implications, the real issue appears to be the comparative levels of control – the ‘fair[ness]’ of the government’s treatment of two sectors which are competing for the same natural
Fragment 10.6: Alpha Meeting 7, Muddy Bay

Mark: I think, given that, then um, it should stay the same as [the minister] set it out! : Leave the boundary right where it is!

Max: I reckon it should be less!

Fragment 10.7: Alpha Meeting 7, Muddy Bay

Max: ... But the reason the Minister for Fishing is saying what he's saying is: cos he doesn't want fourteen ... fishermen, who have had access there since: forever, basically,

Matt: [Yeh. 1966.
Max: [when licenses were granted, to have their rights taken away from them!

Fragment 10.8: Alpha Meeting 7, Muddy Bay

Max: I just, just think that it's really unfair on the people that operate within that area! They already have restricted themselves to on a bad year two days fishing in the bay, and on a good year a maximum of three months fishing in the bay! The rest of the year it is totally closed – you're not even allowed to drive your boat in there! ... And the complications that would arise from those people having to operate within not only a [licensing] framework, but a [marine management] framework, I think are unfair on those people.

Matt: But Max, just, just, I know that, from your previous discussions, that you're concerned about the more legislation and I c, I can agree with that! Um, the other thing is that, I guess, the same things've now been placed onto the recreational fishing sector! Not only are we governed by bag limits ... we're also now controlled by zone, zoning if this gets up in this marine reserve! So when you're saying it's not fair to those people, it's the same, y'know! It, it's a mo', multiple use --

Max: It's not the same, Matt. {I, I beg to error, mate, {because --
Matt: {It is the same. {Yeh. Lots of mo {ney's changed hands!
Max: {No, hang on! Hang on!

Matt: Yeh.

Max: There's fourteen boats --

Matt: Yep.

Max: -- that are allowed to fish with certain fishing gear, with spatial controls, within those areas, that have government deciding on whether their fishery is sustainable or not and implementing rules to maintain that! : recreational fishing is not sustainable! It doesn't have a top limit of what can be taken! Of what can be taken! You have a bag limit, --

Matt: {Yes, we --

Max: They're controlled, {mate.

Matt: {that eighteen million people in Australia can go and get! : When the recreational fishing industry faces up to the real issues within: their um, : areas : -- which I doubt is ever going to happen - then -- That's the reason we're putting sanctuaries in place, so that people can't go fishing there! Because they're not prepared to I, look seriously at bag limits or the numbers of people that are going into areas, you can't say recreef, recreational fisherman are even {controlled!

Mark: {We, we, we're, we're not discussing recreational versus commercial fishing people. ...
resources. There is a sense in which this ‘fairness’ issue allows the recreational fishing sector to support controls on commercial users not for the ‘official’ purpose of conserving stocks, but to promote a perception of equity with other users – from a rationalist perspective, almost as ends in themselves. Such a position is almost indistinguishable from pure enmity.

The discourse quickly becomes confrontational, with the two protagonists interrupting to contradict each other, and to generalise negatively about each other’s sector (‘Lots of money’s changed hands’; ‘they’re not prepared to look seriously ... ’). The use of the normally friendly vocative ‘mate’ by both parties here – highly unusual in the data as a whole – appears to signal conflict; perhaps it is intended to ‘soften’ the impact of their disagreements, or to evoke their past relationship with (and thus their knowledge of) each other. When Mark steps in to mediate, ‘recreational versus commercial fishing people’ is treated as a participant, an established ‘thing’ that can be ‘discuss[ed]’. The entire set of substantive issues regarding controls, license numbers and sustainability can be symbolically packaged as a decontextualised feud.

As a symbol of that feud, the Muddy Bay question was intractable. The quest for ‘fairness’ (or advantage) represented an enterprise which formed a central part of the two sectors’ collective identities (Gray 1997; Forester 1999a; Kong 2000). As Mark makes clear in Fragment 10.9, the issue is related to some members’ continuing perception of themselves as representatives rather than ‘experts’. The fear of alienation from their communities – here, in the discourse of the recreational anglers, framed as ‘the public’ (Chapter 7, 7.3) – prevents some committee members from making a decision on the issue. This fear is explicitly linked by Mark to ‘accommodat[ing] the commercial fishing’.

Resolution

In spite of the intractability of the Muddy Bay issue, in Fragment 10.9 a solution also begins to appear: accepting the deus ex machina of the minister’s advice, and thus avoiding personal responsibility. As with the port’s exclusion, the interpersonal patterns begin to show more general participation and frequent supportive interruptions as the solution starts to emerge.
Fragment 10.9: Alpha Meeting 7, Muddy Bay

Mark: ... I believe the biggest problem that we're gonna have with all of this is going back to the public and saying, 'hey, listen, guys! We've just taken another, we've just taken the rest of Muddy Bay out to accommodate the commercial fishing!'

Dick: Nah, I mean that's not --
Murray: Well we're not doing it! We're not doing it.
Morrie: Yeh, well they can lobby the minister!
Mark: The minute you do that, you've just wo', we'd better beli', yeh.
Murray: Well that's a political decision!
Morrie: Yeh.
Mark: And that's, that's the, the whole reason that -- It's exactly what Marshall's saying, is, is that -- I'm in agreement with Marshall! The line stays where it is! If the minister wants
Murray: Yeh.
Mark: to change it, the minister changes it.
Chair: Yeh. Yep. He changes, it's not, it's not out of, it's not out of our --
Mark: And it takes the onus --
Matt: Not out of the committee! Yeh.

Mark: It takes the onus off this committee for changing it!
Chair: Because if this committee changes it, --
Murray: Y, yeh.

Mark: -- in my view, you've just blown your credibility outa the water.
The chairperson takes advantage of this emerging procedural consensus to clarify the next step forward (Fragment 10.10). His suggestion is a repeat of the procedure devised by Monty to resolve the port issue (Fragment 10.2): by explicitly shaping the committee’s output around the members’ own preferences (‘if we believe ... then we should say so’), it allows for agonistic acceptance of the imposed decision. However, Muddy Bay symbolises a question of deep values (Forester 1999a). Max, seeing that a decision is approaching, makes a personal claim for procedural justice, to which there is general agreement (Fragment 10.11), and the chairperson invites the committee to vote (Fragment 10.12).

The voting method of ‘going round the table’ often – including in this instance – led to the opening of new arguments and issues just as debate was being concluded, exemplifying a key contradiction – between opening and closure – that characterised Alpha’s process throughout. Moreover, because people’s preferences were complex, framing them in terms of stark choices such as ‘leave as is ... or change’ sometimes required adjudication on the chairperson’s part. For example Matt’s preference (Fragment 10.13) was recorded as ‘leave as is’, and Morrie’s ambiguous preference (Fragment 10.14) was recorded simply as ‘reduce’.

In spite of such interpretive complexities in the ideational dimension, however, the final ‘count’ of the votes, and the decisions that those counts represented, were rarely challenged. The procedure – including the option of minuted objections – appeared to meet all members’ requirements for accountability. The Alpha experience, then, suggests a strong case for a deliberative, procedural justice approach to ‘agonistic consensus’.

10.1.3 Meeting 8: inside Rocky Island

At a later meeting, Alpha’s procedural principle came to be spelled out. Following discussion of public submissions, the chairperson called for a vote on retaining part of a controversial sanctuary zone on the ‘inside’ (shorewards) of Rocky Island. One member questioned the procedure and, for the first time, the committee was made to define ‘consensus’ explicitly.

In Fragment 10.15, the chairperson collocates ‘some sort of vote’ with ‘consensus’, later explicitly equating ‘consensus’ with ‘the majority of people’. This failed
**Fragment 10.10: Alpha Meeting 7, Muddy Bay**

Chair: But I think we as a committee, if we believe that it should remain where it is, then we should say so, and say, it's up to him to make that decision!

Mark: (Yep.

Chair: If we believe that it should be altered, then we can say 'yes, we agree with your comments', and ah, er and the comments that Max made – in regard to taking it up the ah, ah, further up ... -- ah, might be applicable! As I said, the decision's yours!

**Fragment 10.11: Alpha Meeting 7, Muddy Bay**

Max: Um, : : if the committee wants to go ahead and recommend that it should be included, the minimum that I would ask is that it be minuted : that I strongly, s, strongly object! : And that I am sure the commercial fishermen will be putting their views to the Minister for Fishing to make sure that that area is reduced : as I suggested.

Chair: And I think that's a, {y'know that's a fair comment.

Matt: {Yeh.

Dick: {It is!

Matt: {Yeh! {Yeh!

Chair: {And if you, we got {an um, request on that, and if you y'know, if you feel that strongly about it, then that's an appropriate way to go.

Owen: Mm!

Dick: Mm! Yep.

Morrie: {Mm!

Matt: {Yeh!

**Fragment 10.12: Alpha Meeting 7, Muddy Bay**

Chair: We'll just go round the table, and ah -- Murray?: : : I think: leave as is or, or change? ...

**Fragment 10.13: Alpha Meeting 7, Muddy Bay**

Matt: Yeh, I've deci', I've, I've, I've got problems with it as well, um, and I guess that --

Chair: Just give me one or the other!

Murray: [laughs]

Mark: [laughs]

Matt: I'd like to see the minister make the, the decision, {cos I have, yeh, {no', not this committee.

Chair: {So you, {But, so you're s--

Chair: You're saying, leave as is, basically? Or extend? : Leave as is!

**Fragment 10.14: Alpha Meeting 7, Muddy Bay**

Chair: ... Morrie?

Morrie: Um, reduce, but add in some additional area : elsewhere.

Murray: Yeh. So extend!
immediately to satisfy Mike, who had not been present at the previous two meetings and had not accepted voting as a decision-making procedure for zoning (‘I don’t think we’re about that ...’). There followed a reopening of the arguments against imposing a sanctuary zone, and ideationally the discussion oscillated for about ten minutes between evaluation of the committee’s decision making (Fragment 10.16: ‘... we should be talking about ...’) and external/factual issues (‘there are other sand flats’). This was apparently frustrating for the chairperson, who attempted three more times to close the debate (‘I think the discussion’s finished’).

The problem was solved – that is, the majority vote was transformed into an agonistic consensus – once again by the minuting not only of Mike’s (and Mitch’s) opposition to the outcome, but also of the reasons for that opposition (Fragment 10.17).

10.1.4 Summary

The procedural principle that Alpha derived from their third meeting onwards allowed for the imposition of a decision by either an external authority or a majority vote but required that members’ objections, and sometimes the values underlying them, be recorded. This principle is not a novel one. Allowing minority objections to be voiced publicly accords with a traditional liberal conception of procedural justice (Rawls 1971), and is standard procedure in many formal settings. In Alpha’s case, the principle itself was, as Habermas might have hoped, subject to debate and consensus, and it turned out to be very robust: decisions made by vote remained stable, and the pattern of bowing to ‘consensus’ became so established that, at the final meeting, one decision (regarding a complicated amendment to the management plan’s zoning table) was reached by a possible majority stating that they were not happy but would go with the majority. As a metaprocess, the discursive establishment of procedural norms worked well in this case.

10.2 Negotiation

Voting, even where it requires minuting of objections and/or an additional statement of values, is a relatively straightforward procedure, easily identifiable by generic conventions (‘all those in favour?’ or, in the style of Alpha’s regular chairperson, ‘we’ll go round the table’). However, Alpha did not always, or even mostly, make
Fragment 10.15: Alpha Meeting 8, Rocky Island sanctuary zone

Chair: Alright? So the, the inside's left as it is. Ah, outside! : : Merv?

Mike: Hang on! ‘The inside's left as it is’? In terms of a comment, --

Chair: Yeh.

Mike: -- that, that means that you're saying that there was some sort of vote taken, and that ah, and {that the, : the ayes mu', the ayes won it?

Chair: {We've gotta come to a consensus! Yeh!

Chair: Yeh.

Mike: Cos that's, I don't think we're about

{that! We're not making votes to make decisions like that!

Chair: {Yeh.

Mike: I {would like the minutes to reflect the discussion, which is {that, --

Chair: {The committee -- {Yeh?

Mike: -- that there was strong opposition to the inside remaining the same!

Chair: Mm! But the majority of people -- the consensus -- was, Mike, y'know you can't get away from that! You've ah, : we've got two ah that ah, m, think there needs to be some change, and four, and possibly five, that think we should leave it as it is! ...

Fragment 10.16: Alpha Meeting 8, Rocky Island sanctuary zone

Mike: Yeh, okay, well then ma', maybe that's the sort of stuff that we should be talking about! ...

But we're, we're not even, we're not even gonna discuss that; we're gonna discuss getting rid of it! : We're gonna say that those sand flats in there are too, too : valuable to allow anybody to go ... fishing there!

::

Murray: {Well there are other {sand flats, --

Chair: {I think -- {Look, I, I think the discussion's finished

{now. If {you've got that, we've {got the -- :

{So we'll move onto the outside now.

Mike: {Yeh, it is! {Yeh! That's right. {It's --

Murray: {Yeh.

Mitch: {Could you read the, the last thing

back on that, {please?

Chair: {Yeh. : Mm.

Fragment 10.17: Alpha Meeting 8, Rocky Island sanctuary zone

Deidre: Ahm, so 'strong opposition by Mitch and Mike.' : Ah, and then I've got 'Mike -- there is no good evidence that ... fishing should be excluded, and highlighted, and [they] highlighted that this is an important area for small boat use.'

::

Mike: Okay. I'm happy with that.
decisions this way. Apart from at the third meeting, with its guest chairperson, voting tended to be used as a last resort, when negotiation did not produce a timely consensus. Negotiation, as realised by Alpha, combined elements of both bargaining and argumentation: claims and requests were made and justified with reference to facts and ‘public interest’ arguments.

The most difficult decisions the committee faced were decisions to delineate sanctuary zones. Some proposals for such zones attracted many comments/objections, particularly from the recreational angling community, and were the subject of lengthy debate both in the first instance (Meeting 6) and following the two *de facto* public submission periods (Meetings 7 and 8). Below, I illustrate the nature of Alpha’s negotiations by examining the resolution of debates surrounding one of the most contentious proposed sanctuary zones: Rocky Island.

10.2.1 Meeting 6: Rocky Island

Meeting 6’s zoning session began with a ‘blank sheet’, and committee members were encouraged to suggest places where they felt spatial controls would be appropriate. The Rocky Island zone was first mooted during this session by Monty (Fragment 10.18). Monty’s turn is a suggestion – a demand for a service (*“Let’s take from [reef] ...”*) – incongruently framed as giving an opinion. It is the first specific suggestion to be offered for a zone around Rocky Island, and provides a basis for discussion for the next fifteen minutes or so, also continuing through the tea break. The suggestion is explicitly framed in terms of the premise that a zoning system should be representative of a range of habitats (*“If you wanted a representative area”*), a premise that DOMM had imposed (Chapter 9, 9.2.1) and which the committee is assumed, apparently, to share.

In explaining his suggestion, Monty appeals to trustworthy scientific knowledge – objective facts – about habitats (*“you’ve got ... two different exposures ...”*).³ He also acknowledges that subjective interests are an important consideration, but objectifies and generalises those interests, distancing them from anybody present (*“... to keep everyone happy”; “to satisfy all the users”*). As such, Fragment 10.18 captures what I see as the essence of Alpha’s negotiation discourse: phases are initiated and punctuated by demands for service; those demands are justified and/or qualified with
Monty: Um, for my two cents worth, if you wanted a representative area, ... I'd take from [reef] right through to the whole lot, and say that's a very good representative group of habitats for this area. Now how you manage that, or zone it is um, the tricky bit, y'know to keep everyone happy. But it is, you've got er two different exposures to the offshore reefs ... um, and you've got all that ah, island associated fringing reef, and then big flats in the back there. And you'd capture it as a representative area -- a host of habitats in that y'know fairly compact arrangement.

Chair: {Can you, can you, can we get that marked on the --}

Morrie: Yeh.

Monty: But I reckon that if you could come up with something to satisfy the, all the users is --

Murray: {[laughs]}
Monty: {um, y'know, ah, no take, um, sanctuary, multiple use, whatever -- in that, then all of those habitats you'd capture at least one block. And if you could match say in another area within the reserve as an offshore area, you, you'd be doing pretty well. But it's a big block! I mean --}
reference to facts and to interests external to those of the committee members. As Jane Mansbridge puts it: ‘...negotiation denotes a mix of power and influence. It stands between pure conflict, based only on power ... and pure persuasion, based only on influence’ (1992: 42).

**Knowledge and process**

This pattern accords well with DOMM’s construction of the committee as ‘experts’: they negotiate from their knowledge, rather than from their personal interests. The evolution of the debate raises opportunities for different members’ ‘expertise’ to be foregrounded and performed. In Fragment 10.19, the discussion splits into two streams foregrounding local and technical knowledge respectively, each generating its own suggestion for modifying Monty’s initial proposal. The mention of ‘recreational fishers’ raises two lines of discussion: from Mark’s point of view, it makes the proposed zone a ‘real big [political] problem’, which might be mitigated by reducing the size of the zone; for Monty the issue is about managing the impact, which, as Miles suggests, could be achieved by ‘get[ting] rid of anchoring’. In this case, it is Mark’s suggestion that prevails, in that further negotiation concerns the spatial extent of the zone, rather than the specific management measures involved in the zoning. A key reason for this, I believe, is that the local knowledge contributing to this spatial theme – knowledge of where particular habitats are, of where ‘the guys’ go, of seasonal events (such as whale migration), of existing and proposed developments, and so on – is shared by more of the committee members than either the scientific knowledge (‘fish communities where ... snapper aggregate’) or the technical management knowledge that Monty is performing. Thus, the spatial talk provides more members with better opportunities to be involved.

Indeed, as discussion progresses, knowledge performance becomes the principal feature structuring the conversation. In Fragment 10.20, for example, as throughout most of the negotiation phases in Meeting 6, opinions (‘I could happily see ...’) and suggestions/demands are given meaning by accumulating items of information/knowledge (coral, geomorphology, whales, turtles, dugongs), most often realised in existential clauses (‘there’s a ...’; ‘there’s some ...’) and in identifying clauses where the identified is a location/reference to the map (‘the tip there ... is a ...’).
**Fragment 10.19: Alpha Meeting 6, Zoning**

Monty: For example, I know there's a lot of recreational fishers fish along the edge of the shoal.

Mark: Ooh, yeh. I, I can see it, a real big problem with that one!

Monty: But their only impact, probably, on a lot of that area, will be, there's anchor damage, okay?

Murray: {laughs}

Mark: If you brought the line in so that you're on top of the red, or just the other side of the red, would that, would that still help or not?

Dick: Er and I think that, I think that's exactly how you do it! I think you suggest one perspective,

Mark: {laughs}

Dick: {and someone else goes 'well I, I think if you did this you would mu', you'd get ninety percent of what you want, or you've suggested, but you'd get rid of this major {conflict!'

Monty: {Now.

Miles: {There might be in an area like --

Monty: There might be in an area like that some special features of say the fish communities where ah s, snapper aggregate at certain times of year, or, or whatever, but that doesn't have to be {dealt with. There's no --

Max: {I think what Mark's trying to say is that red is shallow {reef! Very few fishermen go

Mark: {That that's the one we would --

Max: and sit on top of it with their boat! {But just outside of it's good fishing! {And so --

Mark: {Yeh. So we'd, we'd --

Monty: {Yep, if you came into the, to the red line there, to, to where your, your main exposed reef is with your green line, so okay, it starts from there! Then you, yeh! I couldn't see a problem with that, cos the guys would fi', mainly fish on the other side. There's the odd one or two that come inside, but not that many, so you really wouldn't be affecting that.

**Fragment 10.20: Alpha Meeting 6, Zoning (not in sequence)**

Morrie: O' on the ah, north western end there there's, there's just a really thin veneer of coral --

Monty: Mm.

Morrie: -- there, but there's some other overhang like, overhangs which grows and things.

{So, got some interest for divers, but not necessarily for fishing.

Monty: {Yeh.

Monty: Yeh.

Morrie: You wouldn't nece {ssarily {prefer to have that end in a no-take --

David: {So --

Monty: {And the s, the sperm whales come in pretty close to there

{too! They're no'--

Murray: {Humpbacks? Or --

Monty: Humpbacks, I mean! Yeh.

Morrie: The other thing is that the tip there, it is a major turtle aggregation area – just on the very tip of Rocky Island – pre-nesting. : And ah I, I for one would, I could happily see a box like that being a, a high level protection, because it's full of dugongs inside it; it's full of ah, ah, a turtle feeding area; and it's difficult to access anyway.
Returning to Fragment 10.19, another notable feature is that Dick’s meta-
commentary on the negotiation procedure (‘... *that’s exactly how you do it!* ...’) is
almost completely ignored (apart from Mark’s brief acknowledgement). In contrast
to the voting phases, Alpha’s non-executive members generally did not engage with
procedural issues during negotiation phases. Rather, they enthusiastically embraced
opportunities both to suggest ‘concrete’ ideas, and to perform their own knowledge.

10.2.2 Meeting 7: Rocky Island

In later meetings, negotiation phases followed similar patterns – suggestions or
requests punctuating input that appealed to external ‘facts’ – but with some key
differences.

Ownership

First, suggestions often came from the written submissions received following
DOMM’s *de facto* public consultation periods. In responding to those suggestions,
discourse often turned to setting principles, both for evaluation of the submissions
(Chapter 7, 7.3) and for the zoning. While principles the committee developed in
this way were often similar to those that DOMM had attempted to impose at Meeting
6 (Chapter 9, 9.2.1), it was through their negotiations at Meeting 7 that members
explicitly began to adopt them for themselves.

In Fragment 10.21, Mark ‘owns’ the principle (‘*my philosophy*’) – previously
expounded by DOMM – that fewer and bigger zones would be better than more
smaller ones, and invites the rest of the committee to share it by contrasting low
probability of the doubt (‘*maybe my philosophy’s wrong*’) with high probability of
his own authority (‘*I’ve certainly looked at this*’). As an argument against the
suggestion that the zone be reduced, the principle differs from the ‘facts’ that
dominated debate in Meeting 6, in that it is expressed as an opinion (not a fact) using
‘authentic’ appraisal (‘*the better off we’re gonna be*’). However, there is still no
appeal to personal interests: it is the inclusive ‘*we*’ that will be better off, and for
abstract reasons – the notion that bigger zones are more effective is a management
principle, not a justice one.
Mark: Um, the only problem I can see is while, while I understand where they were coming from, um there are other areas in the archipelago that they could utilise for the same thing. Um, and whether there are other areas in the archipelago that we could actually get that much diversity from one area.

Morrie: No way!

Mark: I mean my, my – maybe my philosophy's wrong, but I've certainly looked at this – and if we can get three or four big ones that cover everything, rather than fifteen or twenty small ones that cover bits and pieces, the, the better off we're gonna be. …
Barter

As the debate over how to respond to submissions progresses, however, a new pattern emerges, in which quantities begin to structure suggestions, and abstract negotiation becomes personal. Matt’s suggestion in Fragment 10.22 for amending the zone is framed as ‘reduce[ing]’ it to/by a quantitative proportion (‘half way down’; ‘fifty percent’). This quantitative framing suggests a limited resource which must be shared: a zero-sum game (see Dale et al. 1999: 943 on the importance of ‘expanding the pie’ to avoid a zero-sum game). Here, Matt’s suggestion is pre-justified in terms of the concerns and desires of people outside the committee – recreational game fishers and divers. There is still a strong division between ‘they’ in Matt’s justification and the inclusive ‘we’ in the suggestion itself (‘we could bring it ... ’).

However, when an objection appears, that division vanishes. In Fragment 10.23, given the received assumption that their zoning system needs to be representative, Miles, Morrie, Murray and Dick are clearly raising an abstract objection to reducing the Rocky Island zone. They are doing so cooperatively; their interruptions are supportive. Faced with this apparently unified opposition, Matt assumes solidarity with the recreational fishers and divers, and reframes the suggestion as a direct request from the first person (‘what we’re asking for ... ’). And the justification is no longer in terms of either external ‘facts’ (such as habitats or the concerns of other stakeholders) or management principles (such as ‘bigger is better’), but in terms of fairness (‘a fair request’).

It seems to me that Matt shifts here from generalised and abstract considerations to personal ones, at the same time framing the debate as a zero-sum game (‘what we’re asking for is just fifty percent’). That is, he is bartering – resolution is to be a fair quantitative compromise (a matter of give and take), rather than an objective best solution. In sum, such an approach to negotiation might be called (in Elster’s terms) ‘bargaining’ rather than ‘argument’.

Rationalisation

However, the bartering approach never comes to dominate the debate entirely. Where factual, abstract and rational arguments are used to justify or counter
Fragment 10.22: Alpha Meeting 7, Rocky Island sanctuary zone

Matt: There's a couple of concerns from the urn, recreational fishing side ah, game fishing side. The, the northern boundary -- : And also the diving side - those dropoffs - : I've spoken to a lot of divers in relation to it as well - and um, they'd like to see that northern boundary reduced.

Morrie: From which end, do you think, Matt?

Matt: Well, probably thinking with this other deep port and whatever, it, maybe that, if we could bring it maybe half way down or something like that, that ah y, I guess you'd call it the western end? : On the northern side? : : : Reduce it about y'know sort of fifty percent, or -- : There is a really nice dropoff --

Fragment 10.23: Alpha Meeting 7, Rocky Island sanctuary zone

Miles: Have we got other dropoffs? We must have {other drop {off.
Matt: {We have!
Mark: {We have. We've got --
Matt: We have.
Morrie: Like {Rocky Island, though?
Murray: {But we --
Murray: But, n, not {like Rocky Island, {cos it's {the only rocky {island!
Dick: {No. : {No. {It's the only {rock--
Morrie: {Rocky Island's --
Matt: {No.
Morrie: {Like that.
Matt: {Yeh. But, but what we've, but what we're asking for is just fifty percent! And I mean, and I think that's a fair request. It's a, an area that does get fished a lot, and dived a lot, : and I think fifty percent is um, is a fair request!
requests/offers, they are often responded to in kind. Fragment 10.24 illustrates how the discussion shifts between bargaining, based on requests and offers to share a quantified resource (using the lighthouse as a boundary indicator, congruently rejected by Matt), and argument, based on facts and distanced/generalised interests. In this case it is a DOMM officer, Dick, who conducts the shift, with a statement of facts about 'the museum's point of view' and the site's uniqueness. In their responses to Dick's counterargument, Morrie immediately adopts the 'fact' approach, albeit softening it by projecting it as their own opinion ('I reckon ... that ... that first third ...') and Matt, though initially sustaining the zero-sum framing, likewise shifts after a short delay ('The ... further south you come ...').

This shifting between bargaining and argument is the key discursive characteristic of what I am calling 'negotiation'. Requests and offers, even when made on personal grounds, are debated in rationalist terms – of facts, abstractions and generalised principles which the negotiating parties can be assumed or persuaded to share. Through such rationalisation, the zero-sum game of compromise becomes, discursively, one of mutual gains; the value of fairness becomes that of correctness.  

At Meeting 7, as we have seen (Chapter 7, 7.3), the resolution of the Rocky Island zone actually hinged not on negotiation but on the committee's acceptance of the museum's expression of their views (Fragment 10.25). In spite of lengthy (approximately 35 minutes) negotiations, then, the zone was left unaltered.

10.2.3 Meeting 8: Rocky Island

After the seventh meeting, the Scrubfield Fishing and Diving Association held their three public meetings. Matt and Mark, who each chaired at least one of these meetings, strongly encouraged SFDA members to submit comments in writing so that their concerns could be mobilised in Alpha's meetings. It seemed to me that, along with those Alpha colleagues who attended, they also defended the committee's previous decisions in the face of some hostility, portraying those decisions as based on 'the best information at the time' and, thus, adding impetus to the need for written input from the recreational sector.

The sanctuary zone at Rocky Island was one of the key points of contention at SFDA's meetings. It became the subject of a form letter, of which 88 copies were
Fragment 10.24: Alpha Meeting 7, Rocky Island sanctuary zone

Miles: The l, the light house'd be a good reference point.
Mutt: (Oh.

Mutt: No, we'd like to come further down past the lighthouse!

Dick: This is one of the most important sites from the museum's point of view.

Murray: Yep.

Dick: There is no other site like this in the area! So take that off and, or you take significant amounts of that off, and I reckon you --

Morrie: Yeh. (Well I, I, I reckon, Dick, that, though, that first third of the island,
Mutt: (Well, we're not talking about all of it! That's --

Morrie: from the north west tip, is physically, looks exactly th, the same.

Mutt: Yes. And it --

Morrie: Y'know I wou ld, I

Mutt: The, actually er the further south you come, y you get more gutters and, and more um, different corals! It's more rocky up the northern end. And, and from the lighthouse down it's a big slab. You'd need to see what on, w, where that big dropoff is is a big slab that's fallen off that's y'know probably about seven or eight ton! Whereas up this end it's, it's more ahm, as I was saying, gutters and small corals, coral colonies.

Fragment 10.25: Alpha Meeting 7, Rocky Island sanctuary zone

Mark: I mean I d, the guys have told me they want it taken out. But after reading that, reading it, I have to say that there's nowhere else that I've seen that the museum has said 'must be included'. So, so that to me means that it must be very significant for them to've, have gone to those lengths, to put that, to call that word!
submitted to Alpha for consideration at Meeting 8, and which suggested that a
certain bay on the island be removed from the proposed zone and left open to
exploitation by recreational anglers and divers. The proposal of the form letter was
substantially repeated in a presentation by a local diver, Otto, on Day 1 of the
meeting, following which the committee agreed to compromise, conditional on
keeping the site of concern to the museum within the zone (Fragment 10.26).
However, the actual location of the museum’s site was now in doubt (apparently due
to somebody misreading a map). The committee returned to the issue on Day 2 to
finalise the zone boundaries.

DOMM had conferred overnight with museum staff, and it transpired that the
museum’s site for inclusion and the recreational users’ site for excision were
precisely the same bay. The committee, therefore, was faced with a new dilemma,
forcing them to revisit their decision (Fragment 10.27).

Impasse

By this time, members had adopted the role of powerful dispensers of justice – in the
form of zoning changes – to the supplicants who came before them either personally
or by writing (Chapter 7, 7.3). Grammatically, in Fragment 10.27 ‘we’ consistently
acts to benefit (or not) others (‘cater ... for Otto’; ‘satisfy them’). In this case, they
have attributed worth to both the museum’s demand and that of the recreational
groups represented by Otto. The total incompatibility of those demands, and the fact
that neither party is now present (Otto did not stay for the second day; neither did
Matt or Mark), make the decision difficult and bring framing conflicts to the surface.
Thus, the previously easy oscillation between rational argument and compromise/
bargaining that characterises Alpha’s zoning negotiations now becomes a tension.

In Fragment 10.28, Murray focuses on the rational achievement of outcomes
(‘doesn’t service that ...’; ‘if shifting it up’s not gonna do that ...’), while Mike’s
opinions are structured by quantity, making bargaining possible (‘the whole lot’).
The two framings are no longer compatible – means-ends argument is not (or cannot be)
used to justify a compromise – and the moves become non-supportive negations
and rechallenges.
Fragment 10.26: Alpha Meeting 8, Day 2, Rocky Island sanctuary zone
Mike: Okay? Then, then my recollection of our discussion yesterday was that we were going to include that, include the museum site, but that we were gonna remove a section of this: um: seaward side: to reflect the fact that there needed to be public access: on that side of the island.

Fragment 10.27: Alpha Meeting 8, Day 2, Rocky Island sanctuary zone
Mike: Yeh, but I, I don't think Otto's site in particular is, I don't know that we're, : : can cater entirely for Otto! {I think that that --
Murray: {Yeh! Well, : Otto and eighty others!
Mike: Yeh! But the museum was pointing out that that area, and as {you said yester {day, is, is the area {of high diversity! So --
Murray: {Mm. {Yep. {Yep.
Murray: Yep. But by, : by changing it where [sighs] that, that particular group want the exclusion, are we really going to satisfy them?
Merv: Probably not.
Martin: No.
Murray: So why exclude it?

Fragment 10.28: Alpha Meeting 8, Rocky Island sanctuary zone
Murray: But, but the chunk that services the boating requirements, which was that top end. : S, coming back further south down the island doesn't service that safe boating.
Merv: Well hang {on, just {back --
Mike: {Yes, it {can!
Murray: {They still safe, {they've still --
Mike: {It can't, because they put up that whole lot! They preferred the end bit, but the whole lot was put up!
...
Murray: I don't think moving it up er, will service what -- : Why are we shifting it? Just to, to appease an interest group! And so if shifting it up's not gonna do that, we'll have to shift it down if we do anything. ...
The catalyst for resolving this decision was a ‘scientific perspective’ presented and later elaborated by DOMM staff, which undermined the museum’s position (‘must be included’) and provided for ‘rational’ compromise with the recreational sector (Fragment 10.29). David presents this new perspective in general terms, phrasing it as an abstract principle rather than a statement about Rocky Island (‘in a ... place where you’ve got ... ’); this is in keeping with DOMM’s assumed role as advisers and information resources, rather than participants in decision making. Mike’s checking move relates the principle directly to the issue at hand, through the use of specific referents (‘the museum’; ‘it’s [the Rocky Island site is] high fish diversity’; ‘it should remain ... ’); that is, Mike asks David to commit to an opinion about Rocky Island itself. However, that opinion remains abstract, a management principle expressed as modulation rather than personal preference (‘you don’t think ... it should’ vs. *you don’t want it to). Rationality dominates, allowing the committee to escape their dilemma by countering the museum’s (rational) opinion.

When the chairperson calls for a decision, the debate’s mixture of compromise and rational argument is invoked explicitly as the ‘rationale’ for what is to become a unanimous position. In Fragment 10.30, Murray gives two reasons: one is about distributing justice to interest groups (‘the committee has given something ’), and the ‘public perception’ that creates (‘the process will look a bit flawed’), and the other is about (modalised) fact (‘fish diversity is probably all the way along ... ’). Each reason is then paraphrased by another member. Thus, the nature of Alpha’s negotiation discourse – rationally argued compromise/bargaining – is neatly packaged in this example.

10.2.4 Meeting 9: Rocky Island

The ninth meeting was the last time the committee met before the release of the management plan. Its purpose was to finalise the plan, including the zoning system. There had not been any ‘official’ public consultation following Meeting 8, apart from the usual mailout to sector consultation groups; however, there had been vigorous discussion within the recreational angling community, including an article damning the Rocky Island zone in a popular fishing magazine.
**Fragment 10.29: Alpha Meeting 8, Rocky Island sanctuary zone (not in sequence)**

David: I er, I mean, I mean really from a, I guess from a scientific perspective, in a hi', place where you've got high diversity would be, is, is great to put in a sanctuary zone, obviously, for obvious reasons, because it's an area of high biodiversity! Um, but it doesn't, the fact that, if you didn't put that in a sanctuary zone it's unlikely you're gonna lose that biodiversity: by having activities, if they're managed in an appropriate way. ...

Mike: So y, so you don't think that because the museum has said that it's high fish diversity that it sh, that it necessarily means that it should remain as a sanctuary?

---

**Fragment 10.30: Alpha Meeting 8, Rocky Island sanctuary zone**

Murray: I accept the boundary coming back to the land boundary on the lighthouse land, for boat users.

... [clarifying locations on the map]

Merv: For c, what's your rationale behind that?

Murray: Going on what David said before – that: (1): public perception: of: the committee has given something: that a majority of em want, and it may benefit the whole reserve. If we don't do it, maybe the process will look a bit flawed. And the other comment David made is that that fish diversity is probably all the way along that, that reef. ...

Miles: There's enough of em under {there, and um --

Chair: {Olive branch!
The first substantive item at Meeting 9 was Mark's dramatic withdrawal from the planning process, citing opposition to zoning as a management tool. Following this, Matt made a less 'radical' presentation requesting significant changes to three of the proposed zones, including Rocky Island.

**Ambiguity**

Fragment 10.31 shows Matt's introduction. His requests are explicitly framed in terms of 'compromise' – in this context, a zero-sum game in which the committee 'gives' to supplicants. But this introduction contains two important additional moves. First, Matt displays authority in terms of local politics, both as a representative ('representing the ... wider community') and as an expert ('I have a lot to do with the general community ...'). Second, his criticism of the process so far ('the committee hasn't absorbed ...') is related to 'the information that we've received', a face-saving move which is immediately elaborated at length: the influential input from the museum was flawed.

There are, therefore, three elements to Matt's presentation: the requests; an information-based argument against the committee's previous decisions; and a political dimension which is foregrounded in the presentation's final words (Fragment 10.32). These final paragraphs – the prominent 'macro-new' (Martin 1992: 437) of Matt's monologue – are explicitly political. The key justification for the requested changes is that, without them, *the general public will not support this ... proposal*, and the potential of that lack of support is emphasised through invocation of particular politicians whose influence over the reserve's eventual implementation is known to the committee. Further, in spite of positioning himself as a supplicant ('cap in hand'), Matt displays his own power as president of the SFDA ('members'; 'I've asked them ...'). This show of power (or at least of nuisance value) might be understood as a (thinly) veiled threat – a common element of negotiations.

In spite of its prominence, though, this political element was not highlighted in the debate itself. Rather, the discussion centred, as usual, on factual/abstract justifications and on 'fairness' associated with quantitative distribution. Matt uses both framings freely, adapting to cues from other members (Fragments 10.33-34).
Fragment 10.31: Alpha Meeting 9, Member presentations
Matt: Yeah, I guess: um, as you can see, today ... I'm sort of wearing the um, the hat of representing the um, the community – the wider community. As you know, ... I have a lot to do with the general community that do get out there and fish, dive, fish extraction, and whatever else .... And I guess: : one of the things that – hearing what Mark's got to say, and er the general public – I think it's; : er its' probably a good time to introduce a word called 'compromise'!

Murray: [laughs lightly]
Matt: We've been using that quite a lot, : this committee, towards the general public in relation to their submissions. My honest opinion is that this committee : hasn't absorbed and taken on board that word, : especially when we come into consideration of all the public submissions, and the, and the general people's feelings that are out there. :: Um, a lot of that's to do I guess with the information that we've received ...

Fragment 10.32: Alpha Meeting 9, Member presentations
Matt: ... These : : appear to be the three main issues: that : the general public will not support : this um, proposal for a marine reserve in its current state. So I come here today, with my cap in hand, requesting that this committee : consider making these, these changes. :: Um, it would be greatly appreciated: ::

I know that : members've already had meetings, with [the local member] and, and with [the Minister for Fishing] in relation to it. : I've asked em to hold off until the outcome of this meeting, to see whether we can compromise. I really believe there is room in there for us to manoeuvre and satisfy everyone.

Thanks for that time!

Fragment 10.33: Alpha Meeting 9, Rocky Island sanctuary zone
Matt: ... I've been up there and made a point of diving this area, and I'm very very concerned about the small size of it, er cos I really believe – honestly – that if it's left at that size – it's a very very popular dive site, because of the deep water – and that, : with the extraction rate, that area will be completely denuded; I, I would say it'd be a couple of years. And, and I really believe that {part of the solution would be to : :

Debbie: {Yeh.

Matt: I guess spread the p, the ah, pressure further over : um,a bigger area! And also, as I mentioned earlier, the species of fish that are there that are targeted by the recreational users : um, aren't that great. ... So it really is {just a couple of species.

Miles: {Well, --

Miles: So on the northern side it comes half way down the island?
Thus, the political dimension does not come into overt play during the negotiation. However, I believe that Matt’s political comments actually frame his apparent acceptance of the committee’s (majority, rather than unanimous) resolution, which is to change the zone more or less as Matt requested (Fragment 10.35).

In Fragment 10.32, a (negative) logical association was created between Matt’s ‘members’ lobbying politicians and the committee’s ‘satisfy[ing] everyone’: there is an implication that Matt will pursue, or allow his ‘members’ to pursue, political means if the ‘outcome of this meeting’ is not satisfactory to them (‘I’ve asked them to hold off until ... to see whether we can compromise’). If this logical connection is taken as the context for Matt’s comment in Fragment 10.35, the invocation of ‘the ... community’ can be understood as a reminder that his support is conditional. Thus, the comment takes on quite a different meaning than personal agreement – which was how it was understood by everyone present (including me) at the time.

In the event, ‘the community’ – that is, Matt’s colleagues in the SFDA – opposed not the amended Rocky Island zone specifically, but a range of general issues to do with the marine reserve, including the number and size of zones, the apparent concessions made to commercial industries, and the lack of explicit commitment to involve recreational anglers (‘the community’) in ongoing management. This led to Matt’s and Mark’s lobbying efforts, and consequent major alterations to the committee’s management plan before it was released for public comment (Chapter 4, 4.3.1). While negotiation frequently led to consensual agreements, then, those agreements were not as consistently stable as those made by voting: they were revisited repeatedly not only in the light of new information/interests, but also in relation to implicit framings that rendered some members’ consent conditional.

10.3 Conclusion: deliberative democracy at work, for now

Alpha successfully achieved agreement and made decisions according to a traditional deliberative framework. Their most consistent strategy was a discursive mix of quantitatively structured bargaining, which appealed to values such as fairness and equity, and rationalist argument, which appealed to facts and abstract principles that were assumed to be shared. I have labelled this style of decision making ‘negotiation’: the rationalist element justifies the compromises reached – even where
**Fragment 10.34: Alpha Meeting 9, Rocky Island sanctuary zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Go down further. Yeh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>To there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Yeh. Just {give us a --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>{About five and a half Ks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Five, {: I think five Ks {is fair!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monty</td>
<td>{But, er {I think if we just, that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{bay where it ends, it might be a little bit too far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>{[inaudible] the sanctuary!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monty</td>
<td>Just because you see that the nature of the reef, the fringing reef starts to extend: south of there, and you're getting into slightly different --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>The gutters, {you mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monty</td>
<td>{So it would be good to get just a little bit back, so that you've still got some of that straight drop off edge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fragment 10.35: Alpha Meeting 9, Rocky Island sanctuary zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Thank you very much for that! We, I'm cer, sure the, the ah community will really appreciate that!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
these are reached in the context of threats or coercion – in terms of a public interest or ‘mutual gains’ (Fisher et al. 1999). While some of the agreements reached this way were conditional and/or temporary, they generally received the endorsement of the whole committee when they appeared in the minutes. Where agreement was difficult to achieve through negotiation, a ‘consensus’ was accomplished via a ‘procedurally just’ voting technique that met most of the members’ needs for accountability.

In sum, Alpha’s decision making discourse appears to support the framework posited by Jon Elster. Moreover, the committee constructed deliberative norms – in particular their voting procedures and methods for acknowledging and ‘taming’ agonism – through discourse, reaching consensus on such procedural matters with relative ease. Thus, the case study seems broadly to support Habermasian principles of deliberative democracy (Barber 1984; Dryzek 1990; Young 1990, 2000; Benhabib 1996a; Gutmann and Thompson 1996; Elster 1998a): Habermas’ practical discourse can be (in my terms) an appropriate metaprocess through which shared norms can be constructed in the face of strangeness.

Yet, after the achievement of Alpha’s major goal – the management plan – many of the committee members remained unhappy with the process and/or its outcome. In particular, a majority felt that DOMM’s control of the process had undermined members’ sense of ownership. This disconcerting result suggests that, as a number of critics have suggested (Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998; Fischler 2000; Phelps and Tewdwr-Jones 2000; Yiftachel and Huxley 2000; Pløger 2001), the adoption of communicative action principles at the micro level is insufficient either to secure consensus, to satisfy participants as to procedural fairness, or to address the problem of unequal power relationships. Alpha’s deliberative arenas, at the meeting level, were transparent, supportive of different opinions, and self-regulatory: all qualities that Healey (2004a) associates with creative potential. However, such qualities were less evident from a more holistic perspective. Neither DOMM’s substantive values (such as scientific knowledge and administrative integrity), nor their shaping of the overall procedure, nor their ultimate control over Alpha’s resources (for example, for public consultation – Chapter 9, 9.2.1) were open to challenge.
Moreover, members' success in establishing norms for decision making can be seen as actually reinforcing DOMM's power, by allowing the committee to move on according to DOMM's linear agenda. The better Alpha became at resolving immediate conflicts 'for now', through established negotiation and voting conventions, the less likely members became to step outside of the agenda to deal with meta-issues such as power and trust (as they did in the early stages of the process – Chapter 7, 7.1). Alpha's decision making thus illustrates some complex tensions between institutional 'levels' (Coaffee and Healey 2003). Alpha were able to control and politicise their meetings to and, thus, to take ownership of institutional norms and relations within 'specific episodes'. However, by doing so, the committee may have reduced its ultimate influence over DOMM's overall governance processes and culture.

While it is beyond the scope of this enquiry to pursue Alpha's negotiated practices into these 'deeper' levels, DOMM's reported 'lessons' from Alpha (Chapter 9, 9.3.1) appear mostly to be the product of officers' own reflections. These included reflection on Alpha's consensus-building practices, both in staff meetings and in interviews with me. On the basis of those interviews, DOMM officers have no intention of imposing similar practices on future committees, preferring to leave such details to members and individual chairpersons. However, two points might be noted: the officers have learnt that such strategies are effective, at least in achieving immediate closure; and Alpha's deliberation was subject to tight constraints – most importantly a particular kind of 'balanced' rationality – imposed by DOMM, many of which are likely to be repeated. It would be interesting to see how the evolution of future committees' decision making reflects these lessons and constraints.

Alpha's achievements occurred in the context of an outcomes-driven process with strong leadership from the chairperson and a reflective executive. In Chapter 11, I interrogate the very different decision making discourse of my other case study, whose initial conditions included neither strong leadership nor a clear outcomes-oriented task.
11 Strange Practices: Beta’s decision making

Chapter 10 described the deliberative construction of and agreement to Alpha’s decision-making norms. The processes through which Alpha achieved this agreement were ordered and, like the committee’s negotiation of framing conflicts (Chapter 7), often explicitly ideationalised (for example, Fragments 10.15, 10.30). They may have been made possible by the strong role played by Alpha’s chairperson, who continually kept in mind DOMM’s need for an outcome, and who demanded closure of every agenda item, using a voting procedure if necessary. In this chapter, I present some of the decisions, and non-decisions, made by Beta, which was not subject to the same level of control as Alpha (Chapter 9). The analysis suggests that, in this case, successful resolution of agenda items relied on the emergence of more idiosyncratic approaches which allowed expression of different rationalities. The chapter concludes with a summary of the approaches noted in the two case studies and the identification of some discursive symptoms of constructive dialogue. However, it also notes that such a summary is temporal and contingent; that is, what worked for these cases was so context-sensitive that it does not translate straightforwardly into any universal principles.

Beta, as Chapter 9 (9.1.2) explains, had conflict resolution at its heart from the beginning. Originating in the dispute between the LAG and SOHE over changes to the Shire’s zoning scheme, the issues became more complex and unwieldy with the introduction of the port management’s concerns in Meeting 1. Nonetheless, conflict continued to revolve around a single issue: the permissibility of residential use in Lumbervale. Below, I look at three instances of unsuccessful decision making on issues related to this conflict, followed by five instances of successful decision making, where agreement was reached. What emerges is that, for Beta, ‘standard’ deliberative approaches of argument and bargaining tended to lead nowhere. Substantive decisions made were more often the incidental outcome of the committee’s working on organisational and interpersonal matters. In particular, I identify three recurring patterns of discourse which seemed to lead to substantive outcomes: I label these ‘procedurising’, ‘rebuilding’ and ‘backgrounding’.
11.1 Argument

11.1.1 Meeting 3: the need for accommodation in industrial areas

Following Council’s endorsement of Beta’s newly-agreed objectives (Chapter 7, 7.1; see opposite), Beta devoted their third and fourth meetings to going through those objectives as tasks. In particular, they decided to concentrate on Objective 1.3: ‘Investigate the availability of land for future light industry …’. The key characteristic of ‘light industry’, as framed by Beta’s objectives, is not the type of industrial uses present, but the addition of residential uses – ‘caretaker dwellings’ – to the land-use mix.

Premises

Before beginning on ‘Objective 1.3’, the port manager, Sam, questions the assumption that there is going to be a real need for such ‘light industrial’ land (Fragment 11.1). His point is first posed as a factual question about the future existence of an abstract thing – ‘an ongoing demand’. As such, it sets the tone for the following discussion, which continually appeals to facts and technical abstractions. Semantically dense abstracts ('facility', 'cost saver', 'businesses') predominate and, although Sam is asking for an opinion, that opinion is actually a projected fact, with no appraisal, modalisation or modulation^2 except to indicate that the case is hypothetical (‘light industry that might come along today’). The hypothetical case is one of the most frequently used and effective means of generalising from event to principle in oral discourse (Iedema 2003a: 103-04, 185-86).

What Sam is doing, then, is attempting to establish a principle – a premise upon which further debate and agreements can be logically based. The premise that he wants to establish is that having no ‘facility’ for light industry with attached dwellings is unlikely to harm the town – presumably, such a premise could logically be extended to Lumbervale itself. This intention becomes obvious in Fragment 11.2, in which the ‘wrong’ answer from Cr Burt prompts Sam to repeat the question, elaborating extensively to make his meaning absolutely clear. The discourse continues to deal in facts and abstractions: even though Cr Burt’s response to Sam is somewhat evasive (because it addresses the past rather than the future), it avoids
uncertainty apart from projecting the fact in the final summary ('I would say ... that was the incentive'), with the modalising adjunct *probably* being corrected before it is completed. What is at stake is Cr Burt's understanding of the world outside the committee, rather than an evaluation.

Some patterns are also evident in the turn taking. Sam, who is attempting to guide the ideational direction of the discussion, takes quite long turns, with interjections mainly restricted to acknowledgements and registers. Even when interrupted, people tend to complete their turns rather than allowing others to do so (in contrast with the collaborative meaning making in, for example, Alpha's Fragment 10.3, or Beta's Fragment 8.20). Sam repeats Burt's attempt to complete the turn ('Is it gonna put business off?') with no explicit textual cohesion, at the same time asking him to commit to the idea by projecting it as his own view ('Do you think ...? Do you really think ...?'). Also, when examined at this level, discussion tends locally to be between two people, rather than involving general participation.

Twice more, Sam receives the 'wrong' answer to his question of principle, first from Barbara (Fragment 11.3), then from Barry (Fragment 11.4). Barbara and Barry are, in different ways, unequivocal in supporting the need for caretakers' dwellings. In each case, Sam repeats the question, again suggesting (rather than overtly stating) his own disbelief with 'really' and framing it as a question of fact.

**Quarrel**

Sam's attempt to establish a premise for argument was unsuccessful to the extent that the discussion became repetitive rather than reaching agreement. An attempt by the DOP planner, Sue, to close the debate moved it into a new phase. In Fragment 11.5, Sean (a DOE officer) initiates a new pattern of responding to claims in favour of caretakers' dwellings not by repeating the question, as Sam had done, but by presenting counterarguments. Sean's questions demand not a polar rethink of the general principle, but enhancement (or explanation) of the principle: making explicit the underlying causes of the 'demand' exposes them to argument on more fundamental grounds. In spite of Sue's evident desire not to revisit the issue – her invocation of the DOP's position as a higher authority; her unwillingness to be specific about the 'whole range of reasons'; her decisive statement of facts (albeit
Beta’s revised group objectives (adopted by Council after Meeting 2)

1 Identify and recommend strategies to seek the provision of land suitable for general industry use in the District of the Shire of Harbourtown and Environs for those industries that are not compatible with caretakers’ dwellings.

1.1 Identify and protect strategic industrial interests of the key stakeholders in the municipality, namely:
   a) Shire of Harbourtown and Environs
   b) Port management
   c) Realty Australia
   d) State Government
   e) Department of Industry
   f) Lumbervale Action Group
   g) Local Business
   h) Municipality as a whole

1.2 Examine the feasibility of zoning Lumbervale for Light Industry.

1.3 Investigate the availability of land for the establishment of future light industry, including the expansion of Lumbervale.

Fragment 11.1: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Sam: Can I just ask one question before we do? Eh, cos ‘identifying alternative light industry sites’ : erm assumes that ah, there'll be an ongoing demand for people to live and work in, in the southern, same location.

Sue: Yes.

Sam: Er er, is that the case today? If um – y ‘know I know that the ah, facility’s been there, so that's been desirable, it's been a cost saver – but er, Burt, do you see businesses – ah light industry that might come along today – if they weren't able to live with their business, that they would leave Harb, not go to stay in Harbourtown?

Fragment 11.2: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Cr Burt: Well that, that, one of the ones that went through our application that appealed was, was basically he, he had to live on site to um service his trucks and security reasons and stuff like that, and he put that through, and that was prob, it's a good reason why he's got it. I would say years ago that was {the incentive.

Sam: (But the, the, if it was in the future; what I’m getting at is that n next year, if the zoning scheme is through, and there's no more {approval for er y'know, that's not an issue.

Cr Burt: {Yep.

Sam: Um, and I've heard the security reason put up lots of times myself, and I've received ap {plications like that in port and harbour a {reas.

Cr Burt: {Yep. {Mm. Yeh.

Sam: Um, ah, and ah, but in the future, without that option – they wouldn't have that option if it was just : Lumbervale, as a lot, as an, as as an area, ah has industrial ah, facilities, but no caretakers’ residence allowed,

{no more caretakers' residence allowed – {do you, do you think that --

Cr Burt: {Eh? {Is it gonna put business off?

Sam: Do you think that it'll put business off? Do you really think it would?
Fragment 11.3: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Barbara: If there was not the ability to have a caretaker's residence, that business would die.

Sam: Yeh, maybe it would be, but if there's not, would they really just not come to Harbourtown?

Fragment 11.4: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Barry: I think you gotta look at the [region] as a whole. And it seems to be a characteristic of the, the [region] as um, light industry to have caretakers' quarters! : [Town 1], um down in whatsiname, that, in [town 2] --

... [clarification of provisions in town 2]

Barry: Down at [town 3], right throughout the [region], ah, light industry, it's entrenched that um that people live on the, the site. : : : {And um

Sam: {I know. But we're looking, we're looking to the future. Looking to the future, and ah, I'm saying that the, er is it really going to put this town's development backwards if in future - from now on - people don't have an option?

Fragment 11.5: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Sue: The DOP have als', they've been on a bit of a learning curve about the caretakers issue, :
and has pretty much realised that there is a demand for it in the [region], and that it's part of the culture here, and that it will always be here.

Sean: Because of the cost? Not because of the security? Is that right?

Barbara: {Well, --
Sue: {A whole range of reasons really, whole range of reasons.

Sean: But surely security is something, a c, a commercial security arrangement between people moving into a light industrial area could be something that, that could be set up.
{And so there's --
Sue: {It, I don't think security's the major reason.
projected by 'I don't think' in the last case) – it is Sean who sets the direction for the debate at this point.

Lexicogrammatical and register patterns are largely sustained as the argument moves from one phase to the next. Ideationally, facts independent of the committee, relational processes and abstractions ('issue', 'demand', 'culture', 'cost', 'security', 'reasons') still predominate. Interpersonally, modalisation is restricted to metaphorical projection of facts, direction-setting turns tend to be quite long and locally the discussion tends to involve two people only – Barbara’s attempt to break into the conversation is ignored.

However, two important differences in the exchange dynamics emerge as the debate continues. First, as noted above, direction is set by Sean’s developing and countering moves, rather than by Sam’s reopening moves. Second, non-supportive interruptions become more and more frequent. In Fragment 11.6, again, the conversation is between two people (Steve and Sean), who largely ignore Barbara’s attempts to enter it. Now, though, both parties are engaging in countering moves, still in generalised/hypothetical terms (‘you’ is generic here), and logically connected to previous moves with contrastives ‘not’ or ‘but’. Moreover Steve, in particular, does not allow Sean to complete turns before countering. This non-supportive dynamic seems to ‘infect’ the rest of the committee: when the negative appraisal ‘lesser lifestyle’ appears in association with the generic ‘you’, it elicits a flurry of protest from the Lumbervale residents and their supporter Sue.3 I believe that Barry, at least, may have interpreted Sean’s ‘you’ as a literal second person, rather than as a generic.

There is no end to this discussion. The pattern of non-supportive counters between two people – albeit with some broader participation in ‘transitional’ moments such as the end of Fragment 11.6 – continues with little change until at last the debate’s initiator, Sam, suggests that they move on. Certainly no agreement is reached on the need for live-work opportunities, not even an ‘agreement to disagree’.

The combination of premise setting and argument-counterargument, with reference mainly to facts and abstract relations rather than interests or ideas, can be labelled ‘argument’ rather than ‘negotiation’. It involves few or no suggestions or
Fragment 11.6: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Steve: I suspect that the real reason behind it is that the entry level --

Sean: The, the cost of the extra block to put a house on up here? {Is --
Steve: {That's right. Well that's the point! Not with the cost of the block; it's the cost of {the house.
Barbara: {The --

Barbara: {I thought --
Sean: {But you've gotta build a house anyway, whether you put it on a caretaker's {block or --
Steve: {Yes but the level of dwelling that you would accept as a caretaker dwelling is vast {ly different --
Barbara: {Mm. Large difference.

Steve: -- to the level of dwelling that you have to {build so you can put it on a residential block.
Sean: {Alright, you -- Alright.

Sean: So are you accepting a lesser lifestyle here then, because you're prepared to live in a light industrial area?

Barbara: {Well not nec-- {It is different!
Sue: {It's diffe {rent!
Barry: {It's not a {lesser!}
quantitative bargaining, it appeals to a traditional kind of rationality, and relies on rational persuasion for its resolution. In Beta’s case, this type of ‘pure’ argument appeared frequently, and was almost always unsuccessful in resolving disputes. The following subsection discusses another attempt at premise setting from a later meeting, with a largely different set of participants.

11.1.2 Meeting 17: the future of Lumbervale

Meeting 17 followed the presentation of Colin’s Stage 2 report and the port planning study (PPS), in which two contradictory positions on Lumbervale (as a live-work light industrial area, as a general industrial area with no residential use) had been resemiotised as written recommendations of professional consultants. As the port management was represented on the committee, this made Beta’s report – the HIS – highly contentious and potentially difficult to finalise. To help the committee deal with this problem Simon, a senior officer from DOP, was brought in to help mediate. By this time Barry had been elected to Council and resigned from his position as LAG president. The new LAG president, Bruce, had joined Beta to maintain LAG’s membership of three.

Policy

Simon’s first major utterance (Fragment 11.7) is an attempt to establish a premise from which the committee can logically move forward. His turn is a very long monologue; in Fragment 11.7 it is significantly abridged, but I have retained what I see as the hyperthemes of each ‘paragraph’ to illustrate its organisation. This is highly bureaucratic discourse: not only does it display all the usual features marking it as such (lexical density, abstraction, unspecified agency, ‘performative’ rather than ‘authentic’ appraisal [Iedema and Grant 2004; see Appendix E]), it is also carefully structured according to the generic schema of a typical planning report to decision makers. It contains, in this order: a problem statement; background to the problem; current factors introducing urgency to the decision; implications of making the recommended decision; summary restating the problem. Moreover, the monologue is completely uninterrupted: although the other participants watched Simon attentively, they did not respond, even with registering murmurs or nods, until he had finished his report.
Simon: I think um, ... we d, we've come to a point now where ah, a fundamental decision has to be taken as to whether ah Lumbervale is an industrial area – and when we're talking about 'industry' in the context of Lumbervale, : ah, I think we're talking about a combination of light industry and general industry cos it's what exists – so fundamentally: what is it? Is it an industrial area, or is it something other than an industrial area : (and let's leave what that means just for the time being)?

It's always been established as an industrial area, and over the years it's become um, let's say 'compromised', ah by : ah, the, the introduction of non-industrial uses, and especially the ah, the introduction of caretakers' dwellings! ....

We have now obviously got ah, the ah, the impact of the, ah the port planning study, ah which calls into question ah, the future of Lumbervale in terms of its relationship to what the port would like to see ah, in its land area! ....

However, coming back to the point about Lumbervale as an industrial area, if the decision was to be taken to um, make Lumbervale : – let me call it a 'pure' industrial area – : then there would be some uses that ah, could no longer ah, exist there, : : and they would have to be um, found another home! Which comes back to the debate that we've been having: if you need to relocate, either by necessity or by choice, : where you put them? : .... : But also, in terms of ah the relocation, if you've got the issue of ah, if it's a forced relocation, ah what mechanism should be in place to compensate people? : Not only what mechanism's in place but who is responsible ah, for implementing that mechanism, and when do you start talking about compensation? What criteria do you use to assess the value that is associated with that compensation? And those are questions that ah, we don't have answers to at the moment. : : ....

So ah, I think there's, there's the fundamental issue: what's the future for Lumbervale? And there, depending on which way you go, there are consequential issues that have to be determined. So. : .... I'm just suggesting that that's a course of action that you're looking for.

* Note that Simon does not use the term 'light industrial' to mean 'industry with residences', as the Beta members do. This special usage has been constructed by Beta itself (11.3), and does not conform to the DOP definitions that frame Simon's talk.
The planning report genre evokes contexts (formal meetings of decision-making bodies such as Council) in which decisions are binding and can be assumed as background knowledge in future deliberations. Simon is clearly trying to fix a principle – that Lumbervale is an industrial area and not 'something other' – as the basis for further discussion. Unlike the principle Sam tried to establish in Meeting 3, however, this question does not demand commitment to a 'fact', but to a policy.

Other participants did not engage with Simon’s policy principle, however, focussing instead on the ‘facts’ involved. In Fragment 11.8, Bruce interprets and reacts to what he sees as negative implications of Simon’s claim that their homes have ‘compromised’ the integrity of the industrial area. Their moves, though generally polite, are unsupportive: counters, refutes and negates. They argue categorically ('this idea ... is wrong') on factual grounds, using modalisation and modalisation metaphors to project facts ('... my understanding that ...'), rather than to offer opinions.

The history of Lumbervale has been invoked and disputed repeatedly throughout Beta’s process as having a bearing on residents’ legitimacy not only from a legal or even a moral point of view, but also culturally – as true locals with prior claims on the land. Simon has not been part of these previous discussions and, without commenting on their validity, dismisses those claims as irrelevant to the present issue, going on to repeat the need to establish the principle (Fragments 11.9-10). Like Sam in Meeting 3, Simon is persistent in the face of opposition (or, in this case, disengagement) and continues to repeat the question when LAG members respond in what he sees as an inappropriate way (no other members participated in this discussion, although three local government employees and four other state government officers, including the port manager, were present). LAG members consistently appeal to the kind of disinterested logic – facts and abstract principles – that, in the framework developed in this thesis, characterises argument. Underlying this conversation is their suspicion that the purpose of the meeting is to endorse the port management’s point of view. They are, therefore, trying to persuade Simon – whom they do not see as a neutral party in spite of his nominal ‘mediating’ role – that the PPS position on Lumbervale is irrational, and should be discounted. Further, they wish to convince Simon that, discounting the port’s concerns, Beta’s consultant
Fragment 11.8: Beta Meeting 17, Stage 2 HIS report

Bruce: Simon, just a point: that you said that ah, Lumbervale started off as ah, as industrial then the residences came later. It was my understanding that it was set up as light industry and the residences were there from the start. ... But um, this idea of that it was set up as industrial from the start is wrong. It was set up as light industrial, with caretakers being allowed there right from the start. And there's the zoning that was changed in 1985 – and, and it's been pretty unclear as to the legitimacy of that change.

Fragment 11.9: Beta Meeting 17, Stage 2 HIS report

Simon: ... Um, however we now have a situation where there are a number of residences which are more than ah what you'd describe as a caretakers house. And whether they should or should not have been approved is, is really immaterial, cos they're there!

Cr Barry: {Hm.

Barbara: {It's irrelevant now, yeh.

Simon: Ah, it's a question of, of what you do. ah, with them from now on! ...
has made (objectively) the best recommendation. Hence, the argument, wherever direction is set by LAG, centres on the recommendations of the PPS, not the HIS.

**Alternatives**

LAG’s intention becomes abundantly clear as, similarly to Meeting 3, the argument shifts to a new phase of claims (by LAG members) and counter-claims (by Simon). The claims take the form of suggestions for alternative solutions to the dilemma: that the decision be deferred until there is a concrete proposal; that Lumbervale be zoned for light industry now and the residents be relocated if and when necessary; that the state refuse to allow major industry to locate in the port, directing them instead to Export Estate. However, these suggestions do not lead to the supportive negotiation of a solution, as usually happened in Alpha’s case. Rather, each is acknowledged then refuted by Simon (Fragments 11.11-12). And each of Simon’s counter-arguments is followed not by further countering, but by a new suggestion. The most common cohesive conjunction is the contrastive ‘but’ and, throughout, personal interests are not invoked.

There is one exception to this pattern, a brief exchange where the matter becomes personal (Fragment 11.13). Here, Bruce’s frustration with, and mistrust of, Simon leads him to abandon rationalist deliberation. Simon’s position is represented as strictly in favour of the port (‘you’re saying that the port can improve the value of their land’) and as a consequence against Bruce and his cohorts (‘at our cost’). This statement makes explicit a view that the issue is not a question of finding a rational solution, but a zero-sum game between strictly conflicting interests. Framed in this way, rational deliberation may not be the appropriate strategy for resolving the problem. Rather, it might be seen as a business negotiation, best resolved by bargaining. As such, Fragment 11.13 anticipates a later stage of the same meeting, where, perhaps as a ‘last resort’, there is an attempt to propose a compromise (Gutmann and Thompson 1996: 88).
Fragment 11.11: Beta Meeting 17, Stage 2 HIS report

Cr Barry: Wouldn't, wouldn't it, ; it be more logical, if : there is some development on the port land -- let's say that [a] ... smelter ... or some, something of that nature did go ahead on the land -- isn't that the time, because of the, ; the immense cost ... Aren't you better off waiting until you do get -- if you ever do -- ah, ... something of that nature ...? Isn't that the solution of funding it? ... That's the only way I see that you'll ever fund it!

Simon: Yeh. The, the, the, I don't think there's any suggestion that um, : : if the um, ah let's say the port planning study gets endorsed as it stands today ah, ; with the implication that the residential component of Lumbervale need to move -- I don't think there's any suggestion that the day after that happens all of a sudden somebody rolls into Lumbervale with a dirty great cheque book and starts acquiring property! I mean that, that ain't gonna happen!

Cr Barry: No.

... 

Simon: ... : But, but ... we still have to do the planning now : for a new area for these people to be located into! I think it would be um, I think it would be ah, a fairly um, irresponsible way of planning things if we don't have a suitable location to put these businesses into should that eventuality actually happen!

Fragment 11.12: Beta Meeting 17, Stage 2 HIS report

Barbara: But wouldn't you send them to Area I though? Doesn't the state government want the alternative?

Simon: Yeh! {: Well!
Barbara: {Then it doesn't say - well, these people want to be in the port -- well then can't you just say 'well, no. You've gotta go to Area 1?'} {Or does the, the port --
Simon: {Well! The the, the, the, the, and by the same token in, in Export Estate! I mean when I went, the sort of suggestion, suggested land uses in the port plan; I mean my immediate thought would be well why can't we go to ah, to Export Estate? I mean 'that's, that's being set up!
Barbara: {It's mine too!
Simon: But : Sam has ah, explained that ah, : to me and to others .... If you leave this, this question of the accessibility to deeper water berths and all that sort of port infrastructure, that makes land within the port area more attractive than Export Estate! Now! : : Not wishing to avoid the question, if the state said 'well ah, we actually want businesses to go to Export Estate rather than have them locate in the port area, : then there may be some costs associated with that. : Ah, of course the ultimate cost may be if the industry say 'well thanks very much, but we will be going somewhere else!' ... 

Fragment 11.13: Beta Meeting 17, Stage 2 HIS report

Bruce: So basically you're saying that the port can improve the value of their land, and develop their land, : at our cost!

Simon: Well, : er not, not, not without, not without ah, you being adequately compensated! ... 

* In the HIS report, 'Area 1' is Export Estate. Simon may not be aware of this.
11.2 Bargaining

11.2.1 Meeting 17: the zoning of Lumbervale

Although the sole substantive item on the agenda of Meeting 17 was to respond to the consultant’s Stage 2 report, the majority of the meeting was actually spent discussing the future of Lumbervale, with particular reference to the recommendations of the PPS.

Sharing

Fragment 11.14 represents the first suggestion of a compromise on this issue. Cr Barry’s suggestion is in quantitative terms (‘top half’), signalling a zero-sum game (Chapter 10, 10.2). The port manager, who is the one being asked to compromise, rejects the suggestion out of hand, then reclaims the debate with the time-honoured bureaucratic tactic of ‘returning’ to the committee’s agenda. Barry has expressed his suggestion not as a demand service (‘let’s allow ... ’), but as a demand opinion (‘do you see a problem with ... ’). Sam takes advantage of that framing, and responds – positively – with an opinion (‘I think we do’) rather than – negatively – to the request (‘No, let’s not’). For authority, Sam draws upon previously resemiotised (that is, consolidated as consensual) positions – ‘the present zoning scheme’; ‘the original brief of this particular study’.

In spite of the face-saving exchange metaphor and the appeal to external authority, and in spite of the lack of compromise, I would characterise Sam’s reply as bargaining. The quantification of the zero-sum game is sustained in ‘extend right over that’, which contrasts explicitly with Barry’s ‘half’. Moreover, unlike the projected facts in the argument phases, this is a personal opinion, a mental process associated with ‘authentic’ appraisal (‘we do [see a problem] ... ’; ‘we support ... ’; ‘I support ... ’).

Sam supplements his bargaining moves and deflects the Lumbervale issue with the diversionary tactic of interpreting the report’s original purpose. He is not successful in this: Cr Barry’s response refocuses on Colin’s report, which is the only substantive item on this meeting’s agenda (Fragment 11.15). Thus, Sam is forced to state a
Cr Barry: ... But the, the other thing then: do you see a problem with ahm, the top half of Lumbervale being allowed to contain new caretakers' quarters?

... 

Sam: I, I think um we do at the moment – ah, now the, that our study would indicate buffers ah, would extend right over that. So er we're ah, we support the present zoning scheme, which was ahm, that ah er, zoned industry with only lim, limited number ah um, of properties with approved caretaker quarters. Um, and, and I support the original brief of this particular study, which was to er identify alternative areas: for the different types of industry ...

Sam: You're talking, you're talking about ah, er ah, er a different issue, I think, to what this planning's set up for. ... 

Cr Barry: No, well this is part of the ah, consultant's recommendation: 'It is recommended that the existing mixed r, mixed residential/industrial land use fabric of Lumbervale: is given formal recognition'!

Sam: Yep.

Simon: Well. In whatever it exactly means.

Cr Barry: Sure. {But I don't -- 
Sam: {Apart from accepting what it is at the moment, there's recommendations which we don't approve!

...
negative position. Cr Barry’s first attempt to initiate a compromise has failed, resulting in antagonism instead of agreement.

‘Welcome to the world of planning’

Cr Barry is not easily deflected. He makes a second attempt to bargain later in this meeting (Fragment 11.16). This time, the suggestion is congruently expressed (‘... I was suggesting ... that ... ’), and as a request to the port for goods, rather than to the committee for an abstract service (‘that the ... port ... give a little bit’): this is the most explicit bargaining move in Beta’s entire process. Such a move is highly sensitive in this context, as Barry’s hedging and hesitation suggest. And, as a request, it receives no congruent response. Rather, Simon returns to an argument framing: an unequivocal statement of fact (‘the worst of the buffers would impact just on that very top ... ’).

Simon’s statement is based on a misunderstanding. Barry’s ‘top part’ referred to the high ground in the south – reflecting the lived experience of the local. Simon, an experienced urban planner who spends much of his working life looking at maps, seems to have internalised an equivalence between ‘up/top’ and ‘north’ (see Figure 4.2). However, the confidence with which the statement is made confuses Barry such that the thread of the suggestion is interrupted. Simon could have made a range of alternative moves, including clarifying Barry’s meaning – as in Lance’s response to Barry’s earlier suggestion (Fragment 11.17). Simon and Sam do not recall that earlier exchange, but deflect Barry’s bargaining attempt with reference to their own (mis)interpretation of its content.

From this point on, the conflict between personal interests and abstract argument dominates the debate. No further attempts at compromise are made; rather, Bruce tries to establish that the port’s proposed buffers are a direct imposition – in exchange terms, a demand – on the Lumbervale residents’ interests. Bruce addresses Simon, whose responses become more and more abstracted from the immediate situation, rather than engaging with the personal concerns (Fragment 11.18).

Neither Sam nor Simon has engaged with LAG’s attempts to bargain or to personalise the debate. There may be a range of reasons for this: Simon, in particular, is presenting himself as a neutral party with no stake, and therefore with
Fragment 11.16: Beta Meeting 17, Stage 2 HIS report

Cr Barry: I think Sam, this area here, ah, what I was suggesting, is that ah, this top part of Lumbervale : [coughs] be allowed to have um, new caretakers. : Sufficient buffer, from the --

Bruce: [inaudible comment]
Cr Barry: In other words, that the, the port y'know, give a little bit as well.

Barbara: {Exactly!}
Cr Barry: [Ah, and ah, if they're gonna put a ... smelter in there, maybe move it a little bit closer down the other way, so they reduce their buffer zone, rather than --

Simon: But, but the worst of the buffers would impact just on that very top of that area through here!

Cr Barry: Oh? Just on the very top of --

Bruce: Yes, but if I could {just, if I, if --
Sam: {Across the top.

Fragment 11.17: Beta Meeting 17, Stage 2 HIS report (not in sequence – expansion of 11.14)

Cr Barry: ... But the, the other thing then: do you see a problem with ahm, the top half of Lumbervale being allowed to contain new caretakers quarters?

Lance: Top half being the southern {half? Or { top --
Belinda: {Mm.
Cr Barry: {Yyep. Well, yep.

Barbara: Southern {half, it is.
Cr Barry: {Yep. Closest to the um --

Belinda: High ground.

Cr Barry: -- the tanks, and the-- We {do need a place where ...
Lance: {Southern.

Fragment 11.18: Beta Meeting 17, Stage 2 HIS report

Bruce: But what, what, what I mean is the decision that we, y'know have to make is being, ah --

Barbara: Taking a {hypothetical : situation.
Bruce: {Well! We have to take it into consideration, but it's just purely hypothetical!

Simon: Yeh, but, that's right - it, it's the recognition of a, a possible scenario that may {happen in the future. : Um, --
Bruce: {See we went through this zoning scheme, where there was all this industry waiting to happen, and we were pushed into a corner. : And we were rushed into a decision.

Simon: Yeh.
Bruce: And as, as, as I say, y'know, we're still waiting for this industry to come!

Simon: Sure. Um, I'm afraid um : I could say 'welcome to the world of planning'! It's, it's an inexact science at times, : : {and especially {ly when you're trying to anticipate usage.
Barbara: {But there's {people!
Bruce: {You see? The effect it has on people is not!

Simon: A'. absolutely. And that's, that's the worst part about it! When ah, when you're dealing with uncertainties, that has a very damaging impact on people! I mean, planning blight is a well known term around the world, where : where that's adverse impact of either planning indecision or planning decisions that take a long time to actually come to fruition!
no role in such a discussion. Sam has clearly staked a position and, on the evidence of other statements, feels confident that the PPS – which rhetorically demonstrates a risk of the state’s ‘losing’ major industrial investments (Fragment 11.12) – will prevail. It is well established that unequal power – in the form of a ‘[better] alternative to a negotiated agreement’ (Chapter 9, 9.4) – works against successful compromise (Fisher et al. 1999; Innes 2004).

11.2.2 Summary

Elster’s categories of argument and bargaining – as I am analysing them – appeared in Beta’s discourse, but in general they were not successful decision-making strategies. Elster’s third category of voting rarely appeared (votes were taken only twice in the entire process), and never when there was serious disagreement (11.4). Yet, the committee did succeed in making sometimes difficult decisions; in what follows, I examine in detail the discourse leading to five of those decisions in order to see how they were achieved.

11.3 Procedurising

11.3.1 Meeting 2: Objectives

As Chapter 8 (8.1) showed, the exposition and discussion of LAG’s revised committee objectives were characterised by tension and difference at more than one level: not only was Beta’s key substantive conflict (the zoning of Lumbervale) at stake; different members realised different understandings regarding the nature and purpose of ‘objectives’ in a planning exercise, and focussed variously on a range of substantive and procedural issues, leading to a disjointed and meandering conversation. In spite of these differences and shifting foci, the discussion eventually produced an agreement that was remarkably stable: throughout the entire planning process the objectives provided a recurring point of reference, and were invoked whenever conflict threatened. This section shows that the agreement was made possible, in part, by the need to explore members’ differences.

The fragments reproduced in this section refer frequently to the revised objectives provided by LAG (reproduced overleaf).
Making definitions

As discussed in Chapter 8 (8.1), LAG’s objectives differ both from Beta’s earlier set and from planners’ generic use of ‘objectives’, in that they are mental processes which the committee can achieve through deliberation, rather than ultimate goals. The other notable feature of the new set is their focus on Lumbervale. And although the future zoning of Lumbervale is problematised in Objective 1.2, elsewhere it is backgrounded as Lumbervale is relegated to minor, circumstantial (and therefore difficult-to-challenge) positions in the clause. Thus, the objectives contain a number of contentious assumptions, both about Lumbervale and about the point of objectives. A key characteristic of the conversation that follows the objectives’ exposition is that those assumptions are put at risk. In Fragment 11.19, Sean moves to clarify the meaning of Objective 1, and this move becomes the thematic basis for the conversation’s development, thus opening that meaning for exploration. Len’s turn is a closing move, which identifies a given token (‘it’ = ‘those industries that are not suitable ...’) with a new value (‘those industries that have a basic incompatibility ...’). This identification implies an identification of Lumbervale with ‘residential dwellings’, bringing LAG’s backgrounded assumption about the status of residences in Lumbervale to the foreground.

Similarly, in Fragment 11.20, Len makes LAG’s background assumptions about Lumbervale – as they are realised in Objective 1.3 – explicit, and therefore challengeable. He goes on, indeed, to challenge them. In this case, Len has performed both the opening and closing of those assumptions in his clarifying move, which is also an identifying move (‘I think what you mean is ...’). These substantive clarifications and confirmations tend to develop into arguments with no resulting agreement – the ‘meandering logogenesis’ noted in Chapter 8 (8.1, also 11.1 above).

Convergence

However, the beginnings of a resolution appear about ten minutes later, when the objectives themselves are put at risk. Fragment 11.21 is extracted from a long monologue in which Sam explains the port management’s position on Lumbervale, advises Beta of the port’s proposed planning study, and draws a relationship between the two. This extract, towards the end of the monologue, represents a turning point in the debate, as it refocusses from the objectives’ substantive implications to their
LAG's revision of the Committee Objectives, presented at Meeting 2 (November 2001)

1 Identify land suitable for general industry use in the municipality of the Shire of Harbortown and Environs for those industries that are not suitable to be located in Lumbervale.

1.1 Identify and protect strategic industrial interests of the key stakeholders in the Shire.

1.2 Examine the feasibility of zoning Lumbervale for Light Industry.

1.3 Investigate the availability of land for the expansion of Lumbervale.

2 Implement strategies, management options and statutory policy for the above objectives.

Notes to 1.1: Identify key stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder 1</th>
<th>Stakeholder 2</th>
<th>Stakeholder 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fragment 11.19: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Sean: Can I go back to, to the first one? :: What, what restrictions do you see being placed, well does the group see being placed on the industries that are not suitable to be located in Lumbervale?

Len: It's, it's really those industries that have a basic incompatibility with residential dwellings.

Barry: Yes.

Fragment 11.20: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Len: 'Investigate the ability, availability of land for the expansion of Lumbervale' -- I don't think that that was ever part of the Council resolution, and that's something I think that we need to think carefully about. Because what it in effect it is saying aah, is -- Well. We do have areas identified for the expansion of Lumbervale now -- it's in the Harbortown Planning Study -- it's, it's listed in here as a future industry area. Ah, but I think what you mean is the availability of land for the expansion of Lumbervale including its current availability of caretaker residences?

Barry: That's correct, yep.

Fragment 11.21: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Sam: ... I'm simply ah, at this stage er looking to see if this is, if these are the objectives that Council -- whether I like the objectives or not I don't think is the point. If these are the Council, er objectives that reflect Council's motion in November, then ah, then I think we move forward.

I mean, as we say, we've already identified erm, a general industry area, but ah, 1.1 is defined 'protect strategic industrial interests' -- I get a chance to, talk to that point. Er 1.2 -- you get to, we could examine er, the implications of the Lumbervale going back to light industry for everybody -- both for people who are there now, and for the future development of the m, of the port, which also means the future development of Harbortown quite frankly. Ah, and er, yeh, we take it from there. ...
procedural ones: firstly, by insisting that the committee and their output are
subordinated to Council and its resolutions ('whether I like the objectives or not I
don't think is the point'); and, secondly, by unpacking the ideas contained in
individual objectives.

In this ‘unpacking’, first and second person pronouns (I, we, you) appear consistently
as the subject of neutral verbal and mental processes: the ideas being elucidated
concern procedure, not external facts and principles, nor (directly) the substantive
interests of participants. Although Sam takes the opportunity to argue for the port’s
position, no further discussion is invited on this matter – as a subordinate
(hypotactically embedded) clause it is difficult to challenge. Rather, the port’s
preferred scenario is reframed as one possible outcome of addressing the objective.
Following Cr Bob’s reply, Sam takes this move further (Fragment 11.22), explicitly
contrasting (‘But’) outcomes and process with reference to his opinions on each (‘If
... the verdict is ... I would think that would be detrimental .... But ... I have no
objection to ... discussing it’). Following Sam’s ‘unpacking’ (Fragments 11.21-22),
Sue then ‘repacks’, again using an identifying process to define the idea of
‘objective’ as ‘[not] pre-empting what we might decide’.

Sue is not replying to Sam’s statement of opinion, but developing it in a supportive
way. This exchange sets a pattern (Sam’s second turn and Cr Bob’s aborted turn are
also supportive developments) that characterises many of the debates that led Beta
successfully to a decision (also many of Alpha’s successful discussions, as noted in
Chapter 10). It indicates that participants are working together, developing meanings
collaboratively.

Somewhat later, Len suggests an amendment to Objective 1.3, initiating a new phase
(Fragment 11.23), and Barbara replies, non-supportively, to the substantive
implications of Len’s suggestion (‘other options’ → ‘fragmenting the town’).
However, this exchange triggers a crucial moment in the (re)construction of the
objectives, in which the committee members’ understandings seem to converge.
Fragment 11.24 shows symptoms of constructive dialogue: participation by several
members (rather than just two, as in the argument phases); frequent supportive
interruptions; and a relatively high proportion of developing moves – particularly
those beginning with extending or enhancing/elaborating conjunctions ‘and’ and ‘so’
Fragment 11.22: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Sam: ... If the ah, after the ah, discussion of 1.2, the verdict is to zone as light industry – to change the zoning – I would think that would be detrimental to the port. But I, I'm quite, er y'know I have no objections, if that's what Council resolved, I have no objection to that being on the table and discussing it.

Sue: And it is the objective. Like, I guess preempting what we might decide is not necessarily the objective. Yep.

Sam: It's an, exactly. Doesn't say, doesn't predetermine the outcome.

Sue: Yes. Yes.

Cr Bob: No, so we have a --

Fragment 11.23: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Len: Alright, but I do think that we're being too restrictive in 1.3. Now, the expansion of Lumbervale may well be one option to consider for future needs for, a light industry zoning. Um, but there may well be other options, too, that we, we should be considering.

Sue: Yeh.

Len: And perhaps at 1.3: we broaden to include ah, 'invest, investigate the availability of land for the future expansion', or 'for the establishment of future areas for light industry, including the expansion of Lumbervale'. Because --

Barbara: No, we can't agree with that. Because you're fragmenting the town again. As Barry initially said, the town is in so many pieces at the moment; our intent is to keep, to, to join it more together.
rather than simply replies. What is being constructed here is a reframing of the idea of 'objectives'; in particular, the understanding of LAG members Barbara and Barry is changing, with help from Sue and fellow business proprietor Belle (who, like the councillors, is not a LAG member).

Belle’s hypothetical ‘if Lumbervale can’t roll on’ treats the objectives as needing to cover a range of possibilities. Sue’s next turn recalls the exchange with Sam in Fragment 11.22 and similarly separates the procedural matter that they are ‘talking about’ (‘not pre-empting what may happen …’) from substantive matters such as Barbara’s ‘the maps’. Sue realises an opinion that it is substantive, not procedural, matters that are the site of possible dispute (‘our objectives should be pretty much the same’). Together, Sue and Belle unpack and ‘broaden’ the idea of ‘objectives’ until Barry takes on the crucial role of ‘repacking’ the concept with an identifying clause (a modalised one – ‘that can be part of the objective’).

Barry is careful to justify his acceptance of Len’s suggestion, but now he does so with reference to the committee’s own obligations and knowledge – that is, to meanings that they have constructed internally – not to external facts/issues (as in Barbara’s justification in Fragment 11.23). Throughout this talk, ‘we’ and subsets of ‘we’ (‘I’, ‘Len’, ‘he’ and so on) are the key participants, usually as the agents of verbal and mental processes.

Barry’s repacking is significant in several ways. Not least, it indicates an acceptance that LAG’s attempt to background their preferred outcome for Lumbervale has failed: that the committee does not agree. But it also realises some important reframings which allow the committee to move on. First, the gap between objectives as ‘strategic direction’ and objectives as ‘tasks’ (Chapter 8, 8.1) has been closed: possible outcomes (strategic direction) are incorporated into what the committee is to do (tasks) as ‘part[s]’. Second, the ‘parts’ of an objective are characterised as alternative outcomes, rather than (more conventionally) as complementary contributors to a single (if complex) desired outcome. As a corollary, the substantive dispute between LAG and the port management has been contained: each party’s preferred outcome is embedded in the objective as possible outcomes.
Fragment 11.24: Beta Meeting 2, Objectives

Belle: I think what Len says is fair and equitable, because if Lumbervale can't roll on, then you need to identify those land. So I can't see the problem in putting in, slipping in the, the {extra --

Cr Bob: {And we're not talking a five year time frame. We're talking long {term.

Belle: {We're talking long term. {That's what I'm saying. So if {we can s--

Barbara: {Alright. {But we haven't identified on the {maps yet, so [inaudible] would be long term as well.

Sue: {But again, your objectives should be quite s, all that we're talking about here is not preempting what may happen in the next ah, few committee meetings. Our objectives should all pretty much be the same.

Belle: Yes they should be broad, {and then maybe come back in closer as --

Sue: {Yeh, and broad, and so we're not preempting any, yeh.

Belle: -- as things happen. So I don't see that that would be a problem, to insert what Len's just said. I actually think it's, it's logical.

Barbara: Well that's already in this one [the previous set of objectives] {isn't it?

Sue: {Yeh.

Belle: But he's including the expansion of Lumbervale, whereas {that's not the case in that one, is it?

Barry: {Yes but, by um --

Barry: That can be, that can be part of the objective!

Barbara: {Mm.

Barry: {I I don't see any, any problem with it. Our preferred whatsiname, objective is um : to expand Lumbervale. : Ah, but we have to look at the, y'know what land's available, and ah, we're a long way y'know away from knowing the, exactly what, and ah y'know what kind of buffer zone the port needs, and ah, um : yep. If we need to broaden it ah, to look at other areas, ummm.
This ‘procedurising’ of the dispute was the basis for an exceptionally successful consensus on the objectives. Although the discussion continued for approximately another hour after Fragment 11.24, from that point on it was a process of refining the precise wording.

11.3.2 Meeting 3: Opportunities and constraints

Following the successful resolution and Council’s adoption of the new objectives/tasks, the committee began at the next meeting to work on them. In particular, it concentrated on Objective 1.3, the investigation of future light industry sites. To assist with this task, Sue (the DOP planner) had identified nine potential sites and prepared an ‘opportunities and constraints’ matrix – a standard planning tool – through which to evaluate each. She had done this, by her own account, the night before the meeting, because she did not wish to attend another meeting with ‘nothing on the agenda’, particularly as she had to travel for two hours to do so. From such an *ad hoc* genesis, the matrix became central to the committee’s work. As they explored its use, they worked towards a multi-levelled consensus.

*Valorisation*

When Sue handed her matrix out, other members did not immediately engage with it (Fragment 11.25). Sue replies to Sam’s question about the matrix’s purpose, elaborating with an example, ‘*[site] number 1*’. In doing so, she identifies LAG’s position – that further light industry land should be an ‘extension of Lumbervale’ – as an ‘opportunity’, thereby valorising it in procedural terms. The matrix does not, however, become topical at this stage, and conversation drifts into discussion of another site, ‘number 6’, which is near the airport. Sue continues to attempt to reframe others’ input in the terms of her planning tool (Fragment 11.26).

In Fragment 11.26, Larry’s turn is a performance of his knowledge of planning principles. The discussion on site number 6, like Alpha’s zoning discussions (Chapter 10, 10.3), becomes an opportunity for various types of knowledge to be realised – the conversation continues with general participation (Fragment 11.27). Barbara’s turn at the end of this ‘information’ phase (*‘All these sort of issues’*) suggests to me that she is beginning to recognise the complexity of the committee’s planning task. Such complexity is the very thing that tools such as the opportunities
Fragment 11.25: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Sam: So what are you trying to s, what? Are you trying to identify what businesses we want to come in?

Sue: Oh, what some of the opportunities of the land are. Like, so um, for instance, [coughs] if you say, umm --

Larry: Take (number 1!)
Sue: (Number 2, maybe? Okay, number 1. Opportunities are: I guess it's a logical extension of Lumbervale?

Fragment 11.26: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Larry: But the thing is, it won't be good in the airport area. Because once you've identified residential type ah use, then noise will be affect it. And then it'll be another issue.

Sue: There you go; that's a constraint!

Fragment 11.27: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Barbara: Well you can't have it near the airport anyway, cos that's all underwater.

Sue: The public land is all dry.

...  

Larry: Unless, unless the ANEC or the contour level, noise contour lev, level ah --

...  

Sue: What are, what are your height restrictions and your noise restrictions for the airport? Didn't, didn't … Council have an airport manage [ment plan?
Larry: (Yes we did. Yep, we did. We've got that.

We have.

...  

Belle: Excuse me, it's only two flights a day!

Sue: Well yeh I know, but, but --

[laughter]

:: 

Sue: Yeh. What if the boom does happen and you've got more flights? Yeh.

Barbara: Four flights a day then. For the [development] in that respect.

:::

Barbara: Mm. Yeh. All these sort of issues.
and constraints matrix are designed to deal with, by providing a systematic format for detailing and controlling wide ranges of interlocking issues. Barbara's — and others' — realisation, therefore, provides a conducive context for the use of the matrix.

In Fragment 11.28, Sam shows his engagement with the matrix by making a suggestion for improving it ("if we were to ... treat each one ..."); showing that he is willing to use it. Following Sue's acquiescence, he begins to contribute to the task in the terms of the matrix, demonstrating his understanding of the word 'constraint' by using it 'correctly'. Through this fragment, he moves steadily from a high degree of uncertainty and hesitation to a more confident discursive style.

Sam then moves onto specific instances, showing why the distinction between light and general industry is important to him and foregrounding the contentious issue of Lumbersvale's future once again (Fragment 11.29). Faced with the emergence of this most divisive issue, Sue again reframes it in terms of the procedural task: Sam's position — that light industry is an inappropriate zoning near the port boundary — is acknowledged and accepted in the definition of a 'constraint', just as LAG's position was contained in her earlier 'opportunity'. Sue has not asked participants to ignore their interests or to treat them as unimportant; rather, she has demonstrated a way of recognising and valuing both sides of the dispute, containing them in procedural terms which are perceived as relatively neutral. At the same time, the planning tool that she has provided gives participants a method for engaging with a complex network of issues with which they are only now — through the process of performing local and technical knowledge — beginning to come to terms.

This learning and reframing process has been a considerable effort — both socially and intellectually — for members, and at this point (about twenty minutes into the agenda item) the discussion almost runs out of energy (Fragment 11.30). Following Sam's repacking of the procedure — again, an identifying clause ('those are the sorts of things ...') — there appears to be no more to say, until Sue proposes moving on. Members acquiesced to her request, and from here on, Beta worked systematically through the list of sites according to the matrix. The work did not always progress smoothly — for example the debate was interrupted by the argument about the need for 'light industrial' (that is, live-work) land (11.1.1). However, there is no doubt
Fragment 11.28: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Sam: Well I er, I, that's, but in relation to erm, our options here, where er, if we were to look for, treat each one of these sites and say it's suitable for light industry um, er or it's suitable for general {industry? Or it's not suitable for one of those?
Sue: {Yeh.
Sam: I mean I'm, that mightn't be, might be useful, to be able to say for {each one of those?
Sue: {Yes.
Sam: I did have that column, and I took it out cos I thought I, I didn't want to be the one to {say, 'right, --
Sue: {No, no that, that's fine. {I think that, that's good.
Cr Burt: {Yeh.
Sam: And ah, constraints: I mean, clearly where there's flooding there's a, a cost to fill - is a constraint - {but, but it doesn't mean that, say, that it's, it's not a usable area!
Sue: {Yes!
Sue: That's right.

Fragment 11.29: Beta Meeting 3, Land Availability

Sam: And, and you know if you're talking about I - Area I - which is er, er, that extension westward of ... Lumbervale, ...

Sam: You see if we, if we decide that in the long term we want to halt Lumbervale and, and and, compensate, and revert to general industry in the long term, ; then it would be inappropriate to ah, er, say that one is suitable for light industry! But it might be very suitable for {general industry.
Sue: {That's right! : And, yeh. If you do say that is suitable for light industry, then you've got the constraint of the proximity to the port : again! So yeh.

Fragment 11.30: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Sam: Those are the sort of things that I think we --
Sue: Yeh.
Sam: -- could talk about here, couldn't we?
Sue: Definitely.
Sam: Mm.

Sue: Well. We couldn't, I mean, move on a bit? We didn't really have much on the agenda today, {and um --
Sam: {No well, I's actually a hard one I think, because it is got all those complications.
that members began to think and talk about potential sites in terms of opportunities and constraints. By the end of the fourth meeting, members had come to a consensus regarding their preferred sites for light industrial land, prioritised at three levels (A-C) according to the opportunities and constraints identified.

The opportunities and constraints matrix is a mundane, reductionist planning tool based on systematic method and rationalist thinking. It may seem (to some commentators) an odd choice in a collaborative forum. However, in this context it was, like the introduction of ‘objectives’, highly successful in allowing antagonists to value both sides of their disagreement, to work together in a respectful way and to come relatively quickly to stable agreements both on their ‘shared enterprise’ and on some difficult substantive matters. To me, the technical nature of the tool seems incidental against this remarkable achievement. 7

11.3.3 Summary
Beta’s strategy of ‘procedurising’ contentious issues – acknowledging and containing both sides of a dispute in procedural terms – appealed to a different sort of rationality than either argument or interest-based bargaining. Rather than trading in facts or in goods/services, participants traded in meanings: they opened up backgrounded assumptions, shared obligations and reified planning concepts for challenge and reconstruction. Success may have hinged on the morphogenetic reclosing (repackaging) of those opened-up concepts, usually in the form of identifying clauses. The key issue here is that ‘procedurising’, as a metaprocess, was neither imposed on Beta as a decision-making method nor discursively established as such. Rather, it emerged, without conscious attention, out of chaotic and meandering discussions generated by participants’ diverse understandings of planning conventions.

11.4 Rebuilding
11.4.1 Meeting 12: selection of consultants
By Meeting 12, Beta had moved into Phase 3 of their process. They had completed their consultant brief for the HIS (Chapter 8, 8.3) and received four tenders for the job. Of these four, three had prior dealings with the issues: Charlie was one of the
consultants currently working on the port planning study; Chris had developed the changes to SOHE’s zoning scheme; and Colin had previously worked for LAG in their opposition to those changes. On this basis, the port manager (Sam) had declared a conflict of interest and excused himself from the selection process, leaving representatives from SOHE, LAG and DOP to discuss the matter. Barry had been elected to Council, and officially represented SOHE, rather than LAG, on the committee.

Planning in the face of consensus

Larry and Stan (who had replaced Sue as DOP’s representative) had prepared for this meeting by using a matrix to score each consultant against the selection criteria on the brief, both indicating a quantitative preference for Chris. The LAG representatives (including Cr Barry) were reluctant to accept this finding – Chris had recommended the despised zoning change for Lumbervale, and LAG held a strong preference for Colin, whom they knew well. Rather than argue against Larry’s and Stan’s evaluations, though, they looked elsewhere for justification, raising new issues that lay outside of the formal selection criteria.

In Fragment 11.31, Belinda and town planner Lance are, in the style of an argument, appealing to facts. However, this argument differs from others (11.1) in that the facts are either outside of the speaker’s realm of experience (Belinda) or fabricated on the spot (Lance). At one level, therefore, they are speaking nonsense. However, the legitimacy, truth or sincerity of these claims turns out (pace Habermas) to be irrelevant to the work that participants are doing, which is largely in the interpersonal dimension. Here, and throughout the discussion, all moves are supportive (agreements, acknowledgements and supportive developments); talk is often simultaneous; non-contributors to the argument (Larry, Stan and Barry) nonetheless participate by acknowledging; and both modalisation and hesitation lessen as turns progress and support is forthcoming. The committee thereby constructs a supportive tenor in which to build an agreement. This work continues as they go through the tender document (Fragment 11.32).

As this phase progresses, it becomes clear that none of the planners – Lance, Larry or Stan – feel strongly about Chris’s selection. However, they require a face-saving
Fragment 11.31: Beta Meeting 12, Consultant selection

Belinda: And looking through C, Chris's um, 'selected project experience', I mean really when you look at it, I mean he's done strategic planning – [town], local planning, rural component!
    Well, I mean there's not gonna be really any conflict there – it's ... (rural!)

Stan: (Mm.)

Belinda: Y'know, like there's nothing that's really er, any ah strategies where there's likely to be, like, conflict.

Larry: (Mm.

Stan: (nods)

Belinda: (That's, y'know like it's --)

Lance: (Yep! : And I think that that's mainly because, to be honest, um, we're probably gonna be doing the first strategy where we're deliberately gonna be looking at this con {flict, rather than finding, um, either hiding it or just doing the, the old way --)

Belinda: (That's {right!)

Larry: (Mm.

Stan: (Mm.

Belinda: Yeh!

Lance: -- which is what {hap, which was what was happening with the zoning scheme -- which is

Belinda: (Yeh!.

Cr Barry: (Mm.

Lance: 'no, just don't allow it'. : We're getting the strategy to try to see if we can come up with a solution to the conflict, {because there's either the one way, or the other!

Belinda: (Yeh!

Fragment 11.32: Beta Meeting 12, Consultant selection

Belinda: Well, can I just say th, like, I've just found this {in um, Colin's!

Lance: (Yep.

Belinda: And it's actually quite detailed!

Stan: Ah!

Belinda: Like, the p, 'Stage 1: inception meeting {with Council and committee visit --

Stan: (Yeh.

Belinda: seven and half hours.' It'll be done by Col, : Colin! So y'know it's the Principal!

Stan: (Mm hm!

Lance: (Yep!)
way to change their minds in order to finalise the committee’s decision. This need becomes ideationalised a little later. In Fragment 11.33, after a lengthy pause in the conversation, the committee’s problem is identified as the ‘meta-decision’: ‘how do we make a decision’, and – joking about the secretary aside – all participants offer to other parties the opportunity to make this meta-decision (‘do you wanna’; ‘what do you think’; ‘it’s up to you, Larry’). The exchange becomes hesitant here, as these demands for instruction – the imposition of one will over the group – put at risk the supportive tenor that the committee has developed.

Belinda’s turn is particularly interesting in its exploration of decision making possibilities. She explicitly identifies three possible strategies – ‘vot[ing]’, ‘talk[ing] everyone around’ (persuasion), and ‘think[ing] about it’ (deferral) – displaying a remarkable affinity with Jon Elster’s view: ‘arguing and bargaining are forms of communication, that is, they are speech acts, whereas voting is not’ (1998b: 6). Belinda later makes an elliptical suggestion by labelling her preferred strategy ‘consensus’. On the basis of interviews, Belinda means a (deliberative) process of persuasion and unanimity, rather than voting, a framing of the consensus ideal that contrasts markedly with that developed by Alpha under the guidance of their chairperson (10.1):

... that committee, in our eyes, has never ever worked on numbers, and had, in fact had worked on a consensus basis, and ... any decisions that had been taken throughout the process was ‘one in, all in; none in, all out.’

and:

It came down to someone, or p’ members making a more, a stronger argument for one consultant over the other. (Belinda, March 2005)

The committee members know – though they have not admitted it – that a ‘consensus’ already exists. The assumption that Colin will get the job is realised indirectly by both Belinda and Larry in Fragment 11.34. Belinda suggests that they ‘need to change the weighting’ (that is, the scores on the assessment matrix) to present Colin as the preferred consultant, then corrects this suggestion to sustain a framing of the committee’s discourse as rational argument (‘change’ → ‘convince you ... to change’), in accordance with her understanding of consensus processes.
Fragment 11.33: Beta Meeting 12, Consultant selection

Larry: We could Linda [the secretary] to make the decision!

[laughter]

Stan: Yep. yep. But do you wanna look at it in more detail {and get it back?

Linda: {Yeh, yeh! But --

Stan: Or are {you, or what do you {think?

Lance: {Well there you are! And {you can make the unbiased decision! [to Linda]

Belinda: {Well I think Larry wants a decision! So, I guess, how we, how do we make a decision? Do we having a {vote? Or do we just talk, everyone around?

Linda: {Mm. I don't know. [to Lance]

Belinda: Or go away and think about it? Or -- : : It's up to you Larry! Being a --

Stan: [:laughs]

Larry: I'd like a decision!

: : :

Lance: But ‘how do we get there?’ is what : {the query is!

Larry: {I guess what, what we can do is --

Belinda: Consensus!

Fragment 11.34: Beta Meeting 12, Consultant selection

Larry: What ah . the first thing I have to do is in terms of the matrix itself. ...

   And ah, {and then what we'll do is make --

Belinda: {So in other words, we have to change the weighting -- convince you that need i’, you need to change the {weighting!

Larry: {[[laughs]

Stan: {[[laughs]

Larry: No, no no! No, {no. : : {No. I think that's that, that has to be accurate there.

Lance: {I might be convinc {ible!

Belinda: {[[laughs]

Larry: So we'll leave it as is. Ah what I want to do, as part of the process, is then identify our ah, selection ah, process in terms {of ah, ah what ah --

Stan: {Are we changing the, the weighting?

Larry: No no no. We leave it a’, as is.

Stan: Oh, okay.

Larry: What, what we need to identify is ah, why we haven't um, nominate {ah, Charlie, Chris, and so forth.

Stan: {Oh! Okay, uh huh.
This framing is a façade, as the planners acknowledge by laughing, and Larry’s turn (‘why we haven’t nominate[d] ... Chris ...’) make his expectation clear.

**Presentation**

However, the committee is still searching for a face-saving way to make this decision in the context of Larry’s and Stan’s earlier assessment which, resemiotised as it is, cannot be questioned or discounted (‘that has to be accurate there. So we’ll leave it as is’). The committee’s ‘real’ problem is named by Belinda shortly after (Fragment 11.35): it is not the decision that is problematic, but its presentation. The decision needs to be rationalised for the higher authority to endorse it – much like Beta’s earlier decisions about releasing industrial sites. Throughout these problem-identification phases (Fragments 11.33-35), process is foregrounded in the discourse, with committee participants as the agents of mental and verbal processes. The supportive tenor is maintained, with almost no unsupportive moves (apart from Larry’s face-saving refusal to ‘change the weighting’), and frequent simultaneous talk.

Having identified the problem, the committee return to the task at hand. For the next half hour, they painstakingly examine the ‘scores’ in Stan’s matrix, discussing in detail his reasons for them and, as earlier, presenting new arguments for Colin’s appointment, always being careful not to undermine Stan’s assessments. The conversation is circular and meandering, in the way of most of Beta’s arguments.

Finally, Stan presents a way forward, bringing the committee’s newly constructed arguments directly into the decision-making process. In Fragment 11.36, the solution to the committee’s problem is named: they could appeal to ‘things that are outside this criteria’. As with the problem naming, the solution naming is a morphogenesis, a packaging of meanings that the committee has been constructing for some time. This is a turning point in the discussion. Barry and Belinda both supportively develop Stan’s turn by translating his points into abstract, impersonal terms, suitable for use as rational justification (‘if you think Colin’s better’ → ‘the perception of the town’; ‘you’re gonna get a different view ...’ → ‘fresh eyes’). Members are collaboratively rebuilding their ‘public’ argument to support a consensus that was, in fact, reached tacitly.
Fragment 11.35: Beta Meeting 12, Consultant selection

Belinda: And I guess it'd be like a, if we present to Council with a strategy, ... they would say 'well why are you asking for more money for this one, when, when {you've got, this one's got the higher mark?'
Lance: {That's right!

Fragment 11.36: Beta Meeting 12, Consultant selection

Stan: ... I mean : : I've only assessed it in terms of the criteria here, but if you look beyond, you could consider whether you're gonna get a different view, or another perspective that may have some value, {which it probably does!
Belinda: {Mm!
Belinda: Mm.
Stan: Um, your ability a' as, as a Lumbervale Action Group to deal with em, and if you think : Colin's better, then that's a, a view as well. I mean there's things that are outside this criteria which we couldn't look at, I {suppose, and --
Cr Barry: {There is. And that was partly my same reasoning on it, is the perception of ah, of the town!
Stan: Yeh.
Belinda: I think the fact that they've had previous experience, too, means that they've got a bit of ah knowledge, and yet they have been not : as intimately involved in the last few years. So maybe : you would hope that there is {fresh eyes!
Stan: {Mm.
The report to Council after Meeting 12 included Stan's original matrix, with additional comments explaining Beta's preference for Colin as follows:

The Committee believes that a fresh set of mind will provide a fresh look at the entire issue and result in a better outcome. The Committee also believes that Colin has greater experience in the Industrial land use planning as indicated in the submission. Furthermore, the Committee is dealing with the Principal of the company and the experience from the Principal will provide a better outcome, as decisions and recommendations can be made on site by the Principal of the Company.' (SOHE Minutes, September 2002)

While at least the latter two points – as I saw it – could have been incorporated into the matrix evaluation under the criterion 'qualifications and demonstrated experience of person undertaking the project', Council's planners chose not to do this, instead presenting Beta's face-saving and collaborative rebuilding deliberations to Council in a more 'raw' form. In the event – and somewhat surprisingly – only one councillor queried the recommendation, asking why the committee had chosen a consultant that had both quoted a dearer price and performed worse on the selection criteria. The mayor and Cr Barry argued strongly for the committee's choice, and Colin's appointment was accepted unanimously. Thus, Council became implicated in Beta's discourse.

11.4.2 Meeting 17: an alternative light industry site?

Rebuilding can be seen as an elaborate, face-saving method of conceding an argument. Beta again appealed to this strategy (although not at such length) later in the process, when they considered Colin's 'Stage 2' report at Meeting 17 and, finally, had to confront the issue of Lumbervale's zoning (Section 11.1). Before doing so, though, Sam makes the point that a light industry area, if needed, should be somewhere other than Lumbervale (Fragment 11.37). This substantive concern is expressed as a procedural one ('His brief required ... '), summarised by a procedural suggestion ('I think he's gotta be asked ... '). Sam is unusually direct both in his criticism and – despite the grammatical metaphor and passive voice – in his demand here, reflecting both his strong disapprobation and the fact that Colin is not present.
Sam: Well ah, there is one aspect. I don't think that he's, he hasn't fulfilled his brief. His brief required him to look at alternative sites for different types of industry.

Belinda: I don't --

Belinda: Yep.

Sam: And ah er, the one that he hasn't found an alternative site for, or hasn't recommended an alternative site for, is um, light industry. ... I think he's gotta be asked to ah, ah, complete his brief and actually recommend somewhere!
Evasion

Sam’s interpretation of the brief is not uncontentious – other members believe that the report satisfactorily identifies Lumbervale as the light industry site. However, they are all aware of the potential for conflict at this meeting and, at this stage, are carefully avoiding it. Rather than directly challenge Sam, therefore, they search for a way to support him without undermining their own position. They do this by ignoring the criticism and building new, non-procedural arguments for acquiescing to Sam’s request (Fragments 11.38-40).

This constructive argumentation begins with the naming of a problem and its solution, just as the longer sample from Meeting 12 was punctuated by such moves. Members draw upon facts and abstractions to justify Sam’s procedural suggestion, without challenging the accuracy or appropriateness of his claims. Throughout the phase, all moves are supportive and include a high proportion of developing moves – members build their argument cooperatively, each finding justifications from their own institutional position (Barry: ‘Lumbervale is going to fill up [if it is light industry]’; Sam: ‘If someone comes to town right now ... where can they go [as Lumbervale is general industry]?’; Larry: ‘That’s shown on the new structure plan’).

11.4.3 Summary

In the ideational dimension, rebuilding relies on many similar linguistic choices as argument: it draws on external facts and ‘public interest’ abstractions. However, it begins from a tacit consensus rather than a disagreement, and is consequently quite different interpersonally: exchange is generally supportive and dominated by developing statements rather than questions and replies. Further, it is punctuated by ideational interruptions: moments of procedural ‘problem naming’ or ‘solution naming’ in which members are foregrounded as agents of mental and verbal processes.

The key difference between argument and rebuilding is that, for the latter, the most important discursive ‘work’ is in the interpersonal dimension. As such, ideational ‘problems’ – for example, reliance on claims that are demonstrably untrue or illegitimate – can be ignored. In Beta’s case, the planner/facilitator almost never challenged input from other members (Chapter 9, 9.2.2): had he attempted to impose
Fragment 11.38: Beta Meeting 17, Stage 2 report

Cr Barry: Yep. ... But: eventually, Lumbervale is going to fill up, and you're going to need an expanded area for small business ah, that will incorporate caretakers! ...

Belinda: Well why did that, like that Area 3 drop off?

Barbara: {I can't remember!
Lance: {Cos there's a lot of services ah, infrastructures ah, running everywhere --

Barbara: {Oh.
Belinda: {Yes. That was a point, but it doesn't, in, in his site assessment matrix, :: um, he doesn't really say it's unfeasible.
Lance: -- {there.

Fragment 11.39: Beta Meeting 17, Stage 2 report

Sam: More immediately though, more immediately - and Barry's worked that out - if somebody comes to town right now and wants to set up a business --

Lance: Where do they going to go?

Sam: -- where can they go? ...

Cr Barry: Well that's right. ...

Fragment 11.40: Beta Meeting 17, Stage 2 report

Cr Barry: See, regardless of what they decide to do with Lumbervale, the very nature of the size of the streets and, and the blocks there don't allow for a big business to locate there. It will always be reasonably small businesses, ah, unless we start ah, widening our streets or, or whole blocks. { Because --

Lance: {That's shown on the new structure plan for these identified site - to accommodate these various sizes : of ah, properties.

Cr Barry: Yeh.
a Habermasian ‘ideal speech situation’, the rebuilding strategy might not have been available to the committee. Moreover, the rebuilding strategy developed in response to the shock they had received when previous decisions – mostly made incidentally through ‘procedurising’ their disputes – could not be implemented, and the need for rationalisation was imposed by an external party. In sum, rebuilding, like procedurising, developed ergogenetically as a result of highly contingent circumstances, and without conscious or deliberative reflection.

11.5 Backgrounding

11.5.1 Meeting 3: Port Planning Study

In Meeting 2, LAG’s attempt to background their preferences for the future of Lumbervale was unsuccessful. However, on other occasions, contentious proposals were successfully backgrounded. The most significant example of this was the prioritising of the port’s planning study over Beta’s own.

Tangent

As the committee began to address their objectives in Meeting 3, it was suggested that the question of Lumbervale’s zoning be deferred pending further information (Fragment 11.41). Barry and Cr Burt concur with Sue’s suggestion to defer consideration of Lumbervale, using ‘buffer zones’ as an example of the information that they need. This is followed immediately by a long monologue from Sam, from which Fragment 11.42 is extracted. Sam achieves two remarkable things here, in addition to generally agreeing to ‘leave it’. First, by raising his proposal to commission a long term plan for the port in this context, he demonstrates a background assumption that the missing information about Lumbervale is equated with the port’s future buffer needs – this equation is foregrounded in the highlighted section of the fragment (‘here’s a realistic assessment of the options. ... ’). This is an extraordinary move, effectively dispensing with a whole range of other substantive issues. Second, and equally important, is the implicit suggestion that the PPS will supply the information required by Beta. That is, that the missing information about Lumbervale can be provided by Sam’s own consultants, working under Sam’s direction, in consultation with a number of ‘government agencies’ selected by Sam (‘that will give us more guidance’).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment 11.41: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sue:** | Now, po' one point two: ‘examine the feasibility of zoning Lumbervale for light industry’.  
I don't know about you guys, but I don't feel confident to do that today. |
| **Barry:** | We're a long way away from that until we know some more and -- |
| **Cr Burt:** | Well we need to know buffer zones, and, and all that {sort of thing first, ; don't we. |
| **Barry:** | {Buffer zones, everything. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment 11.42: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sam:** | And I, er I, I, I'm, I'm more comfortable to leave it. Um, what I, what I'll say is that um, er,  
y'know I've got a general perception about ports and how they can develop in the long term  
and so forth, but we don't have a detailed plan to table, that um, you can look at! |
| | Um, but what, what we've found a broad agreement to is to, to ah, enter into a  
consultancy um, to look at the long term planning of the port, er and, er, including things  
like buffer zones, major transport corridors, y'know the output er, and the like; ... It'll be er,  
developed on a consultative basis: the er, it will be very, we'd like the Council to join us er,  
and a number of other er, government agencies to join us in, in ah, working up that plan. :  
Um, and that will give us more guidance. But that will take a, a wee while. ... |
| | Er I think I think it's, it's best for us to be able to say 'well, here's a realistic assessment  
of the options. If we, if er, Lumbervale is light industry, it means this for the future  
development of the port, it's general industry, it means this for the future  
development of the port. And I think it'd be nice to know that and, rather than talking in  
general terms – which I can, from experience – .... .... |
| **Sue:** | But those are the sort of things that are going through my, my mind, so I, yeh. I think  
that sort of {planning work will be very useful for -- |
| **That, that, so when we get that study, how does that um, fit in with the time  
that this committee has? |
Sam’s talk in this monologue is difficult to challenge. Although he refers directly to known agents (himself, the committee, the port management), the concepts those agents interact with are highly abstract, vague and/or temporally distant ('long term planning'; 'buffer zones'; 'consultative basis'; 'government agencies'; 'assessment of the options'; 'future development'; 'general terms'). Moreover, they are elaborated upon at length, leaving little time to insinuate another voice. When Sue does interrupt, it is not to challenge any of Sam’s assumptions, but to develop the (to me) incidental theme of time ('that will take a wee while' → 'when we get that ...'). It is this theme that becomes topical, with the result that the committee agree to wait for the PPS (Fragment 11.43).

Thus, members’ agreement is constructed. Not only do they agree that the proposed PPS will provide useful information for Beta’s task of examining Lumbervale’s future zoning, they also agree that the task should be deferred – and Beta’s timetable extended – until the PPS is completed, something that will happen at the discretion and according to the program of the port management (in the event, three years).

During the course of this short phase of discussion, a significant assumption has been fixed: that the port’s need for an as yet undefined buffer is an essential consideration. By extension of this, and also of the fact that no other considerations have been named, a more contentious claim seems to become reasonable – that the port’s needs take priority over all other issues. This claim has not been explicitly debated nor agreed upon; it is a tacit statement that, through this almost accidental process, has become set as ‘background’ for further discussion. The ‘backgrounding’ of the PPS’s priority is evident many times over the course of the next three years.

Fragments 11.44-45, both from the same meeting as the above, illustrate this. Beta is discussing opportunities and constraints of ‘Site 2’, an expansion of Lumbervale. Nobody questions Sam’s appraisal of the ‘implications’ of Site 2 as light industry ('it’s an improvement ... but not a huge amount'). Rather, Sue ideationalises the committee’s sympathy with that position ('we all know what that means') – no constraints/issues for Lumbervale have been mentioned other than the port’s buffer needs. In Fragment 11.45, even Barry questions only how far the port’s influence extends, not its priority over considering Lumbervale’s rezoning.
Fragment 11.43: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Sam: Um, but er that, I, I actually think that that study could take a while. And and and cr, and I can report on how it's going, but er, and we might start getting some guidance out of it as it's going along, but it will take a while. And I notice that Council is prepared to, I think it's prepared to (consider extending the timetable?

Cr Burt: {Extend.

Cr Burt: Yep.

Fragment 11.44: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability

Sam: I, I would think with the expansion of Lumbervale um, and the zoning of it almost comes into 1.2?

Sue: Yep, it does too. But 1.3 says ‘including the expansion’ . I know ah --

Sam: I, I know. I know. I'm just saying that the implications of that are y'know it, it's a, an improvement on having something right against the port boundary that's residential --

Sue: But not much.

Sam: -- but, but not a huge amount. So I, I would like to see a bit more guidance in terms of what sort of buffer zones are for typical type of industries that might sit in the port area - what sort of buffer zones you're looking at.

Sue: So for land parcels 1 and 2, we can probably say that the constraints to those um, land parcels is that they will have the same issues, land use plan, ugh, the same issues as Lumbervale, basically.

Cr Burt: Mm. And we really need to get more information on your buffer zones or some {thing like that.

Larry: {Pending the ah, some strategic, yeh. Pending the strategic ah, {ah planning.

Sue: Yeh! Just s, 'same issues as Lumbervale', and we all know what that means.

Fragment 11.45: Beta Meeting 3, Land availability*

Barry: I'm prepared to leave 2 off, because that's y'know a little bit close to, to Lumbervale, and until we get some guidance from ah, the port ah, on buffers and that. But 3 ah, falls into it, ah --

Sue: Well it {does --

Larry: {But we don't [inaudible] 3 do we?

Barry: And 10 ah, falls into it.

* Site '10' was added to Sue's list of nine options during Meeting 3.
Instability

In spite of this successful backgrounding, though, the implicit agreement to prioritise the PPS turned out to be less stable than others. For example, in Meeting 5, following Larry’s accident, Beta members advised the CEO, Len, on their decisions so far. When they reached their deferred Objective 1.2, there was an indication that the Lumbervale residents’ sympathy was not complete. In Fragment 11.46, Belinda, like Sue in Fragment 11.42, is developing the time theme, but she realises an assumption that Lumbervale is going to ‘return to light industry’, without giving the port’s ‘real problem’ any acknowledgement. In Barry’s (delayed) reply to Belinda’s question, the port has vanished completely. It appears, then, that Meeting 3’s apparent ‘consensus’ regarding the priority of the port’s buffer needs – a consensus assumed by Sam and some other state officers throughout progress of the PPS – was relatively illusory. Possibly, this relates to the fact that this backgrounded agreement was achieved through tangential development; it was never ‘fixed’ morphogenetically through identifying statements and problem/solution ‘naming’ such as those that punctuated Beta’s procedurising and rebuilding phases (Fragments 11.24, 30, 33-36).

11.6 Emergent practices

Unlike Alpha, Beta rarely made consensual decisions using Elster’s traditional strategies for resolution. Rather, idiosyncratic and largely unconscious forms of debate evolved as the committee worked together. Early in the process, a highly successful ‘strategy’ – which I am labelling ‘procedurising’ – emerged by chance from members’ exploring their diverse understandings of abstract procedural terms such as planning ‘objectives’ and ‘opportunities and constraints’. As distinctive meanings were constructed for these terms, conflicting substantive positions were acknowledged and valorised, but contained. A number of difficult but remarkably stable decisions were reached this way, including the identification of land parcels for future industrial use.

Later, when Beta’s own work had been subordinated to the system’s need for rational justification, a different strategy developed, in which consensus was reached and recognised tacitly and participants worked cooperatively and supportively to rebuild a face-saving justification (a form of ‘Realrationalität’ [Flyvbjerg 1996, 1998]) fo
Len: ... So it's probably premature to consider it at this stage until the port is, is a fair way down the track with its planning study, and has, has, at least identified ah, er, er y'know what, what if any component of Lumbervale they have a real, are going to have real problem with --

Sue: Mm.

Len: -- once they start looking seriously at developing the ... harbour for, for ah, {for, for, for the industry.

Barry: {Yeh. {For --

Belinda: {And can we put a timeline on when Lumbervale might return to light industry?

Barry: Yes, when we get general industry! An area for general industry!
that consensus. During these phases, differences of opinion and interpretation tended to be bracketed and ignored, rather than explicitly reframed.

It is hard to reconcile Beta's successful 'strategies' with a deliberative democracy framework such as Elster's. Habermasian communicative norms (such as truth and legitimacy) – and, indeed, the claims to which those norms apply – seemed to me often to be subordinated to more immediate circumstantial concerns, particularly interpersonal and organisational concerns such as face protection, conflict avoidance and establishment of a shared enterprise. An environment in which norms such as truth, sincerity and legitimacy could be bracketed is a curious one, created in part by Larry's consistent – and highly unusual – acceptance without challenge of any input. Moreover, two members of LAG told me that their responses to events and debates within the committee were influenced by the knowledge that '[Larry] doesn't like conflict'; '[Larry] finds it hard to deal with [angst and hostility]': these members had constructed an understanding of their discourse context in which Larry's personal feelings and communicative skills were of particular relevance. The interpersonal and textual patterns of their rebuilding strategies – their consistently supporting moves, their careful (re)statements of the problem – grew in part from this understanding.

Further, as the backgrounding of the port's needs shows, 'consensus' can be constructed by means of a tangential method of development: by developing an incidental theme prior to resolution on a contentious issue, a position on that issue can become assumed to be fixed. This phenomenon was not unique to Beta; Alpha's 'agreement' to hold two-day meetings was achieved in a similar way (Chapter 9, Fragment 9.1). However, these instances do demonstrate the contingency of much decision making on aleatory elements of discourse and context. A cunning actor could make strategic use of tangential development; Len did so in avoiding conversations about Lumbervale (Chapter 9, Fragment 9.17). And such an actor could gain advantage from their own sensitivity or from calculated deference (as DOMM staff frequently attempted to do). However, I think Beta's case shows that the success of any such ploys is extremely context-sensitive. That is, successful decision making emerged locally from an unpredictable combination of 'strange' discursive practices and events, rather than from any normatively prescribed tactics.
Beta's adaptive 'metaprocesses' were constituted 'beneath the surface' of the committee's discourse.

Table 11.1 (opposite, continued overleaf) summarises the discourse features and relative success (in terms of reaching consensus) of Alpha's and Beta's decision-making 'strategies'. Apart from any questions it might raise about the value of 'pure' argument or 'pure' bargaining to achieve complex policy decisions, the summary suggests that there may be little potential for generalising about, or prescribing, appropriate consensus-building 'strategies' at this level. What worked for Alpha and what worked for Beta were different, contingent on a range of locally and temporally contextual issues.

However, the case study data do suggest that some discourse patterns – especially in the interpersonal dimension – may indicate that discussion is moving towards a consensus. These are summarised in Table 11.2 (overleaf). While strategies for forming a stable consensus appear to be highly context-sensitive and (pace Elster) impossible to characterise systematically, therefore, it may be possible to recognise and build upon symptoms of constructive dialogue as it unfolds in particular contexts. Such practical sensitivity might be just as important for planners working with 'strangeness' as are 'universal' normative prescriptions or strategies.

11.7 Conclusion: strange adaptations

When social structures are relatively stable, social actors draw upon 'normal' decision-making procedure, and these may include strategic calculations à la rational choice theory. On the other hand, in times of political and social crisis, a more radical conception of human agency emerges because social actors literally have to reconstitute the social orders that constitute their identities by making decisions about the structures themselves. (Griggs and Howarth 2002: 102)

Although both committees were faced with the problem of 'cultural' difference, Alpha's decision making took place in a context of tight control by the executive agency: its agendas were guided by a constant focus on the end product; a number of potentially contentious principles (debate from expertise rather than sectoral interests, treatment of consultative input as information, the value of sanctuary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Discourse features</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>▪ Standard conventions.</td>
<td>▪ Successful to finalise decisions, provided dissent recorded.</td>
<td>▪ Rarely used, never to resolve conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Procedural norms worked out by group.</td>
<td>▪ Additional argument usually appeared during voting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>▪ Dealing in facts and/or abstract principles (questions and statements).</td>
<td>▪ Rarely used in ‘pure’ form.</td>
<td>▪ Often used but rarely successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Phases of principle setting followed by phases of argument/counterargument.</td>
<td>▪ Relational processes and abstract participants dominate.</td>
<td>▪ Never successful in resolving conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Participants in the debate rarely invoked except in modalisation metaphors.</td>
<td>▪ High frequency of long turns, sometimes with explicit ‘written’ textual organisation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>▪ Dealing in goods and services (requests).</td>
<td>▪ Rarely used in ‘pure’ form.</td>
<td>▪ Rarely used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Quantities frequently invoked to structure requests (zero-sum game).</td>
<td>▪ Principle of ‘fairness’ invoked</td>
<td>▪ Never successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Principle of ‘fairness’ invoked</td>
<td>▪ Participants in debate invoked in association with appraisal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>▪ Fluctuation between argument and bargaining, i.e.:</td>
<td>▪ Highly successful locally; but</td>
<td>▪ Rarely used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Requests punctuate appeal to facts and principles.</td>
<td>▪ Agreements not always stable.</td>
<td>▪ Successful only when one of the parties is external (Chapter 8, 8.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedurising</td>
<td>▪ Dealing in meanings.</td>
<td>▪ Not used –</td>
<td>▪ Highly successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Phasal pattern of unpacking abstract terms for discussion and eventually repacking in identifying clauses.</td>
<td>▪ Procedural discussion (e.g. Chapter 7, 7.1) backgrounded abstract concepts and foregrounded evaluations/ appraisal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Institutional lexis placed at risk.</td>
<td>▪ Procedure ideationalised – participants in debate invoked as agents of verbal and mental processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Procedure ideationalised – participants in debate invoked as agents of verbal and mental processes.</td>
<td>▪ Dispute reframed and contained in procedural elements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Dispute reframed and contained in procedural elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
zones) were imposed by DOMM’s instructions; and most of the meetings were chaired by an experienced bureaucrat with a strong sense of procedure. It seems to me that this might have lent a (perhaps artificial) stability to the committee as a ‘social structure’, allowing Alpha to develop consensus strategies based on ‘normal’ deliberative – that is, information- and claims-based – methods: negotiation and voting. Moreover, those methods were ideationalised in meetings and reified in minutes. Thus, they became available for participants’ (including DOMM’s) conscious evaluation and possible adoption, where deemed appropriate, in future institutional contexts: they can become part of participants’ repertoires for acting (Coaffee and Healey 2003).¹¹

Beta received much less explicit guidance than Alpha, and their discourse was more exploratory of their discourse context. Through exploration of members’ different understandings, there emerged decision-making strategies which were not based on information or claims, but on reconstructing direction and cementing personal relationships (‘reconstitut[ing] the social orders …’). Those strategies were successful in achieving a number of difficult substantive decisions, in spite of being dominated by interpersonal and organisational concerns. This is a problematic manifestation of the ‘layered’ approach to decision making that characterises many consensus building models. There was no linear progress in which consensual meta-decisions constituted the foundation for further, substantive decisions. Rather, there was a tangle of discursive ‘strings’ in which issues and meta-issues were continually negotiated while participants reconstituted their identities as members of a new community of practice, which formed and re-formed, largely by chance, on the boundaries between different fields. This is adaptation at its most delicate. The new ‘community’s’ practices were not reified in formal inscriptions, but only in the habitus of its members. SOHE does not ‘own’ such reifications; their ultimate effects on the shire’s – or other agencies’ – governance practices and culture is unpredictable and may be as strange as the process of their evolution.¹²

Decision making, as a central element of participatory planning practice, is a key site for the ergogenetic evolution of discursive metaprocesses by which divergent cultural norms are reconciled. Analysis of this element of my case studies has led me to two main conclusions. First, this evolution can be enacted in very different ways, with or without conscious reflection on the part of planners and/or other
### Table 11.1: Decision-making strategies (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rebuilding</th>
<th>Backgrounding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Dealing in facts and principles, but</td>
<td>- Contentious assumptions embedded in abstract language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Many assumptions backgrounded for process, imposed rather than established discursively (Chapter 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Claims not disputed.</td>
<td>- Monologue followed by new phase developing incidental theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moves generally supportive.</td>
<td>- Some unease and questioning of assumptions at the end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phases of ‘problem naming’ foregrounding procedure followed by phases of collaborative ‘rational’ justification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequent introduction of new themes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rarely used – Consensus rarely reached tacitly due to imposition of other procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Successful where consensus reached tacitly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.2: Symptoms of constructive dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promising signs</th>
<th>Unpromising signs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- General or wide participation locally.</td>
<td>- Restricted participation (1 or 2 people) locally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Performance of personal ‘expertise’ by most participants.</td>
<td>- Performativity limited to acknowledged experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supportive moves (‘Yes’; ‘And ...’; ‘So ...’).</td>
<td>- Non-supportive moves (‘No’; ‘But ...’. ‘Well, ...’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dominated by replies and rejoinders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No or minimal interruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-supportive interruptions with negative appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of modalisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Frequent non-cohesive moves with no morphogenesis (going nowhere).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequent developing moves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequent supportive interruption or simultaneous talk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Diminishing modalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Summarising moves/morphogenesis (procedural and/or substantive matters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Patterns change over time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Frequent repetition (talking in circles).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participants. Planners and other actors are interacting on boundaries between practices and, as participants build a shared enterprise, they also build a community of practice. That is, each participatory forum can be a unique site of practical learning — of (re)constructing professional identity — not only for stakeholders, but also for planners. Second, metaprocesses and associated ‘metapRACTices’ (such as ‘procedurising’) constitute an uneven form of adaptation. Their strength is an apparent capacity to enable ‘cross-cultural’ work in specific contexts, but this means that they, and the resulting communities of practice, are locally and temporally specific. As such, their ‘travel’ into arenas beyond the specific episode (Coaffee and Healey 2003; Healey 2004a) is unpredictable. Further, if the reifications of metaprapRACTices (either in formal documentation or, especially, in the habitus) do carry into other situations, they are likely to do so in a variety of small, haphazard and context-sensitive ways, rather than as comprehensive structural change (see Healey 2006).

Chapter 12, the final chapter of this thesis, returns to planning theory in the light of the enquiry’s findings, and reflects on the value of strangeness and adaptation to participatory practice.
12 Conclusions: strange directions?

In this final chapter, I step back from the empirical detail of the case studies to summarise and reflect on the themes to which my findings are addressed. I begin by recalling the evolution of my key research questions, which then provide foci for the discussion that follows. Finally, I step forward again, beyond the findings of this enquiry, to some tentative implications for planning practice and theory, and associated directions for research.

12.1 Framing

I began this enquiry with a broad motivating question:

*How might the tensions of participatory planning be resolved?*

This question was stimulated by my experiences as a mobile worker in the current ‘age of participation’ (Chapter 1). From this standpoint, I initially saw the question as a procedural issue: a matter of identifying how tensions and misunderstandings can arise, and then of identifying strategies either to avoid or to confront them in a constructive way. However, as I became familiar with the literature on participation and, even more, as I involved myself with the detail of my case studies it became clear to me that the ‘tensions of participatory planning’ were so complex and multi-faceted that there could be no universal procedural solutions. Moreover, final ‘resolution’ of these tensions may be neither possible nor desirable; difference is inevitable in contemporary social life.

As outlined in Chapter 2, my theoretical reading in the area of participatory planning helped me to reframe my motivating question. In particular, Patsy Healey’s institutionalist approach draws attention to participatory planning as a ‘cross-cultural’ practice, suggesting that tensions can result from difference that is deeper than interests or substantive values (Watson 2003). This reframing problematises the ‘culture’ (or cultures) of planning itself, and casts the management of difference – the ‘tensions’ of my motivating question – not only in the substantive dimension, but between different norms and modes of practice. The question of ‘resolution’, therefore, is not simply a matter of procedure or strategy, but of rebuilding a (planning) practice in which these different modes and norms are reconciled. Such
reconciliation, if it occurs, must be understood as local and temporal, rather than universal or final (Healey 2005a: 324). Conflict and cultural difference are ongoing and central features of contemporary practice.

The development of new, local practices for planning tasks raises further questions. New practices, and any reifications resulting from these practices, need to have legitimacy in the spheres of their implementation – government, investment, community organisations and so on – if their influence is to travel beyond the event. Thus, I came also to focus on the resemiotisations through which decisions and practices are reified and made to act at a distance.

The research was, therefore, driven by theoretical concerns. However, its undertaking was empirical, in that those concerns were examined through analysis of two case studies, ‘Alpha’ and ‘Beta’. The ethnographic case study approach was identified in Chapter 2 (2.3) as appropriate to exploring the cultural issues at the centre of the enquiry. My specific methodology, though, was a form of critical discourse analysis informed by Michael Halliday’s systemic functional linguistics, as outlined in Chapter 3. The focus on discourse, in the sense of (oral and written) textual production, provided a unique, ‘close-up’ perspective on the detail of the case studies: on how ‘tensions’ and ‘resolution’ are realised in the micro-interactions of participants (Chapters 7-8, 10-11). The analysis was undertaken in several layers which probed increasingly deeply into the complexity of the case study data, as described in Chapter 5. The data itself, as Chapter 4 details, was collected over a period of five years in a region of non-metropolitan Australia, specifically in two towns called here ‘Scrubfield’ (Alpha) and ‘Harbourtown’ (Beta).

In this thesis, I have used the metaphor of ‘strangeness’ to signify a central conceptual framework developed in Part 2 of the enquiry: collaborative practice is characterised by the presence of ‘strangers’ – non-bureaucrats/non-planners whose interpersonal and organisational discourse practices diverge from bureaucratic and/or planning norms – within the bureaucratic planning field. It was from within this framework (flagged theoretically in Chapter 6 and developed empirically in Chapters 7-8) that, in Part 3, I explored the ‘adaptation’ of the two committees: first, as a function of planners’ conscious management of strangeness (Chapter 9) and, second,
as the evolution of discourse practices that allow strangers to work together (Chapters 10-11).

12.2 The culture(s) of planning

In Chapter 6, I developed a hypothetical model of planning as a traditional bureaucratic practice, based on an understanding of the bureaucratic field as structured by Weberian ideal-typical features: a strict hierarchy of accountability; rational, fact-oriented decision making; separation of administrative from private concerns; and intense documentation of both rules and decisions. Power, in this model, is represented by reified actor-networks: institutional rank, empirical knowledge (access to ‘truth’), and depersonalised regulations/policy (impartiality).

As my case studies progressed, this hypothetical structure was realised in several ways. First, the confidence with which public servants presented themselves and their views was clearly related to their position in the hierarchy: senior bureaucrats – Dick, Len and Sam – openly set directions for discussion, while most lower-ranking bureaucrats (with the exception of Sue) tended either to defer to stakeholders or to ‘disguise’ their direction-setting moves. Second, empirical and technical knowledge was valued by both committees. In Alpha, especially, formal scientific qualifications were respected by a majority of participants, and committee members were explicitly instructed to contribute their knowledge/expertise rather than their unfounded opinions. Information provided by DOMM tended to draw on empirical and statistical sources rather than interpretive or narrative ones. In Beta, once the need for a documentary product was realised, the committee deferred to expert consultants – its own or the port’s – to empower its collective positions with the kind of ‘truth’ required by the state. Third, impartiality was valorised in a range of ways by bureaucrats: instructions to Alpha to ‘take a balanced view of the issues’; DOMM’s understatement of their own stake; DOMM’s framing of the public submissions as ‘issues’ rather than ‘votes’; Larry’s reluctance to commit to an opinion; constant references to the overriding power of state policy by the planners on Beta. Moreover, even stakeholders on both committees were careful to declare (or, occasionally, to deny) conflicts of interest.
It seems, therefore, that formal notions of the ideal-type bureaucracy continue to frame public servants' (and others') behaviour to some extent, even in non-traditional fora such as stakeholder committees. However, as Chapters 7 and 8 showed, the 'culture of bureaucracy' (Peters and Nelson 1979) goes deeper than these formal characteristics. The discourse practices of public servants in my case studies shared features that appear to represent cultural mores, rather than institutional structure. At this level, the bureaucratic habitus became exposed in confrontation with alternatives (Bourdieu et al. 1999). That is, the cultural situatedness of many discourse practices became obvious because they were not shared by non-bureaucrat/non-planner participants.

For example, it seems that bureaucratic discourse continually seeks 'closure'. As Bourdieu (1994) points out, the state is driven continually to naturalise its own practices, through institutional reifications such as job titles and descriptions, policy, and plans. These reifications, largely achieved through monoglossic resemiotisation, provide foundations for bureaucratic action and decision making: formal resemiotisation allows actors within the bureaucratic field to move on. The language of closure – nominalisation, identifying and other relational clauses, elision of agency, 'performative' appraisal – dominates technical and bureaucratic texts and, it appears, strongly influences the spoken discourse of many public servants.

This feature was particularly obvious at the ergogenetic level in DOMM's organisation of the marine reserve planning procedure, whose linear form relied on closure of Alpha's past decisions to inform new ones (for example, 'zoning to achieve committee endorsed strategies and objectives' [Meeting 6 agenda]). At the turn and logogenetic levels, all bureaucratic actors in both case studies used bureaucratic language. Moreover, the professional planners on Beta made continual reference to formal reifications (policies and plans) of government as fixed positions that participants could take for granted. Such fixed positions are a crucial element of the symbolic power of the state (Brown 1993; Bourdieu 1994; Forester 1999a) and, in both case studies, lay members of the committees tended to resist closure: to keep the deliberative space open for the introduction of new voices, for capitalisation of members' own actor-networks, and for the sake of maintaining personal/collective control over both discourse and outcomes.
Another ‘cultural’ aspect of bureaucratic discourse, as manifest in my case studies, is a strong interpersonal orientation to a kind of face protection. The bureaucratic tendency to depersonalise responsibility – for example, through lexicogrammatical tactics such as nominalisation and the passive voice – is well known (Charrow 1982; Gumperz 1982; Sarangi and Slembrouck 1996; Iedema 1997b), and relates to this face-protecting dynamic. Analysis of the spoken discourse of public servants in my case studies revealed other strategies that appeared to be oriented to similar purposes: extensive use of exchange metaphors for offers and requests, which allowed for ‘emergency’ reframing to avoid face-threatening refusals; careful preparation for and post hoc management of such exchanges, in particular through clarifying, qualifying and justifying moves; consistent reorganisation of clausal participants to place obligation on the speaker and confer benefit on the respondent; avoiding ‘authentic’ appraisal; and ideationalising affective aspects of the interpersonal (Chapter 8, 8.2). Institutional rank was a factor in participants’ use of face-protecting strategies.

Thus, the traditional inheritance of planning, at least in this Australian state, can be seen as both rational and culturally bureaucratic. Moreover, in spite of significant and rapid changes to formal governance practices (particularly in DOMM’s case), the bureaucratic habitus may have been slow to adjust. The planners involved in my case studies were well versed in the discourse(s) of participation: of the need to be open to all voices; to accept different forms of knowledge and reasoning; to ensure participants’ understanding of and comfort with proposals; to respect the personal and/or emotional nature of people’s relationship with the issues; to maintain a cooperative (rather than adversarial) relationship between agency and stakeholder; and so on. However, their own discourse mostly reflected an unconscious adherence to traditional outcomes-driven rationality, formal hierarchy, closure, linearity and face protection, particularly when difference and/or conflict threatened.

12.3 Strangeness and tension

The bureaucratic culture that continues (at least in my case studies) to manifest in planning practice is in potential conflict with at least three aspects of collaborative planning. First, a fundamental tension exists between the language of closure and the discourse of inclusion, a tension that, in my opinion, finds expression in critiques of the consensus building ideal (Chapter 2, 2.2.4). Planning is traditionally about
establishing fixity; its direction is monologic. However, this orientation is at odds with the ideals of flexibility and dialogicity required of collaborative practices. This tension creates discomfort as practitioners and other participants try simultaneously to perform both closure and openness; for instance, Alpha found it almost impossible to construct a resolution for their minutes (closure) regarding their attitude towards Indigenous input (openness) (Chapter 7, 7.2).

Second, there is a similar inherent tension between the traditional ideal of 'impartiality' and the conscious introduction of 'stake' as a symbolically realisable form of capital. In spite of the fact that most commentators now consider impartiality to be impossible in practice and, moreover, part of a specific ideology that itself privileges certain actors over others (Smith 1990, 1999; Young 1990; Agger 1991; Marris 1996), most participants in my case studies continued to expect something like impartiality from the bureaucrats. For some, this tension was resolved by a strict separation of roles: both DOMM staff and the planners on Beta tended to differentiate their 'objective' function as experts and/or administrators from the stakeholders' input regarding their wishes or interests. This tendency was manifest in Alpha’s minutes (Chapter 6, 6.3.1) as well as in interviews with all planners, in spite of DOMM’s insistence that Alpha members should themselves act as ‘experts’ and ‘take a balanced view’. The most common complaints from non-bureaucrat interviewees, moreover, concerned bureaucrats’ failure to remain ‘impartial’: for Alpha members, DOMM’s pursuit of a zoning agenda; for LAG members, the state’s apparent support of the port’s position.

The third obvious tension is not inherent, but forms between the professional habitus of planners and the ‘strange’ behaviour of other participants. Non-planners, whose habitus is shaped by different experiences, may confer quite different meanings on the planning activity and on important intermediaries/actors – such as minutes, the plan, public submissions, and government policies – within it. Thus, they bestow symbolic power on different aspects, and orient their actions accordingly. A committee meeting represents part of a network of events, with intertextual and interdiscoursal links to other events. In a collaborative process, these links are different for each person: the intertexts that participants bring to the meeting – and, often, wish to capitalise and ‘fix’ through the translation intermediary of the meeting’s resolutions – may therefore be in conflict. For some Alpha members, this
meant regular refusal to focus on their agenda; for others, it was impossible to accept DOMM's framing of the public input. In Beta’s case, where discourse was less tightly controlled, competition between different intertexts often led to constant revisiting of issues.

Further, disagreement often surfaced as personal hostility, in marked contrast to the bureaucrats’ determination both to remain impersonal and to avoid threatening anybody’s status. In the case of Beta, the bureaucrats’ orientation to face protection was a direct source of uneasiness: LAG members, coming from the world of small business, took the associated indirectness as both impolite (‘why don’t they just say what they mean?’) and as evidence of institutional indifference to the urgency of the committee’s desired outcomes (‘they’re dragging the chain’). In turn, the LAG members’ urgency made some of the public servants uncomfortable, not only because it led to some face-threatening behaviour (direct requests, unmitigated negative appraisal) but also because – particularly for the planners – it undermined the obligatory passage points that, normally, constitute their accountability requirements (justification through studies, endorsement by senior experts before politicians).

These tensions create instability in planning processes: the discomfort of participants leads them to work (consciously and/or unconsciously) to adjust the field in their own favour. For example, Alpha members made constant efforts to politicise their meetings; Beta participants kept changing their tactics according to their perceptions of both the committee’s direction(s) and the level of conflict between members. Moreover, the tensions seem directly to create a dynamic in which the logogenesis of meetings becomes circular and meandering, as participants, not trusting or understanding each other, refuse to let ‘their’ issues go: the ‘talking in circles’ of which many participants complained. In such an environment, both executive and lay members may be motivated to find new ways of doing things where old methods lead nowhere. Thus, strangeness and tension can provide the impetus for learning, at least at the level of specific episodes.
12.4 Metaprocesses and ‘resolution’

This enquiry has identified three distinct ‘metaprocesses’ through which participants may adapt to strangeness in collaborative planning. First, planners may make conscious choices about how to manage the tensions that strangeness creates, adjusting established practices to a new, participatory context (Chapter 9). Second, diverse groups may discursively establish their own ground rules for action (Chapters 7 and 10). And, third, ‘strange’ practices may arise contingently as groups ‘muddle through’ (Lindblom 1959) their issues and tasks (Chapter 11).

12.4.1 Planners as adaptive agents

Notwithstanding my disclaimer in the introduction to this chapter, there is a procedural element to resolving, or at least managing, the tensions of participatory planning. Indeed, there is an extensive body of normative theory predicated on this element: consensus building ideals provide direction to planners as institutional agents. These ideals do influence practice. DOMM and SOHE planners made deliberate adjustments to their usual methods in order to accommodate the voices of strangers and to avoid what they saw as potentially destructive conflict. The influence of normative participation discourses was clear in both cases: for example in the choice to pursue something that could be called ‘consensus’ rather than ‘majority rules’. Such choices were emphasised not only in the establishment of each procedure (Chapter 9, 9.1), but in each agency’s presentation of committee outcomes, particularly in the minutes (9.3).

An important aspect of consensus building discourses is that they often provide a kind of prescriptive ‘checklist’ for successful participation (Innes 1996b, 2004; Innes and Booher 1999b; Booher and Innes 2002). This prescriptive aspect is easily taken in isolation from the theory that underwrites it (in general, a development of Habermasian communicative action), especially by busy practitioners. As a result, consensus building principles may be adopted in practice in ad hoc ways, according to the aims, priorities, convenience and personal style of particular administrators. As Chapter 9 shows, the choices of DOMM and SOHE, though both apparently guided by similar principles, differed significantly. DOMM maintained a technical framing for the task and focussed on educating participants to enable ‘strangers’
within that framing. SOHE took a more experimental path, accepting and valorising all types of input regardless of the 'strange' rationality underlying it. As communicative action grants agency to planners, planners use that agency to interpret and personally stamp communicative practice.

Moreover, the extent to which those principles are formalised and given 'capacity to travel' (that is, potential to be adopted in other arenas) may be similarly *ad hoc*. In both Alpha’s and Beta’s cases, the bulk of institutional attention was concentrated on the initial construction of the committees (Chapter 9, 9.1) – their composition, the arenas in which they would meet, the formal roles of members, and the structure of the agendas and/or overall procedure. DOMM officers, always focussing on their substantive product, persisted with their original decisions on these matters throughout the process, adjusting those decisions in minor ways (rearranging the texting order, adding educational sessions) and reinforcing them with ongoing strategies (such as emphasising the agency’s own ‘subordinate’ role) according to staff analysis of the ‘problems’ that emerged. DOMM also documented those decisions thoroughly. SOHE officers, more concerned with conflict resolution and the performance of good faith, allowed their initial agenda (particularly with respect to membership, the objectives, and the employment of a consultant) to be appropriated and altered by Beta itself, and only specific procedural decisions were formalised through adoption by Council. The two agencies’ different approaches led to very different translation processes via which initiatives were institutionalised. DOMM reported externally (to sector consultation groups and other stakeholders) on Alpha’s substantive decisions, and internally on procedural principles, adopting what staff saw as ‘successful’ ones as features of subsequent planning exercises. SOHE’s Council received procedural decisions from Beta for ratification, but these were not considered general principles for participatory planning. Nonetheless, the ways in which those decisions were reported did occasionally provide precedents which challenged established practice (for example, the selection of consultants contrary to the formal matrix assessment).

In sum, in spite of the nominally universal prescriptions of consensus building theory, planners’ agency is exercised in widely varying ways, contingent on a range of historical and local factors, including the personalities and immediate priorities of
the planners. Moreover, planners' choices may have unintended effects which, though unpredictable, are no less significant (Giddens 1984: 8-12).

12.4.2 Committees as deliberative innovators

Agency in participatory planning does not belong only to planners. Other participants also act not only to pursue their own desired outcomes, but to (re)create what they see as advantageous conditions for debate. In this enquiry, I explored two aspects of such strategic action. In Chapter 7 (7.1), I showed how some of Alpha's members formed a strategic coalition against DOMM and, without changing their formal agenda, reframed the deliberative arena as a political, rather than a purely technical, forum. This achievement had a number of metaprocessual effects. It 'unprivileged' bureaucratic discourses in discussions of procedure and process, producing informal and face-threatening talk between stakeholders and high-ranking bureaucrats, and allowing members to capitalise on personal relationships with powerful actors in the political, administrative and corporate spheres. It problematised the relationship between impartiality and 'stake', valorising the latter and explicitly associating the former with the administrative role of the executive, rather than the decision-making role of the committee. It also opened the deliberative space to a larger number of 'observers' than would otherwise have been the case, forcing members both to manage those observers' input and to perform their own roles as decision makers and as administrators of substantive and procedural justice.

Alpha also paid explicit attention to its own ground rules. Chapter 10 shows how, under the guidance of a popular chairperson with a strong sense of procedure, the committee constructed a particular sense of 'consensus' which allowed it, locally, to manage (and, usually, to resolve) conflict. This was achieved through a form of voting, but one which was open to allow each member to put their case, and to have 'minority' views respectfully heard and recorded in accordance with liberalist principles of procedural justice (Rawls 1971; Lind and Tyler 1988; Hillier 1998a). The point here, though, is not simply that they used procedurally just conflict resolution strategies, but that they developed those strategies through 'practical discourse' (Habermas 1990, 1998b). Moreover, the strategies were developed in
context: they were not abstracted from actual decisions or conflicts, but built up iteratively – through repeated reference and extension – as the need arose.

Thus, committees can act collectively as deliberative innovators, and they can do so in conditions of conflict. However, Alpha’s case also sounds a note of caution. The committee’s success at immediate conflict resolution allowed the process to continue along the linear path that DOMM had set for it, ‘moving on’ from points of tension without addressing underlying dissatisfactions held by some members. Indeed, some of those underlying dissatisfactions related to the linear structure of the process, which certain members saw as undermining their ability both to question DOMM’s adopted principles and to express a more holistic vision for the area. Even the political reframing achieved in the third meeting, which resisted the interpersonal/stylistic dimensions of the bureaucratic field, did not succeed in changing the overall organisation of the procedure or, consequently, of the management plan as a conservative genre, both key aspects of the process’ ultimate failure to please all its participants.

Deliberative democracy might provide a useful framework for a committee like Alpha, which had a clear task and strong, reflective management/leadership. However, to be more than trivially effective, its principles need to be extended beyond the immediate realm of specific disputes; to allow stakeholders to challenge and provide normative direction to the broader institutions in which they are taking part. Bracketing difference and power for the sake of consensus on the immediate issue, as Alpha tended to do, can leave intact important structural inequalities and constraints to transformative action (Forester 1989, 1999c; Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998; Huxley and Yiftachel 2000; Yiftachel and Huxley 2000; Marris 2001; Hillier 2002b).

12.4.3 Collaborative groups as strange communities of practice

The procedural decisions of planners and the deliberations of planning groups can both bring some order to the chaos of strangeness, through the imposition or cooperative development of shared rules and conventions. However, sometimes chaos can find its own order. My metaphor of strangeness, signifying difference and institutional complexity, can be extended to evoke the ‘strange attractors’ which, in
chaos theory, are said to underlie the fractal patterns generated by certain non-linear dynamic systems (Gleick 1987).\textsuperscript{1} For Beta, where difference was largely uncontrolled, strange but constructive discursive patterns emerged from members' messy, meandering interactions with each other and with planning and/or bureaucratic concepts and tools (the 'objectives', the opportunities and constraints matrix, the consultant evaluation matrix).

The analysis outlined in Chapter 11 suggests that Beta's decision-making practice was neither deliberately controlled nor deliberatively established; it did not follow from meta-decisions on the part of either planners/administrators or other participants. Rather, it formed organically in highly erratic, context-sensitive and temporary ways that seemed to me to be incidental to the (usually reductive/rationalist) nature of the tasks in which they were engaged. While the project manager's intention was that members should adopt 'good' consensus-building behaviour, bracketing power and strategic aims, this intention was not enforced; power and strategic action continued to permeate every aspect of Beta's process. This did not prevent the committee from reaching consensual decisions; instead it formed part of the context for members' practical learning.

Moreover, in Beta's case, learning was not one-way. However, nor was it strictly 'two-way', in the sense of a trading of knowledge and/or skills. It was not simply the case, for instance, that LAG members learnt about technical and governmental matters from the planners, while the public servants learnt about local issues, concerns and practices from the local stakeholders (although such lessons did take place). The reality was more complex. Planning and administrative knowledges were translated and reconstructed through Beta's procedurising and rebuilding talk: terms such as 'objectives', 'opportunities and threats', or 'value for money' took on special, context-specific ideational, interpersonal and organisational meanings; local histories and personal relationships were reframed for both the process and the strategy document, forming new actor-networks of knowledge, power and affect between LAG, LAG's constituents, SOHE and (in various aspects) the state.

Learning, in Lave's and Wenger's (1991) model, is a shift from legitimate peripheral participation to full participation in a community of practice. In Beta's case, this learning occurred on the boundaries between different institutions (in particular,
bureaucratic planning, bureaucratic management and small business), leading to the unplanned emergence of boundary practices to which all participants were peripheral, and which all had to ‘learn’ equally. That is, Beta became a small community of practice, ‘strange’ because it was exclusive to itself in the three dimensions listed by Wenger (1998: 113):

1. close relationships and idiosyncratic ways of engaging with one another, which outsiders cannot easily enter (Halliday’s tenor);
2. a detailed and complex understanding of their enterprise as they define it, which outsiders may not share (field);
3. a repertoire for which outsiders miss shared references (mode).

Beta’s case refuses to conform to a deliberative democracy framework, and conscious agency (or design) seems to have been a relatively minor factor in the committee’s emergence as a strange community of practice within SOHE’s administrative structure. It was, rather, a matter of participants’ shifting identities as they capitalised and recapitalised their actor-worlds through engagement with their problem(s) and with each other. In addition, because Beta’s idiosyncratic participation was never explicitly acknowledged as such nor formally reified through documentation, it is only through members’ transformed identities that their practices may be realised in other arenas.

The ergogenesis of Beta’s strange practices took place through the ongoing negotiation and renegotiation of direction, knowledge and leadership, and was enabled by a number of contextual factors, including that the committee’s task was ill-defined, and that its leadership and management were both inconsistent. As such, Beta’s mutual learning was a kind of practice-reconciling metaprocess, but one which cannot be understood as a procedural ‘step’. Nor can Beta’s practice — at least in its specifics — be standardised or ‘used’ as a model for other participatory processes, because those specifics related to particular people in particular local, temporal and social/political contexts. The detail of such mutual learning remains in the domain of the uncertain: practice is an ‘emergent structure’, not a designed one (Wenger 1998: 86, 93; also Healey 2005a: 322).
12.4.4 The meaning and value of metaprocesses

Alpha's and Beta's experiences show that diverse groups of actors can find ways of working together and of reaching stable agreements, through either deliberate or aleatory metaprocesses which reshape local practices and symbolic capital. Moreover, both cases suggest that such metaprocesses can be effective without requiring the 'resolution' of underlying cultural differences. Framing conflict may continue to be played out even as shared practices and agreements emerge.

This fact can be understood as both positive and negative. Framing conflict reflects institutional and cultural diversity, a necessary and desirable feature of participatory planning (Young 1990, 2000; Benhabib 1996a; Friedmann 1998; Sandercock 1998a, 1998b, 2003). It is valuable, therefore, that this feature can be preserved while metaprocesses of decision making (for instance) make communication and progress achievable. However, it is also possible, as noted above, for such metaprocesses to leave power inequities and misunderstandings intact. Ultimately, both Alpha's deliberatively established conventions and Beta's emergent practices allowed the committees to avoid confronting key issues of conflict and power.

It seems to me that this apparent weakness is closely related to one of the metaprocesses' most important strengths: that they were, in both cases, grounded in context. They evolved in response to specific, temporary procedural problems: imposed *deus ex machina* decisions (Scrubfield port, the need for the HIS); substantive matters of deep difference (Muddy Bay, Lumbersvale's zoning); the introduction of unfamiliar planning concepts and tools; the need to 'give in' without losing face. The particular success of each new decision making strategy was as an immediate 'escape route' from a momentary realisation of the tensions inherent to participation: between closure and opening, between impartiality and stake, between different framings of knowledge, relations and practices. Yet, the ability to draw upon those strategies became much more than momentary: as a discursive skill, it came to form part of each committee member's identity as a 'practitioner' of participatory planning. While specific practices responded to particular moments, and could not be generalised outside the context of the case studies, they nonetheless achieved some 'temporary fixing' – at least for the duration of the projects – in the habitus of participants.
Thus, recurring realisation of tensions in participatory planning can provide impetus for the evolution of new practices and professional identities. As such, these tensions contribute to making participation a condition of possibility for institutional change. But the contextual immediacy of the new practices that are generated creates an additional, and continual, tension between the needs of the moment, the overall purpose(s) of the process (which may be different to each participant), and the ongoing functions of the planning agency. This new tension, it seems to me, creates a particular need to reflect critically on the reifications of specific episodes, and particularly on how these respond to the changing social contexts through which such reifications move.

12.5 Resemiotisation: power to act at a distance

12.5.1 Accountability issues

Planning projects are usually initiated in response to a political, administrative and/or material problem. For instance, Alpha's establishment met a policy requirement for community consultation in developing a management plan as a necessary (administrative) step towards the declaration of a marine reserve, which in turn was to be a step towards (material) protection of the local marine ecologies. Beta was formed to address a perceived (material) industrial land shortage, (administrative) local/state conflict over the zoning scheme, and LAG's (political) anger with Council. Thus, such projects tend to be oriented to outcomes. Some research has further shown that the achievement of policy and/or material aims – that is, the implementation of decisions – is crucial to participant perceptions of a project's success and to the sustainability of positive political/relational outcomes (Moore and Lee 1999; Hillier 2000b; Margerum 2002).

However, a stakeholder committee rarely has power to implement its decisions, or even to commit resources to doing so. Therefore, decisions need to travel to alternative arenas to achieve their aims. In my case studies, as for many, there were two main forms of monoglossic resemiotisation that transported committee decisions into 'higher' realms of commitment: the minutes of meetings and the final planning document. Chapter 9 (9.3) reports that, in both cases, there were specific institutional expectations of the latter: DOMM required that their management plans
conform to a certain generic format; DOP had asked that the Harboutown Industrial Strategy justify its recommendations in traditional planning terms. Thus, in both cases, the structure and general content of the planning document were tightly constrained and controlled by ‘experts’. DOMM exerted this control by structuring Alpha’s agendas to produce segments of text/zoning plans in accordance with the overall plan; the ‘translation’ of committee discourse into decisions, and thence directly into the plan, was achieved in the meetings themselves through resolution mechanisms administered by the chairperson. SOHE, in contrast, removed the translation process from Beta’s realm entirely, by delegating production of the HIS to a consultant.

Neither ‘solution’ to the translation problem was ideal. Alpha members became bored, frustrated and, in some cases, resentful as their discourse was processed according to DOMM’s needs. Beta was confronted late in the process with two conflicting positions already black-boxed and fixed in documentary form, which contributed to considerable antagonism between members. As a result, the committee failed to reach even a nominal consensus on its own product.

Could there have been a better solution – that is, one which might more reliably have satisfied the participants? Minimal-change adjustments to each approach suggest themselves, based on the traditional grounded assumption that satisfaction is related to a sense of ‘ownership’ of the planning product.\(^2\) DOMM could have provided more time for questioning and/or developing basic principles/visions through undirected discourse – for ‘structured unpredictability’ (Forester 1999b: 141) – while still keeping the translation process at the table. SOHE and Beta might have avoided the pre-fixing of conflicting positions by better integrating the work of the two sets of consultants where they were dealing with similar issues, by ensuring that the consultant work more closely with the committee in developing his recommendations, or by undertaking the translation process ‘in-house’ rather than delegating.

However, it also seems to me that possibilities might exist for turning the translation problem around: to challenge conventional, centralised accountability requirements and place local forms of meaning making into the plan. Beta’s selection of their consultants, for example, was based on a contingent, collaborative form of reasoning
(Chapter 11, 11.4.1) that could easily have been translated into a traditionally rational framework, but instead was successfully presented to Council with little change. While this is only a minor example, it suggests that alternative forms of reason can be legitimised in new arenas, challenging traditional forms of accountability.

Textual structure and content can be seen as aesthetic considerations, which combine with other multi-modal devices such as style and graphics to produce a ‘total’ rhetorical impact (Throgmorton 1991, 1993, 1996). Conventions governing style and graphics in government documents have changed considerably in recent years, drawing on non-traditional discourses/intertexts both for ideological reasons (Fairclough 2000a, 2000b, 2001; Fairclough et al. 2003) and to make the documents appealing to a wider public readership. Structure and content, however, are perhaps the most conservative aspects of the plan as an instituted genre. In Australia, plans mostly retain a traditional formal logic and empiricism in spite of a clear shift in governance towards participation. Western Australia’s Network City, for instance, strongly emphasises its participatory origins (Western Australian Planning Commission and Department for Planning and Infrastructure 2004: 3, 11; see Chapter 9, note 23), but its overall rhetorical development from aims to recommendations remains logical. Moreover, as Diane Hopkins (2004) convincingly argues, the Network City process – ‘Dialogue with the City’ – adopted rationalist proxies for deliberative ideals (representation for inclusiveness; information for inquiry; voting for consensus) in order to meet the government’s perceived requirements for accountability and implementation purposes.

Nonetheless, there may be alternative aesthetics in which non-bureaucrat participants’ voices and forms of reasoning can be given more prominence. Documents can be multi-vocal as well as multi-modal. It has become accepted practice in much academic writing, for instance, to freely incorporate oral accounts, albeit usually to support the ‘main’ author’s voice (for example, Forester 1999b). This technique was also used extensively in the report of Australia’s National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families, Bringing Them Home (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission 1997), a document that drew largely on oral sources and had a significant impact on public opinion. Public rhetoric does not necessarily require a rationalist framework.
12.5.2 Metaprocess issues

The acceptance and implementation of decisions relies particularly on the successful translation of ideational meanings. I also want to consider another aspect to resemiotisation: the translation of interpersonal and textual/organisational meanings that help to constitute participatory fora as communities of practice. Following Wenger (1998), I see reification as a necessary element of practice; reification and participation sustain and develop each other. And, following Halliday (1978, 1985; Halliday and Hasan 1985), I see discourse practices in terms of a multi-dimensional semiotic. Therefore, I believe that reification of discourse practices needs to occur in multiple dimensions – ideational, interpersonal, and textual/organisational – if such practices are to represent potential for institutional capacity building.

No formal institutional convention exists for the documentation of non-ideational meanings. Minutes and reports (and even transcripts), in shifting ideational meanings to alternative modes and audiences, necessarily alter the textual and interpersonal content of spoken discourse. How metaprocesses and other forms of adaptation are sustained, therefore, is a local matter, which was realised in very different ways in my two case studies. Many of Alpha’s practices were the product of conscious reflection by both the executive and the members. Organisational and interpersonal aspects of those practices were ideationalised in discussion and documentation; this translation was the basis for the ergogenetic development of reified local conventions upon which participants could consistently draw (progression of agendas from objectives to strategies; the signal ‘we’ll go round the table’; the equation ‘the consensus – the majority view’). Further, through consistent use, such conventions became habitual and unreflective (for example, downplaying DOMM’s power through modalisation and grammatical metaphor; solidarity of members against ‘excessive’ demands from unsympathetic stakeholders; the voting statement ‘I’ll go with the majority’). That is, they were reified not only in DOMM’s documentation and verbal reports, but also in the habitus of participants. Thus, there were at least two ‘paths’ of translation via which Alpha’s practices were given potential to move into other arenas, particularly into other participatory planning arenas.
These paths represent distinct aspects of resemiotisation. Documentation and formal reporting is generally monoglossic/centripetal, shifting transient meanings into fixed forms for use in specific contexts — in particular, DOMM officers used their reflections to inform policy for future reserve planning exercises. Embodiment of meanings and conventions as habitus, on the other hand, is heteroglossic/centrifugal — it shifts shared forms into the somatic realm, potentially shaping the participation of individuals in other practical arenas (for example, planning, lobbying, corporate management) in unpredictable ways. Most participants in both case studies reported that their experience as a committee member (or, in DOMM staff’s case, an executive officer) had altered — in widely varying ways — their knowledge, their interests, their self-confidence in dealings with government, and/or their approach to interactive tasks.

It was the latter, centrifugal aspect of resemiotisation which featured most strongly in the case of Beta. SOHE staff did not undertake to formally discuss or document interpersonal and organisational elements of the process, in spite of their strong orientation to conflict resolution (rather than substantive product) in establishing the committee. Indeed, I would argue that it was largely this orientation that, by reducing the urgency otherwise attached to an ‘outcome’, enabled such a casual approach to procedure. The metaprocesses which formed Beta as a community of practice were mostly unreflective. They were also disordered and erratic, related to immediate imperatives rather than global ones (such as the production of a management plan, as in Alpha’s case) and, often, constituted in quite arbitrary directions in the discourse. Further, those metaprocesses were largely undocumented and unremarked by SOHE staff: as far as I know, my enquiry was the only site in which they were recorded. However, those metaprocesses and associated expectations may, in subtle ways, have entered other arenas in the persons of Beta members: Council meetings and LAG agendas in particular (Chapter 11, note 12).

It is not possible for me to assess whether or not the ergogenesis of Beta’s practice represents enhancing institutional capacity. Unlike the conscious resemiotisations (both monoglossic and heteroglossic) of Alpha’s practice, Beta’s strange approaches to planning, negotiation, and project management were not noticeably strategic or oriented to improving planning/governance processes. Their influence remains to be seen.
12.6 Collaborative planning and textual analysis

The findings of this enquiry do not support a simple or ‘universal’ answer to my general motivating question. The case studies suggest that, while the institutional inheritance of planning continues to exert effects on the behaviour of planners, many of the tensions and misunderstandings of participatory planning are related either to inherent contradictions in the discourse of participatory planning, or to factors that are highly contingent on individual personalities and local context. Further, the processes through which these tensions are ‘resolved’ appear to be equally context-sensitive and, possibly, temporary.

Nonetheless, the research may provide some points of direction. First, acknowledgement of the uniqueness of any social group (such as a committee), and recognition that such groups are likely to develop their own modes of practice, implies that participatory fora would, in general, benefit from having some time and space to ‘mature’. Second, in Chapter 11 I show that, in spite of the apparently contingent and aleatory nature of ‘success’ in decision-making, it is possible to identify relatively consistent signs that promising or unpromising discursive processes are at work (Table 11.2). In essence, my analysis gives formal expression to an intuitive understanding shared by many competent facilitators. Constructive dialogue cannot necessarily be enforced or prescribed; however, if facilitators are alert to its symptoms, it may be recognised and built upon. Third, the experiences of Alpha and Beta support the notion that ‘success’ – however understood – can be realised differently at the event (discussion/meeting), episode (project) and broader institutional (practices and governance culture) levels. ‘Good’ decision-making practice at meetings does not ensure either substantive outcomes or satisfaction on the part of stakeholders. Facilitators’ alertness, therefore, needs to be reinforced by attention to the interplay between these levels.

These findings are located in the fine detail of the case studies. They could not have been identified from generalised, post hoc or fixed representations of the events in which Alpha’s and Beta’s discourse practices were realised. Contemporary understandings of institutions, culture, power and knowledge see such moments of social life as inherent in action rather than pre-existing ‘out there’ (Law 2004a). A close-up perspective on action, such as that provided by this enquiry, can help to
show not only that there is a mutually constitutive relationship between instituted practices and action, but how that relationship is realised. Thus, it can also help to overcome any dualism between structure and performativity (Butler 1996).

There has been a great deal of case study research focussed on the social construction of planning knowledge and institutions in particular contexts. Much of this research seems to me to have been based on intuitive, rather than methodical, classifications of registers and discourses (Pacione 1990; Whatmore and Brougher 1992; Fischler 1995; Atkinson 1999; Collins 1999; Healey 1999; Hillier 1999, 2000a; Burgess et al. 2000; Kong 2000; Phelps and Tewdwr-Jones 2000; Vigar et al. 2000; Raco 2002). Moreover, many of the studies concerned with text have tended to treat ‘discourse’ in relatively fixed terms, to be analysed in the form either of documents or of standard metaphorical devices occurring in interviews (Tett and Wolf 1991; Collins 1999; Hastings 1999; Tait and Campbell 2000; Marston 2002; Hajer 2003). This enquiry has contributed a new methodology to the field: a sociologically-driven textual analysis (CDA) focussing on ‘real-time’ interactions as well as post hoc recontextualisations. This methodology is relatively systematic and enables a much finer focus on the details of discourse in the ephemeral context of specific planning events than is traditionally possible in planning research. Therefore, it can help to identify the often serendipitous processes through which knowledge, practices and place identities emerge, are resemiotised, and given the power to act at a distance (indeed, this enquiry has helped to show just how chancy such processes can be). This is of great importance to the study of power, knowledge and change in a contemporary bureaucratic environment, in which ‘strange’ action is regularly imposed on planning institutions.

In the following, final section, I move beyond my enquiry’s findings to reflect briefly on some possible implications for planning and further research in the ‘age of participation’.

\section{Planning with strangers?}

How might the findings of my enquiry, some of which cannot be evaluated even in context, inform planning practice and/or education more generally? Can my two case studies, neither of which successfully created ‘consensus’, provide direction?
My intention has never been to recommend ‘more participation’ or ‘better participation’ as an answer to any perceived crisis in planning practice. As my motivating question suggests, this enquiry assumed participation (and its tensions) as a starting point: crudely, participation was the problem, not the solution. In contemporary practice, participatory and interactive activities are more the norm than the exception (Chapter 6, 6.2.2): strategic planning in particular tends to be driven by interdisciplinary teams, informed by stakeholder input, and negotiated with political, business and grass-roots leaders (Heckscher and Donnellon 1994; Campbell and Marshall 2000; Tewdwr-Jones and Almendinger 2002; Iedema 2003a). It has often been noted that this trend means that planners and administrators need to develop new skills and understandings of their work (Friedmann 1987; Forester 1989, 1999b; Hoch 1994; Baum 1996; Innes 1996b; Mandelbaum et al. 1996; Healey 1997, 2003; Innes and Booher 1999a, 2003; Susskind et al. 1999; Throgmorton 2000; Almendinger and Tewdwr-Jones 2002; Hillier 2002b).

In addition, the meaning of places and spaces in contemporary society is made complex by dynamic, manifold and multi-scalar social networks (Thrift 1996; Graham and Healey 1999; Graham and Marvin 2001; Hajer and Wagenaar 2003; Healey 2004b, 2005a, 2006; Murdoch 2006), indicating a need for urban and regional planning to recognise complex, contingent relational associations across multiple actants (including non-human ones), places, times and institutions. The suggestions made below are modest and tentative, intended not to set direction but to contribute to ongoing discussion about how such a ‘relational’ practice might develop. In particular, I suggest that, in a context of radical uncertainty, continuous learning and ‘becoming’, practical wisdom may be as important as normative theory or prescription. I then propose some directions for further research that might engage with these features of interactive practice.

**Uncertainty**

This enquiry’s findings support descriptions of the contemporary (post-) bureaucratic/planning environment as highly contingent, realised continually in locally, temporally and personally specific ways (Iedema 2003a). Institutional practices and norms are formed and reformed in interactive events, often as a result of random conversational developments. Such a professional environment is
unlikely to be receptive to universalised procedural prescription. More open readings of the planning discipline may be required to respond creatively to 'relentlessly' changing contexts (Beauregard 2005: 206; see Healey 2004a; Albrechts 2005), in which different actors, in many different ways, bring new cultural meanings to planning activities and concerns. It is important, in this context, to see alternative ways of doing and meaning as generative or constructive rather than as inappropriate or interfering; difference and conflict might be treated as opportunities to renew planners' relationships with the profession, to reshape professional habitus and, concomitantly, to enrich shared experiences of places.

The habitus is embodied, personal. Challenging it can be painful, and people often resist. But the power of public institutions rests, in part, on their ability to adapt (Clegg 1993; Farmer 1999; Hajer 2003). Reconciliation of tensions in the cultural dimension cannot be only a matter of assimilation (for instance, pace DOMM, through induction of the non-habituated into bureaucratic modes of practice); this is the power of 'redundancy' (Iedema 1997a) – important, but stagnant and, thus, unsustainable. Contemporary organisations also need 'morphogenetic' power (Iedema 1997a) – the power to bring diverse meanings and practices together to create something new. Conflict is not eliminated through morphogenetic processes, but channelled into new (and sometimes temporary) identities and relations.

It also needs to be acknowledged, though, that some disagreements might be irreconcilable at any scale. This can occur in the substantive dimension, where the interests and/or values of different parties are deep and contradictory, as in the case of Beta (Gray 1997; Forester 1999a). It can also be a symptom of cultural difference (Watson 2003), reflecting different rationalities and/or ethics, and drawing upon different actor-networks and understandings for the meaning of events and entities. Planning projects may be sites in which long-term political or cultural disputes are, briefly, played out. Perhaps this needs to be accepted as part of the institution's complex social role: not always to resolve conflict, but to allow for the expression of difference, learning and, consequently, enrichment of places as meaningful actor-worlds (Hillier 1999).
Learning

Institutional learning may be ‘one-way’ – a form of assimilation – or ‘two-way’ – mutual exchange of skills and knowledge. But it may also be a ‘learning together’ process, in which new practices, understandings and identities emerge, sometimes unexpectedly, from shared activity. Wenger comments that:

Pedagogical debates traditionally focus on such choices as authority versus freedom, instruction versus discovery, individual versus collaborative learning, or lecturing versus hands-on experience. But the real issue underlying all these debates is the interaction of the planned and the emergent. Teaching must be opportunistic because it cannot control its own effects. (1998: 267)

Contemporary pedagogical theory tends to focus on active learning, rather than teaching: the teacher is a facilitator, a designer of learning environments and activities; the teacher’s aim is to make learning possible (Ramsden 1992: 8; see Peel 2000, 2002; Peel and Shortland 2004). ‘Learning’ is usually expressed as the gerund – an active process rather than a fixed product (compared to ‘knowledge’ or ‘skills’, for example). Contemporary planning, which continually involves new combinations of actors, might be conceived with a similar orientation: a focus not only on planning as procedure, but on its emergent effects as a dynamic relational process. ‘Planning’, however, does not have an obvious gerundial complement as ‘learning’ is to ‘teaching’: ‘urban development’, ‘plans’ and ‘policy’ seem too specific and too static.

Jean Hillier, exploring recent developments in UK planning policy (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister 2005), has grappled with how to describe a planning that is no longer about fixity, proposing a theoretical orientation to ‘becoming-planning’ (2005, drawing on Deleuze and Guattari 1987; see also Chia 1995; Tsoukas and Chia 2002 on ‘organisational becoming’). That is, she sees potential to theorise planning as an emergent property, a form of ‘creative experimentation’. Deleuze and Guattari’s idea of ‘becoming-’ confers a dynamic, performative aspect on things; it gives (gerundial) expression to the constantly evolving nature of identity. Perhaps, a relational planning practice could usefully draw on the idea of ‘becoming-places’.
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Once again, I feel the need to provide a word of caution. I do not mean to suggest that planners should dispense with ‘transcendent’ formulations (Hillier 2005); I still believe that practice (even as an emergent structure) requires reification in some form to be meaningful beyond the event. But I do see an opportunity for planning as a discipline to begin to view its objects in a more fluid, evolving way than is traditional. While planners need regulations and policy to lend coherence to decisions, it also needs to be recognised that daily practice – shared with other participants – is part of those reifications’ semogenesis, and that of the places being planned. If nothing else, Alpha’s and Beta’s projects have contributed, for a range of actors, new understandings of relations that give meaning to places such as Rocky Island, West Scrubfield and Lumbervale.

**Practical Wisdom**

If planning is to engage productively with uncertainty, contingency and emergence, it cannot be characterised by any predetermined box of tools (Albrechts 2005). Disciplinary knowledge and techniques can give practitioners confidence to act, but they do not, in themselves, respond creatively to context. Context dependence is the essence of the ‘practical wisdom’ that distinguishes the expert practitioner from the learner (Bernstein 1971; Flyvbjerg 2001: 10-20). It is something that cannot be received in the form of theory, rules, or even of formal skills; it must be gained from the experience of legitimate participation (Lave and Wenger 1991).

Practical wisdom is underwritten by a feel for the game – a solid, embodied understanding of the discipline and associated institutions (Bourdieu 1990a, b); praxis is not simply intellectual, but sensuous (Thrift 1996: 1). Complexity and contingency do not diminish the need for planners to learn and practise techniques, regulations, policy and so on. But these skills and knowledges need to be supplemented with less tangible attributes – sensitivity (to other rationalities, understandings and practices), alertness (to the emergence of new practices and identities), imagination (to envision different experiences, meanings and methods), adventurousness (a willingness to experiment), reflexive critique (deconstruction of practices to challenge disabling power relationships). Relational planners would be aware of the profession as a historically and culturally situated social construction, and prepared to challenge it or to let it go as circumstances and moral/ethical values...
demand. Ultimately, this awareness and this will to resistance were lacking in both DOMM’s and SOHE’s planners (though they enacted their ‘loyalty’ to their institutions in very different ways). Had they been more open to alternatives – not only in their ephemeral expression (in committee or other meetings), but in their potential to reshape instituted practices and genres (for example, the format of the plan; the meaning of ‘zoning’) – they might, perhaps, also have increased the range of acceptable outcomes and, thus, the committees’ capacity to facilitate locally driven place and/or institutional ‘becoming’.

Further research

Relational practice, then, is strange, uncertain, evolutionary and context-dependent. Research into such a practice cannot be oriented to generalisations (Flyvbjerg 2001). Rather, the work of the researcher is that of the ethnographer: to make ‘thick description’ (Geertz 1973) from which we can gain context-sensitive social understanding. As Bent Flyvbjerg points out, an orientation to the local and the specific need not imply moral or ethical relativism (2001: 130). Contextual research, like context-specific practice, can and should be driven by critical values; by a will to expose and disable mechanisms that (re)produce inequalities of opportunity and distribution.

This focus on inequality has been downplayed in the present enquiry, which sought primarily to discover ‘hidden’ sources of misunderstanding and modes of positive reconciliation between planners and stakeholders. However, power was a constant theme. Local (committee-level) interplays between expert, political/representative, economic and localist discourses and practices intertextually reproduced, distorted and occasionally were subsumed by larger-scale power relationships that, regardless of the rhetoric surrounding each project, ultimately prevented full delegation to the lay-members. The stakeholders recognised this: a lack of trust in the process was a key factor in their ‘strange behaviours’. That is, relations at different scales – regional, state, global – played roles in shaping local context. And vice versa.

I started this research project at a time when the multi-scalar and intertextual/cross-cultural complexity of participatory planning was only beginning to be recognised. Participatory planning theory was dominated by normative ideals, such as
communicative action and consensus building, which seemed to promise general solutions to the strangeness problem: building institutional capital was often presented as within the planner’s control. I saw textual analysis as a descriptive complement to this normative base: a tool for understanding just what marginalising and/or empowering discourse ‘looked like’, as a step towards enhancing reflective praxis. Over the course of the project, the case study analysis has reoriented me to a more complex, contingent understanding of how texts realise participatory planning; this reorientation has been paralleled in the planning academy. Healey’s institutionalism has been increasingly attentive to complex social networks and their multi-scalar effects on relational space and place (2004a, 2004b; Graham and Healey 1999; Vigar et al. 2000; Graham and Marvin 2001; Doak and Parker 2002; Healey et al. 2002; Hajer and Wagenaar 2003; Albrechts and Mandelbaum 2006). Post-structuralist notions of performativity and emergence have started to influence ideas about governance and place (Doel 2004; Duncan and Duncan 2004; Hillier 2005; Buscher 2006). Various interpretations of complexity theory have been used in analysing spatial/city form and/or governance institutions (Innes and Booher 1999b, 2002; Crompton 2001; Byrne 2003; Law 2004b; Crawford et al. 2005; Chettiparamb 2006).

These trends both reflect and drive a growing concern with the micro-processes of governance and place ‘becoming’. I believe that critical discourse analysis has an important contribution to make in this regard, and should take its place in the planning academy with other emerging theoretical tools such as those noted above. Several potentially fruitful extensions of my method are indicated:

- I can only speculate about the relationship between contextual issues (such as control and leadership) and the conventionality of emergent decision-making practices: exploration of this issue in more stakeholder fora might identify patterns in the way that context, agency and practice interrelate.

- Similar explorations of ergogenetic ‘metaprocesses’ with respect to other practices (for example, authorisation of representatives, implementation of recommendations) might highlight emerging spaces of mutual learning.

- It would be useful to extend the exploration of ‘metaprocesses’ to even more complex arenas: for example, those involving radical cultural and/or linguistic
barriers, such as state partnerships with Indigenous land owners; or those oriented to the general public rather than to specific stakeholders (such as the ‘Dialogue with the City’ process in Western Australia).

- Longitudinal pursuit of how and whether emergent event- and episode-level practices might ‘travel’ into ‘deeper’ institutional levels of governance procedures and culture would illuminate the role of metaprocesses in enabling institutional change.

- Close attention to the realisation of participatory practitioners’ practical wisdom (complementing the work of John Forester) might provide valuable insights for planning education and practice. Such a project might benefit particularly from an action research approach, involving participants in the research’s direction setting.

Finally, there is a need to recall that micro-analysis is not an end in itself, but a path to understanding social organisation (or organisational ‘becoming’) and change. Interactive bureaucracy (including participatory planning) instantiates a range of tensions between local empowerment and global power, both of which are enabled by production of the same communicative networks (Hardt and Negri 2004): these tensions, as I have noted, affected both my case studies. Further analysis of the interaction between the local and global scales is needed to identify interstitial spaces for critique and, possibly, for resistance.
Notes

Chapter 1

1 At different times, I worked for organisations concerned with Indigenous cultural affairs or the environment.

Chapter 2

1 I use the term 'governance' in its broadest meaning: 'to refer to collective action arrangements designed to achieve some general benefit' (Healey 2004a: 87), rather than in a normative or sociological sense (compare Rose 1999: 15-17). Some authors (for example, those in Wybo 2003) use it more specifically to refer to an emerging tendency for government – the administrative apparatus of the state – to form partnerships with other actors and decentralise regulatory power in coming to such arrangements.

2 I use the term 'labour' as a classifier, not as a proper noun. The spelling of the Australian Labor Party's name makes the latter use rather awkward in written prose.

3 The popular terms 'Thatcherism' and 'Reaganomics' became 'Rogernomics' in New Zealand, for Labour finance minister Roger Douglas (1984-1988). In 2002, Sir Roger became the first non-European to be awarded the German Hayek Society's Friedrich A. von Hayek medal, named for Europe's most influential neoliberal economist.

4 Since the turn of the century there has been a (possibly populist) countertrend, the result of popular dissatisfaction with 'economic rationalism' and also, in part, of international refugee crises in combination with increased security fears following the events of 11 September 2001. Political figures invoke personal qualities such as compassion, respect, toughness and faith in promoting their agendas. In Australia, law and order, border protection, the 'war on terror' and domestic security have become major political discourses, with largely moral and social (including race-oriented) arguments invoked on all sides of the debate.

5 Conversely, private developers in the USA have found that strict master planning of residential estates has been a successful marketing strategy, providing future residents and investors with a degree of certainty and security lacking in the public spaces outside of the estates.

6 See Abu-Lughod 1998 and Sandercock 1998b for further discussion of other traditions that have been either less enduring or less pervasive in western practice, including advocacy planning, equity planning, and radical planning.

7 At the political level, too, people have increasingly altered their formerly stable voting patterns, abandoning the major parties for others not constrained by a commitment to liberalisation of global trade – principally 'green' and nationalist parties. For example in non-metropolitan Australia, the setting for this enquiry, there was a dramatic shift throughout the 1990s from stable to swinging
electoral seats, often favouring independent candidates and minor populist parties such as the ill-fated One Nation (McManus and Pritchard 2000: 5).

8 Or discouraged, as in Alan Howard’s (1976) satirical exploration.

9 Rational decision making had long been accepted as based on both factual and value premises (Simon 1997), often framed in policy analysis as ‘information’ and ‘objectives’.

10 Friedmann’s work has much in common with that of radical practitioners in community and third-world development, who promoted not ‘community participation’, but ‘community action’ (Mayo 1975; Craig et al. 1979; Midgley 1986). This alternative paradigm emphasised that communities could only be empowered through taking action on issues that they themselves defined. The approach advocated by some practitioners (for example, Benn 1981) drew on Paulo Freire’s ‘pedagogy of the oppressed’ (1996), a process of developing literacy and critical skills through involvement in the pursuit of social change.

11 I use the word ‘pragmatic’ in its ‘plain English’ sense – oriented to achieving practical results. It is acknowledged that the term is also often applied to communicative planning in a number of more technical senses deriving from, firstly, the theories’ philosophical associations with American pragmatism (Hoch 1996; Hillier, 1998b) and, secondly, its genealogical connection with speech act pragmatics (Forester 1985).

12 See David Ryfe (2002) on the proliferation of organisations concerned with consensus building and deliberative governance in the USA.

13 This is not to suggest that the planner is not also an interested party. Forester (1989, 1993, 1999b), indeed, emphasises that planners should acknowledge their own values and position in the debate, as indicated in Section 2.2.2; others suggest that planners themselves should be treated as stakeholders (Byrne 1998). However, consensus building norms do tend to place the planner, if not above interests, at least between them.

14 This is not to suggest that all radical planning theorists rely on Foucault. A notable exception is John Friedmann (1987, 1988, 1992; Douglass and Friedmann 1998).

15 For other types of rhetorical analysis of planning discourse see, for example, Dear 1989; Hoch 1994; Rydin 1998. Although these authors make use of the concept of rhetorical tropes in analysing the discourse their case studies, it is Throgmorton who has consistently treated planning as a process of persuasion.

16 Mark Tewdwr-Jones and Philip Allmendinger (2002) point out that this difference between Healey’s approach and the USA-based consensus theory (personified by John Forester) can be partly explained by the different legislative environments in the USA and UK:

Forester’s emphasis is on the USA with its fragmented federal planning framework reliant on more informal negotiation while Healey’s experience is of more formal institutional arenas for
mediation typical of the UK system which have constrained the development of participatory processes. Consequently, Healey's collaborative planning is more concerned with the transformative influence upon existing structures (in the institutional sense) while Forester's communicative planning focuses more on agency and the mechanisms and direct outcomes of inter-personal relations. (2002: 209).

17 David Marsh and Rod Rhodes (1992) posit similar levels. Their analysis of a number of case studies found that 'policy communities' (whether relatively stable segments of the bureaucracy, pluralist networks, or corporatist coalitions) can be destabilised from above by changes in their economic, ideological, knowledge, technological and institutional environments. Further, these communities can be constrained or altered from below by their interaction with less stable, larger and more diverse 'issue networks'.

18 Compare Lincoln and Guba's (1985) 'perceived reality' as an ontological paradigm. Crotty's 'constructionism' differs from many accounts of 'constructivism' (for example, Guba and Lincoln 1994) in that the former is compatible with a realist ontology. That is, 'constructionism' implies a belief in an 'objective' reality 'out there' (Law 2004a: 24) which nonetheless can only participate indirectly in social life, through the interpretation and socially-constructed knowledge of social agents. The extent to which the 'out there' includes social realities such as structural relations, however, is ambiguous. As Giddens (1984) points out, structure 'exists' insofar as practices are reproduced across time and space, marking digressions from those practices as somehow 'wrong'. Such realities, while they may indeed constrain action, are unstable: as they are continually brought into being, they are vulnerable to change.

Chapter 3

1 The 'cross-cultural communication' stream received a particular boost from the growth of international business, and especially from the emergence of powerful economic forces in Asia (Seelye and Seelye-James 1996). It has also been effectively popularised as a way of accounting for interpersonal miscommunication between members of a society, by treating gender and class conflict, for instance, as cultural rather than structural/political (for example, Tannen 1986, 1990, 1994; Gray 1992).

2 These collections/works give outlines and examples of a number of different approaches, which include inter alia the philosophical speech act pragmatics, which influenced Habermas, and the sociological/ethnomethodological approach of conversation analysis/membership categorisation (Sacks 1995).

3 See also, for example, the 'critical perspectives' in Mumby 1993; and Ben Agger's (1991) 'critical theory of public life', which also focus on texts.
Functional linguistics is contrasted with structural linguistics particularly in the former’s rejection of the opposition between *langue* and *parole* or, as Jim Martin puts it, the belief that ‘semantics is naturally (not arbitrarily) related to grammar’ (1992: 1, emphasis in original). Its focus, therefore, is on texts in context, rather than sentence formation.

SFL sees the realisation relationship not as simply mediated, but as ‘metaredundant’ (Lemke 1984, drawing on Bateson 1972), a term used to evoke the way that one level redounds – covaries – not only with the level it realises, but with the relationship that that ‘higher’ level has with the levels above it. For instance, it is not simply the case that expression realises wording realises meaning; rather, expression realises the realisation of meaning by wording (Halliday 1992: 24).

Compare Halliday’s model to the efforts of Dell Hymes, for example, whose ‘ethnography of communication’ attempted to specify all contextual variables for activities (1977).

Fairclough (2003: 72) equates genre with the discoursal aspect of activity more generally, seeing the privileging of ‘purpose’ as an aspect of the modernising tendency to strategic, rather than communicative, action (Habermas 1984). I am not sure that this is a genuine matter for debate. Suzanne Eggins (1990; Eggins and Slade 1997), for example, has shown that seemingly ‘purposeless’ casual conversation nonetheless serves important (though not necessarily instrumental) social functions. Eggins (1994: 92) further suggests that a realistic social purpose is a basic criterion for considering any piece of language to be a text. That is, the difference between the two definitions becomes insignificant if the sense of ‘purposeful’ is extended to include communicative as well as instrumental purposes.

Lemke (1992) suggests a number of additional intertextual meaning relations:

- cultural narratives – which I take to include myths (for example, Genesis), legends (pioneers conquer the outback), story-lines (acid rain creates a causal link between pollution and dead trees [Hajer 1995]), canons (boy and girl meet, marry and live happily ever after; scientist makes an important discovery) and symbolic icons (the freedom fighter; the self-made millionaire; the peace pipe; the atom bomb), as well as ‘metanarratives’ about the progress of society as a whole (Lyotard 1984);

- heteroglossic formations – patterns of orientation that identify texts with particular points of view or subject positions (Left/Right; Hawk/Dove; Christian/Jewish/Moslem; Feminine/Masculine; Realist/Constructivist, and so on);

- actional formations – relating texts which are generated and linked by the same practice and, consequently, which form parts of an organised whole (in formal teaching for example, program – lesson – assignment – report);

- thematic formations – constructing ‘issues’ and broadly defining the ‘things the community is talking about’ (and by implication, what they are not talking about);

- discourses – ways of representing the world;

- genres.
Chapter 4

1 These agreements (Appendix A), and separate agreements signed by individual participants after discussing the project (Appendix B), also provided (inter alia) for protection of individual identities, and for the withdrawal of consent for certain information to be used or recorded. The enquiry was approved by Curtin University of Technology’s Human Research Ethics Committee, whose guidelines are based on those of the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) and aim to ensure that no harm is caused to participants, that confidentiality is respected, and that informed consent is obtained appropriately.

2 Apart from this, I think many of participants, who showed little overt interest in my research or findings, were simply being nice to me.

3 Copies are available from the researcher on request, censored to protect anonymity.

4 I once spent a year working as a builder’s labourer, usually as the only woman on site. The difference between my co-workers’ behaviour at first and after they got used to me was profound. At some community group meetings, discussion among men who knew each other well showed many similar characteristics to those I heard in my early days on the building site: hesitation and hedging when talking about matters even remotely related to sex or race; very little swearing and self-conscious apologies when it occurred; and a paucity of ironic banter.

5 Initially, some Alpha members did not want the meetings to be recorded. They changed their mind at the third meeting, after being reassured that the tapes and transcripts would not be on the public record.

6 ‘Triangulation’ refers to the use of multiple sources and alternative theoretical explanations to establish the ‘trustworthiness’ (Lincoln and Guba 1985) of a qualitative enquiry’s data and analysis (Yin 1984; Lincoln and Guba 1985; Blaikie 2000). The term is not preferred by some authors (for example, Silverman 2000: 177), because of its positivist/mathematical overtones which could imply truth claims. Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln explicitly caution against this inference: ‘Triangulation is not a tool or strategy of validation, but an alternative to validation’ (1994: 2).

7 This is interesting, as it suggests that most participants saw the interviews as a legitimate use of their work time — was I seen as part of the planning process? Were they perhaps segregating my intrusion on their lives from their own time?

8 Often the personal and institutional are difficult to distinguish: participants’ positions are constructed in social interactions (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Abram et al. 1996; Eder 1996 and Chapter 6 on actor-network theory), and often reflect their own understanding of the role they have committed to in the process (compare my own experiences, outlined in Chapter 1). Moreover, regardless of my promises of confidentiality, some participants may have felt uncomfortable about revealing personal differences with those they represented.
The idea was inspired by recent socio-linguistic research (Jordens et al. 2001) which suggested that the unfolding of cancer patients' stories about their illness reflected a process of 'making sense' of their experience, and restoring order to disrupted lives. Generic complexity within these stories (that is, mixing of genres and difficulty of characterisation) appeared to be correlated with the level of life disruption experienced, whereas generic coherence indicated a level of acceptance or control.

 Nonetheless, participants did talk about their substantive concerns and values as well. I suspect that this was partly because they wanted to convince me of their 'rightness', and partly because they wanted those concerns recorded and/or reported to the executive agencies. As such, this input formed an important (but still minor) part of the case study reports.

 There was no intentional connection between the two cases, other than my own passive involvement. Of course, complex networks do connect any two projects (Healey 2000; Bridge and Watson 2002), especially within relatively small communities. Some examples, which I believe had minimal effects on the issues of concern for my enquiry, include:

 - Scrubfield and Harbourtown were in competition for certain development projects which, if they were to proceed, would affect local planning. Some of these projects were raised in both Alpha's and Beta's meetings.
 - The Department of Regional Development, which was represented on Beta, acted as executive to a regional advisory board, some of whose members expressed concern about aspects of the proposed marine reserve near Scrubfield. One of Beta's members thus had a vicarious interest in Alpha's project.
 - The Shires of Scrubfield and Harbourtown had frequent contact with each other at both staff and Council level, and were both represented on a regional local government committee.
 - Two of Beta's state government participants lived in Scrubfield, and both had personal friendships with some local DOMM staff.

 There was a single exception – my request for permission to observe the process.

 I have capitalised these items to indicate that they represent headings within the management plan, rather than general principles to guide the committee.

 There were two Indigenous Australians on the committee, but neither was from the local sociolinguistic group(s). DOMM's reasons for not appointing a local Indigenous person to the committee appear to have been twofold: first, they had received some advice from an unspecified source that a committee might be a culturally inappropriate forum for Indigenous involvement; and, second, there were competing Native Title claims over the area, creating a potential for conflict in appointing a representative from just one of the claimant groups (the option of appointing more than one claimant representative was considered too unwieldy). In addition, 'Indigenous interests' was always treated as an abstract 'issue' (Chapter 7, 7.2.3) – DOMM were playing a 'politics of ideas' rather than a 'politics of presence' (Phillips 1996). Unfortunately, the matter of Indigenous...
involvement in the Alpha process remained unresolved (to members’ enormous frustration) to the end. This is a deeply fraught issue associated with a complex politics and an emotionally difficult social history, which could be the subject of another full thesis in itself; I will not even attempt to examine it in this one, particularly as I have myself not consulted with the relevant communities. In brief, though, my interpretation of the outcome is that DOMM, in spite of trying hard to engage Indigenous stakeholders in the consultation process, lacked the skills, understanding and confidence to appropriately manage Indigenous participation. They appeared not to realise that Indigenous people tend to expect a more central and authoritative role in decision making, in recognition of their status as traditional owners of the country with concomitant responsibilities for its management (see Porter 2004). As a result, staff efforts failed to establish anything more than the most superficial contact, and they were unable to make decisions regarding how suitably to direct resources to the problem. To be fair, a number of budgetary requests for specialist assistance in this regard were made, and all met with refusal from ‘on high’.

15 After the sixth meeting’s cancellation I made some informal telephone calls to members who had been absent since Meeting 4, to clarify their reasons for non-attendance. In all cases, they cited other priorities and commitments as the immediate reasons, indicating also that they did not see Alpha meetings as the best use of their time. In their second interviews, these and other members said that the meetings had become tedious.

16 At the time, Lumbervale was home to a community of about 800 people living in ‘caretaker dwellings’.

17 During the course of my fieldwork, some state government departments were restructured and renamed. This did not affect the duties of officers involved in Alpha or Beta, and the thesis essentially ignores this fact: the (fictional) names I have given here are retained throughout.

18 Beta’s membership was not constant – several of the state and local government representatives changed during the course of the process, and for each round I interviewed principally those people who were involved at the time.

19 This was the first of a number of personnel changes during Beta’s planning process. These changes raised an ethical issue for me, because later meetings included people who had not been original parties to my agreement with the group. Although the chair generally introduced me at the start of each meeting, I ensured that new members were aware of my involvement and recording of the meetings by discussing the project with them after their first meeting, and again when I approached them to organise their interviews (each participant signed an informed consent form). There were no objections.

20 I was at a conference overseas in July 2002, and did not attend the eleventh meeting. Reports of the meeting all suggest that the endorsement of the final brief was straightforward and non-contentious.
The secretary’s email could not handle such a large document; the courier’s truck broke down; formatting problems made the report unreadable. As the scale of these events suggest, the reports would have been available only at the last minute in any case.

DRD’s statutory responsibilities are open enough to allow broad interpretation, and the agency often takes on the role of coordinating inter-governmental responses to development issues.

Chapter 5

This can be seen from the way that the story in Chapter 4 (4.3.2) frequently ‘names’ individuals, a tactic that was less necessary when recounting Alpha’s story.

This has led to a new tension between the need to protect participants’ anonymity and my desire to give them some credit for their contribution. I had decided that, even if an individual was happy to be named, I would rather treat all participants consistently, which meant that none could be identified in association with their statements (for example, through in-text citation). Hence, the acknowledgements to this thesis refer only to the committees by their fictional names. In contrast, individuals are named in the acknowledgements to the case study reports, which have been distributed only to the participants.

I do not see this as ‘political correctness’, as the term is used by conservatives, but more as a recognition that such groups have enough problems without being publicly criticised by their friends.

Other possibilities might have included: the meaning of ‘meeting’; the establishment of agendas; implementation; conferral of authority to speak for the group; and so on. I chose decision making principally because it is traditionally a key requirement of planning meetings – though I do not believe it necessarily to be a universal requirement. It also connected well with my first passage of textual analysis, particularly the question of ‘closure’.

I have elided from this quote the disquietening words ‘universally valid’, which could be (mis)understood as implying that alternative understandings have no validity. ‘Science’, as I see it, could be extended to cover a range of methods used to understand reality – positivist, interpretive, narrative and so on.

Chapter 6

A teacher of mine once described this phenomenon by saying that skills travel from your head to your gut, a metaphor that resonates with many contemporary understandings of practical conventions as embodied (Taylor 1999).

Dvora Yanow’s (1996) anthropological analysis of rituals as the enactment of myths is instructive: ‘they preserve and propagate the values, beliefs and feelings embedded in those myths ... drawing on language and/or on objects to do so’ (1996: 189). Planning rituals – formal meetings, fact gathering,
mapping, and so on – may thus be seen as sustaining modern cultural metanarratives about rationality and progress (Lyotard 1984; see, for instance, Roe 1994; Farmer 1995; Fischer 2000; Pellizzoni 2001b).

I differentiate here between ‘practice’ – participation and reification through which institutions are constructed – and the count noun ‘a practice’ or ‘practices’ – specific sets of activities associated with institutions. The distinction is similar to that between ‘discourse’ and ‘discourses’.

Wenger was concerned with individual learning, rather than cross-cultural practice.

In this article, William Earle distinguishes between field at the societal level, ‘Champs1’, and the institutional, ‘Champs2’, in order to account for agents’ differing performance in different social contexts.

Bourdieu explains this feature of the habitus as a ‘generative principle’ or ‘competence’, in a direct analogy with Noam Chomsky’s (1965) generative grammar (Bourdieu 1991: 9, Margolis 1999).

For a few examples, see Latour and Woolgar 1979; Law and Williams 1982; Hughes 1983; Callon 1986b; Callon et al. 1986b; Latour 1987, 1988; Law 1991.

David Harvey derives the term ‘moment’ from Karl Marx’s insistence that capital is a relational process rather than a ‘thing’. The meaning he gives the word is similar to Callon’s meaning, in spite of the genealogical differences between them.

Laclau and Mouffe call this new element a ‘discourse’. However, I follow Chouliajfrac{r}{k} and Fairclough (1999) in avoiding the term in this context, because I wish to differentiate between the discursive (that is, linguistic) and non-discursive moments of the social.

To me, the framing metaphor evokes both a structural (for example, housing) and a viewing (for example, picture) frame: framing both provides form to the production/development of meanings and bounds the way that meanings can be received/interpreted. As such, it is a useful ‘shorthand’ concept, used in a wide range of disciplines: for example, in sociology and anthropology (Bernstein 1971, 1981; Bateson 1972; Goffman 1974; Agar 1985; Snow et al. 1986; Gamson 1992; Eder 1996; Boltanski and Thevenot 1999; Rose 1999; also in ANT – Callon 1986b, 1998; Law 1999); in linguistics (especially Tannen 1993); in organisation theory (Schoen 1991; Rein and Schoen 1993); in communication theory (Dick and Dalmau 1999); in cultural studies (MacLachlan and Reid 1994; Paltridge 1997; Schirato and Yell 2000); in policy analysis and planning (Throgmorton 1993; Hajer 1995, 2003; Faludi 1996; Gray 1997; Feitelson 1999; Pellizzoni 1999, 2001a; Laws and Rein 2003; Wagenaar and Cook 2003).

As Chapter 2 pointed out, there has been a plethora of research demonstrating that the realities of bureaucratic practice do not always live up to these ‘ideals’ (for examples within the Weberian framework, Blau and Meyer 1987: Chapter 3). In the planning field, see in particular Bent Flyvbjerg (1996, 1998) on *Realrationalität*; Jean Hillier’s (2001, 2002a) conversations with planners as ‘missionaries or chameleons’; Meyerson and Banfield 1955; Forrester 1989, 1999b; Thomas and
Healey 1991. These planning studies and discussions all show that the reality of planning/policy analysis is a function as much of its strong interface with the political field as of its place in the bureaucratic field. See also Jean Hillier (2000b, 2002a, 2002b, 2003) on the role of informal political action in undermining traditional bureaucratic ethics.

12 In this 1998 article, Rick Iedema uses discourse-analytical techniques to show how assumptions of such knowledge and literacies are embedded within job descriptions. Because rank is codified, actors need not in fact possess such knowledge for it to be attributed to them – the codification realises this form of cultural capital for them. In contrast, the economic and social capital described below are conferred by rank.

13 I am treating ‘social capital’ here as the connections enjoyed by an individual and able to be realised in interactions. This use differs from that in much of the ‘social capital literature’ (for example Putnam et al. 1993; Cox 1995), which focuses on the benefits of social connectivity to society as a whole. In this context of describing the bureaucracy’s internal structure, my use also differs from Innes’ et al.’s (1994) social capital, a normative concept referring to the potential for social connections to extend an institution’s responsiveness to community needs (Chapter 2).

14 Rank does not codify these aspects comprehensively, however, as social and economic capital vary significantly between bureaus according to ministerial seniority, levels of dependence and departmental budgets (see Marsh and Rhodes 1992 on power in interorganisational policy networks). To fully understand and respond ‘appropriately’ to this variation, an agent must be highly habituated to the field and its interface with the political. I do not wish to dwell on this issue. However, it was of relevance to my case studies, and therefore needs to be borne in mind.

15 Although it is a popular perception that it can. One of the most common criticisms of bureaucrats is that institutional rank and departmental resources are their primary, or even their only, concerns (for example, Peters and Nelson 1979). I maintain that this characterisation is usually unjust.

16 Scientific and other knowledge may, of course, be codified as academic qualifications or otherwise, but these codifications belong to other institutions than the bureaucracy.

17 Institutional budgets increasingly include not only Treasury allocations, but also such money as agencies can raise through ‘user-pays’ mechanisms and partnerships with the private sector.

18 Bacon spoke of knowledge as a commodity, but there are other perspectives on this dictum. Foucault’s ‘power/knowledge’ (1980) – an understanding of power as inherent in the way discourses create objects of knowledge – resonates somewhat with Bourdieu’s ‘symbolic power’ of constituting the ‘given’ – a power constantly enacted by the state, for example in its production of ‘social problems’ (1994: 2).

19 Impartiality is often subsumed to external forms of capital anyway, as in bureaus acting under corporatist policies (Yeatman 1990; Young 1990). Moreover, bureaucracies infiltrate every facet of modern life (Smith 1990; Sarangi and Slembrouck 1996), and their internal world is to some extent
familiar to everyone: hence dissatisfied clients (or ‘partners’) often demand access to higher ranking officials. In general, though, this aspect of the bureaucratic field appears often to be a source of considerable frustration to clients (for empirical examples, see Nelson 1979; Sarangi and Slembrouck 1996; Cedersund and Saljo 1997).

20 Compare Innes’ et al’s (1994) intellectual, social and political capital; Healey’s et al’s (2002: 14) knowledge, relational and mobilisation resources.

21 This section draws on a paper presented to the annual conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning in 2002 (MacCallum 2002b).

22 With apologies to those involved in planning as implementation or development control. In each of my case studies, the formal task of the committee was to develop a plan, after which the committee would cease to function and the business of achieving the plan’s objectives would be delegated to new actors.

23 These ‘headings’ represent generic stages in the plan, rather than literal headings (see, for example, Beal 1968; Black 1968; Glasson 1978: 260-65).

24 That is, the structure represents an instrumentally rational process, specifically the systems approach to planning: decision to plan – goal formation – objectives – model possible courses of action (strategies) – evaluate alternative strategies – implement strategies through specific actions – monitor (McLoughlin 1969; Chadwick 1971; Roberts 1974; Hall 1975).

Chapter 7

1 Suzanne Eggins and Diana Slade propose a method for analysing the genre of casual conversation by distinguishing between ‘chunks’ – segments, such as monologues, that are organised rhetorically – and ‘chats’ – segments where structure is managed locally, at the exchange level (1997: 227-230). While Eggins’ and Slade’s exchange framework proved extremely useful in my analysis (Chapter 5, 5.3.2), I found that their understanding of ‘chats’, at the genre level, did not capture the explicitly strategic nature of participants’ interactivity in committee meetings: layers of embedded discourse-semantic patterns that result from, for instance, rhetorical questioning and ‘preparing the ground’ for persuasive or bargaining moves, even when several people are actively participating (Iedema 1997a: 155). My analysis of the case study data, therefore, led to adaptation of the exchange framework to account for such strategic elements of meeting (‘non-casual’) discourse (Appendix F).

2 Much of the analysis presented in this section has been published previously (MacCallum 2002a, 2005).

3 The usual chairperson was away due to a family bereavement.

4 Consultation reports were consistently presented at, rather than before, the meetings, and included all feedback received up to that morning.
The Scrubfield project was the second undertaken by DOMM under their new policy of involving stakeholders in writing the management plan.

In general, where I make claims about participants' motivations or expectations, those claims are based on what those participants told me in interviews, as well as on the utterances represented by the transcript fragments. As indicated in Chapter 4, I felt that it was important to supplement my own interpretations with those of the people directly involved.

'Recommending' is, in pragmatic terms, a performative act (Searle 1970): uttering it is equivalent to doing it. Many performatives are made possible by institutions which authorise their speakers to perform them (Bourdieu 1991: 73-76; 109-111).

Again, it seems to me that the committee are performing their political knowledge – and their understanding of how public agencies can be affected by ministerial/government whim – for DOMM's benefit and also for each other's. The timing of this meeting gave them a special opportunity to do so.

With apologies to Emanuel Schegloff and Harvey Sacks ('Opening up Closings', 1973) and to Jay Lemke ('Opening up closure', 2000).

Having established a non-subservient relationship with DOMM, the committee progressed much more smoothly through the texting during the fourth and fifth meetings. It was reported to me by several members that once they understood DOMM's requirements, they simply wanted to get through 'the boring bits' as quickly as possible.

Following the third meeting Alpha had insisted on electing a deputy chairperson from their own ranks in case the usual chairperson, Marshall, should be away again – another assertion of their power in relation to DOMM staff.

Representative bodies are established across Australia to administer Native Title claims under the Native Title Act 1993. As such, staff of such bodies are seen as working for the claimant groups, which consist of Indigenous people with traditional ownership of, or ties to, local lands.

By comparison, in the Meeting 3 session outlined in the previous section, 68 utterances were by members compared to 82 by staff, with more than half of the staff's turns being lengthy statements.

There were, of course, instances when submissions were used strategically to add weight to particular member positions (as this section shows) but, even when there were submissions supporting member views, those positions were just as often argued for with little reference to the consultation, as in the case of Fishy Island. DOMM staff generally restricted their input regarding the submissions to presenting and explaining them; they tried hard not to be seen to argue for or against any particular position (that is, to realise the 'ethical capital' of impartiality).
I use 'strange' here, as in Chapter 6, with reference to the title of Part 2, to evoke intertextually the idea of strangers in the strange (alien) land of bureaucratic practice. The behaviours are, of course, not strange in themselves — indeed, I doubt that the phrase ‘strange in itself’ is meaningful at all.

Chapter 8

There are several other aspects of LAG’s objectives that display their authors’ lack of practice with the planning discourse they are using, notably: the unclear logic of the embedding (normally sub-objectives elaborate, rather than add to, their superordinate); the clumsy collocation of bureaucratic lexis (‘suitable to be located’; ‘implement ... options’, and so on) and the overburdened nominal groups.

Related to this possibility are two less pronounced differences: in the ‘communication’ and ‘decision-making authorities’ strings the state figures seem slightly low. As in the Alpha analysis, the ‘communication’ and ‘thought/knowledge’ strings are exaggerated because of various interpersonal strategies, especially authorisation by means of direct and indirect quotation, and ‘modalisation metaphors’ such as ‘I think’ (Eggins and Slade 1997: 302). A possible correlation — suggested by the figures in Table 8.1 — between the former of these strategies and the speakers’ distance from the state government is supported by the state bureaucrats’ less frequent invocations of decision-making authorities such as Council and the state government. Perhaps this reflects differing ideas about where authority comes from — reifications/inscriptions, or powerful human agents.

Until 1998, a sign directing motorists to Lumbervale read ‘Light Industrial Area’; the first published draft of DOP’s Harbourtown Planning Study (1998) consistently described Lumbervale as ‘light industry’ — these references were amended for the final report (see also Chapter 9, note 27).

And, incidentally, incorrect: none of the generally accepted environmental management references equates mangrove ecosystems with wetlands.

Based on what follows, Barry’s ‘this’ in Fragment 8.9, unlike Sue’s ‘it’, does not appear to refer to ‘the security issue’ but to the existence of caretaker dwellings in industrial areas — an exophoric reference in this context.

As Chapter 4 (4.3.2) noted, my Round 1 interviews suggested that all LAG members had committed to the same positions and to the same arguments for those positions.

This subsection draws on papers presented to conferences held by the Association of European Schools of Planning (MacCallum 2002c) and the Australian Systemic Functional Linguistics Association (MacCallum 2004).

Export Estate was shown in indicative form on the SOHE zoning scheme. However, there had been no visible progress in alienating the land and it remained unavailable for development. In addition, the state’s precise intentions for the site had never been published.
9 The release of land for Export Estate, as for most unallocated Crown land in Australia, is subject to negotiations with Native Title claimants under the *Native Title Act 1993*.

10 The suggested action, 'write a list of objectives' reflects the success (particularly in the view of the LAG representatives) of the group’s previous objectives-writing exercise, outlined in Section 8.1 (also Chapter 11, 11.3.1).

11 In Fragment 8.19, Scott’s ‘No, no’ is an agreement with Belinda’s development of ‘Don’t have to ...’: ‘And then we wait ...’.

12 Sam was described to me by other bureaucrats on the group, especially Sue and Len, as very polite (an assessment with which I agreed). Most LAG members, however, described him as rude and arrogant, citing a tendency to take fewer and longer turns in conversation than others (producing monologues, not participating in consensus building), and also citing the same face-protecting indirectness that the public servants admired. There were several factors underlying this perception – most importantly the substantive dispute over the future of Lumbervale, about which LAG members became increasingly convinced that Sam was conspiring against them. However I am sure that there was also a discursive/cultural element to it.

13 ‘The government’ of Lance’s utterance is, as Fragment 8.25 shows, represented by officers from the Department of Planning.

### Chapter 9

1 Following adoption of the new policy, DOMM produced a public participation manual and held an internal workshop; however, these formal supports post-dated the establishment of Alpha by several months.

2 This is not to say that such discourses did not exist. The Australian comedy *The Castle* (Working Dog Productions 1997), which concerns a family’s fight to save their home from compulsory acquisition, was released not long before these events; the film was framed by a popular cultural narrative about the sanctity of the family home. That narrative was invoked by Lumbervale residents in submissions and in interviews with me. However, in this context it apparently failed to capture the imagination of the broader public.

3 The ‘goods’ listed here are general ones which are formalised in John Rawls’ procedural justice (Rawls 1971; also Lind and Tyler 1988; Hillier 1998a; Tyler and Blader 2000) and Jürgen Habermas’ ‘discourse ethics’ (1990). They pervade the literature on deliberative democracy and communicative planning (for example, Barber 1984; Forester 1989, 1999b; Dryzek 1990; Mansbridge 1992; Sager 1994; Innes 1995; Renn et al. 1995a; Benhabib 1996a; Chambers 1996; Gutmann and Thompson 1996; Healey 1997; Einsiedel and Eastlick 2000; Marshall and Sproats 2000; Wagle 2000; Weeks 2000; Young 2000; Maier 2001; Jackson 2002) and, indeed, many critiques of the communicative paradigm (for example, Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998; Huxley 2000; Huxley and Yiftachel 2000; Huxley and Yiftachel 2002).
2000; Neuman 2000; Woltjer 2000; Yiftachel and Huxley 2000; McGuirk 2001). They also underlie earlier normative models such as Sherry Arnstein’s still hugely influential *Ladder of Citizen Participation* (1969). For some authors, though, such ‘goods’ need to be checked in relation to the role of the planning agency/project and the purpose of introducing participatory processes (for example, Burke 1968; Walters et al. 2000; Bishop and Davis 2002); that is, pragmatic considerations are as important as moral and ethical ones.

4 The scoping exercise involved over 100 semi-structured interviews with a total of 164 people (identified using a ‘snowball’ technique) and discussions with the public at a staffed display at Scrubfield’s largest shopping centre, in addition to information gathering from documents, government data sets and a benthic habitat survey (summarised from DOMM report on Scrubfield scoping exercise [2000] and various background reports for Alpha).

5 Two members were (non-local) Indigenous Australians (Chapter 4, note 14). I did not know the precise ages of all members, but all were well into the work/family stage of their lives; three were older and approaching retirement. All were, as far as appearances suggested, able-bodied.

6 The space was ‘neutral’, of course, only in terms of the relationship between DOMM and a generic ‘other participant’. It certainly cannot be assumed that all participants would be equally comfortable in a hotel; indeed, there was some evidence that they were not. At the public meetings organised by the Scrubfield Fishing and Diving Association (9.2.1 and Chapter 4, 4.3.1), some people, apparently intimidated or annoyed by the presence of alcohol, remained outside or left (I make this claim based purely on observation—or ‘eavesdropping’, as I was watching and listening to people without their informed consent). It is unlikely that any venue could be considered truly ‘neutral’.

7 Much to Mitch’s irritation, apparently: ‘That I’m wrong’ is sarcastic, motivated by Mitch’s (later stated) perception that Dick was constantly and inappropriately telling members that they were mistaken.

8 The precise extent of certain uses was disputed, and a few members felt that the maps should have been based on navigational charts rather than aerial photos, on the grounds that the charts would have been more familiar and accessible to most ‘stakeholders’.

9 The membership itself was discussed at the first meeting, and a number of additional groups were suggested for inclusion. In particular, LAG representatives felt that the Native Title claimants should be included in the committee, as they had a crucial role in the release and development of land. This idea was opposed by all the state representatives, principally on the grounds that Native Title negotiations were the responsibility of another government department, and people were uneasy about possibly compromising negotiations that were already underway. It was also felt that trying to address Native Title issues in the planning stages would complicate the process by introducing matters that would need to be tackled within a legal, rather than a planning, framework. Thus, as in the case of Alpha, Indigenous participation was separated from the focal forum of the process. The other
additional stakeholders suggested were largely state agencies with no local office; it was decided to include them on an as-required basis rather than permanently.

Later in the process, a new Council demanded the inclusion of a ‘community representative’ from outside of LAG, in order to reinforce the principle that Beta’s task was of more general interest than Lumbervale and the port. They received no nominations at all for this position, and made the appointment by persuading a member of a more popular committee to transfer to Beta. The new ‘community representative’ attended only a few meetings, and contributed so little that, in interviews, no other members – not even SOHE staff – recalled his presence until (and in some cases even when) reminded of it by me. One staff member surmised that he had only come for the sandwiches; perhaps coincidentally, he stopped attending when the meetings became shorter and lunch was no longer provided.

At that stage, it was decided not to engage a consultant, mainly due to Sue’s (the DOP officer’s) assurances that, with her help, the committee could conduct the study themselves. For the second and third meetings, substantive items towards that aim – assessing current land use and further land availability – were added to the agenda at Sue’s request (see 9.2.2).

Some participants feared that it could lead to an unacceptable (non-)decision being adopted by the committee because of one person’s opposition. In the realm of politics, not to make a decision is equivalent to making a decision not to act (Barber 1984: 124).

The overhead was produced in response to a request from committee members for clarity about their responsibility for ‘full consultation’ and their scope of authority in relation to statutory and institutional constraints. In emphasising decision making and review, it did not address these particular concerns.

I mean ‘relative’ in local terms. The first de facto public submission period produced 59 written responses and the second one 179, of which 124 were form letters circulated by recreational angling clubs. By way of comparison, the total number of submissions to a major planning/urban design initiative for Scrubfield’s town centre the previous year was twelve.

More generally, public fora could provide for diverse ‘publics’ to call each other to account (Sandercock 1998b: 198). The public meetings held during the Alpha process mostly failed to realise this potential.

DOMM’s efforts were undermined by the fact that some Alpha members – the recreational anglers in particular – had a different understanding of the purpose of sanctuary zones. DOMM consistently framed zoning as a form of ‘insurance’, whereby whole ecological systems would be left intact in certain places. In contrast, the recreational anglers (Matt and Mark) always talked about no-take zones as a fisheries management measure, justifiable only in terms of replenishing or monitoring table fish stocks. This interpretation frames frequent and ongoing critiques, on the part of recreational and commercial fishing lobby groups, of the idea that zoning is ‘best practice’ – in general, such groups
seem to prefer quantitative measures such as ‘bag limits’ to spatial controls. The anglers on Alpha brought such critiques to the attention of the committee several times, always evoking the ‘scientific’ nature of the findings or opinions being reported. DOMM staff members, all of whom had scientific training, were confident in providing similarly authorised defences. The different substantive understandings were never explicitly addressed or resolved.

I acknowledge that this is a rather contrived distinction – it has long been held that expertise is neither neutral nor disinterested (Callon 1986b; Forester 1989, 1999b; Crush 1995; Baum 1996; Wynne 1996; Flyvbjerg 1998; Fischer 2000; Pellizzoni 2001b). Even in the absence of a direct stake in the outcome (‘conflict of interest’), experts normally have a vital interest in pleasing their superiors and sustaining their own cultural/personal values, as well as in maintaining their standing within and loyalty to their discipline, their organisation and their professional field (Tewdwr-Jones 2002) – ‘expertise’ is in itself a ‘stake’. Indeed, in this case, Larry expressed a strong personal desire to produce a solution that would be technically appropriate and acceptable to the planners at DOP. Nonetheless, the expert/stakeholder distinction was one that was maintained by most of the participants in both case studies.

The only exceptions to this rule were a few occasions when, assuming the chairperson’s role, Larry requested that certain statements be deferred to another agenda item.

The implicit contrast (‘however …’) here between ‘good planning principles’ and ‘what’s best for the community’ represents an unusual sentiment for a planner!


To recapitulate, HIS suggested making Lumbervale a light industrial live-work precinct with permissible dwellings; the PPS suggested that the residential component should be phased out to provide a buffer zone for heavy industrial development in the port. The extent of the contradiction was surprising, considering that five separate agencies – the port management, SOHE, DRD, DOP and DOE – were officially represented on both overseeing committees. In discussions with some of those who sat on the port’s committee, I got the impression that they had not read the documents in great detail before endorsing them. In addition, none of those agencies formally endorsed the HIS, as only LAG and SOHE representatives were represented at Beta’s final meeting, SOHE officers withholding their opinion.

This subsection draws in part on a paper presented to the 2002 Congress of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (MacCallum 2002b).

In Western Australia, the current Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Alannah MacTiernan, has adopted as one of her trademarks a ‘Dialogue’ approach to strategic planning, in which public participation is foregrounded in various ways, including, to some extent, in the resulting plans. These tend to emphasise the workshop processes and/or ‘extensive community consultation’ used to form the objectives and strategies (Western Australian Planning Commission and Department for Planning
and Infrastructure 2004: 3); further, their action plans emphasise continuing dialogue rather than simple implementation (2004: 4, 23-34). Thus, while there remain ‘important departures from [communicative planning] theory’ (Hopkins 2004) in this approach, there is evidence that participation discourses are at last, in small ways, infiltrating the plan.

24 The eventual resolution was to set ‘implementation of management strategies within agreed timeframes’ as the target for every social value.

25 I do not have permission to quote from these records, but interviews with DOMM officers included discussion of how Alpha influenced subsequent processes.

26 The structure of Colin’s contract allowed him to move on from each stage without specifically addressing Beta’s concerns, as all comments were to be incorporated into the final report at Stage 3. This is fairly standard consultancy procedure, as it allows a consultant to proceed according to their original timeframe, and to extract payment for each stage while doing so. Personally, I believe it also provides scope for the non-resolution of issues, and frequently leads to the production of unsatisfactory final reports.

27 The author of the HPS removed all references to Lumbervale as light industrial following the controversy surrounding SOHE’s zoning amendment, during which those references were often used to support LAG’s claims that the general industry designation was an unwarranted change in status. As those claims were contrary to DOP’s own position, this was quite an embarrassing moment. Although the claims were not strictly accurate (for reasons of legal definition), DOP’s instinctive use of ‘light industry’ in the HPS’s first draft suggests that LAG’s ‘popular perception’ argument was a valid one.

28 When I interviewed Colin after the process was finished, he had completely forgotten that the group had done a lot of the work before he began his contract.

29 I had written a letter requesting permission to name the committee in a conference paper I was presenting. In fact, only one person objected, but members agreed to follow their ‘one in, all in’ rule, still showing solidarity at this stage. As I understood the discussion, the committee did not actually object to my request, but rather decided to refuse it.

30 These officers became known to the rest of the technical support group as the ‘Lumbervale Liberation Front’. Few people appreciated the exquisite irony of this label.

31 For example, local governments have no constitutional powers and their decisions in are delegated ones, subject to state endorsement. Political lobbying is always available to participants in planning.

32 It is possible that the key issue was one of ‘deep difference’ (Gutmann and Thompson 1996; Gray 1997; Forester 1999a) – LAG’s identity was bound to a definition of Lumbervale as light-industrial-with-residences, while the port manager related his professional success to expanding the development potential of port land, which required that neighbouring Lumbervale be resident-free.
However, I firmly believe that sedimenting adversarial positions in separate reports exacerbated the intractability of the conflict.

Chapter 10

1 The arguments were as follows.

- For exclusion: the potential imposition of extra controls on industry; existing environmental management systems over the port's activities; the legal/administrative problem of dual vesting.

- Against exclusion: undermining the concept of 'multiple use'; the injustice of excusing only export industries from DOMM’s control; water circulation across the boundaries; fragmentation of the reserve; the need for scrutiny of the port's environmental impacts; the need for coordinated management and management of cumulative impacts.

2 It was a much reduced committee. Of the seven members present, the acting chair did not vote, two said unequivocally 'yes', three said that they didn't like it, but would bow to the majority, and one said, ambiguously, 'that's what I think' – the referent of 'that' could have been either position, but I understood it at the time as the latter one, which had immediately preceded the ambiguous utterance.

3 Monty is a marine scientist with a solid professional reputation both locally and internationally. Most of Alpha's members valued this expertise and treated his opinions with great respect; indeed, according to a majority of my interviews, Monty was the most influential/powerful committee member at the table, in spite of his hesitant and equivocating verbal habits.

4 Here, Dick displays an implicit assumption that the museum, as a scientific body, has a worthwhile and objective point of view; this assumption was not shared and the museum's worthiness had to be reconstructed by some committee members (that debate, discussed in Chapter 7 [7.3], comes later within this agenda item).

5 I am defining decision-making strategies in terms of their lexicogrammatical, discourse-semantic and logogenetic features, rather than normatively. As such, my characterisations differ in type from those of most theorists in the planning, deliberative democracy and dispute resolution fields (for example, Forester 1989, 1999b; Benhabib 1996a; Elster 1998a; Fisher et al. 1999; Susskind et al. 1999). As we shall see, logogenetic shifting between zero-sum bargaining and rationalist argument does not preclude any particular strategic action (threatening, warning, pleading, and so on) within negotiations.

Chapter 11

1 I say 'unsuccessful' in the sense that no decision – not even a deferral or 'agreement to disagree' – resulted from the discussion. While Alpha's chairperson tended to demand resolution of agenda items, taking them to vote if necessary or at least making a formal decision to defer or delegate
responsibility to DOMM, Beta's discussions were less rigidly controlled, and frequently drifted from one subject to another with no resolution at all.

2 The distinction between projecting facts and stating opinions is a lack of attitudinal appraisal, which might be illustrated by example: 'I think they are going to leave.' vs. 'I think they should leave.' 'I think it would be nice if they left.'

3 By 'supporter' here I mean in terms of the immediate context, the 'sides' in this particular argument, rather than generally or politically.

4 'Paragraphs' are a contestable concept in oral language. My decisions were based not only on how I have interpreted Simon's method of development, but also on his choices in the expression plane (intonation and pausing). This monologue is textually so similar to written English that I have made these decisions with some confidence.

5 A typical example:
   Protect and enhance the natural environment, open spaces and heritage by:
   • Protecting the beauty and accessibility of our beaches, parks and rivers;
   • Protecting biodiversity and ecosystem functions …
   • Protecting and enhancing waterways …
   [And so on.] (Western Australian Planning Commission and Department for Planning and Infrastructure 2004: 11)

6 Future general industry (Objective 1) land had already been identified (Export Estate) and was included in the zoning scheme. Key stakeholders (Objective 1.1) were identified as part of the general Objectives discussion. The question of Lumbervale's zoning (Objective 1.2) was deferred (Section 11.3.5).

7 This matter also relates to the debate regarding the need for explicit attention to relational matters in deliberative processes (Ryfe 2002: 367): are productive relationships best established through explicit 'rapport building', or through meaningful activity? Beta's experience would suggest the latter.

8 Sam's abstention was accepted without question by the other members, and his cited conflict of interest explicitly used as a reason for not employing Charlie. However, it was never suggested that the principle should be extended to Chris or Colin in spite of their affiliations with SOHE and LAG.

9 Their claims appear to include: that rural planning would not involve conflict, and that the HIS is the first planning strategy ever to engage with more than one perspective.

10 Other issues included: buffer areas for existing industries in Lumbervale; comparative investment in different types of development; potential management strategies for off-site impacts; financial implications to individuals; social and servicing implications of various options; and so on. Researching these other issues had been explicitly part of Council's original resolution to set up the
group (Chapter 8, 8.1). But that resolution had already been replaced by the group’s own objectives, and those issues were never referred to again.

11 As noted in Chapter 10, DOMM officers consciously reflected upon Alpha’s decision making both in discussion with each other and in interviews with me. Adoption of similar strategies in future exercises is likely to depend on participants’ assessment of the context.

12 All local and state government officers involved in Beta have since left the region. However, Cr Barry is now the mayor of Harbourtown and Bruce is also a councillor, both motivated to stand by their involvement in the Beta project; from casual observation, they bring their idiosyncratic styles of rationality, democracy and decision making to Council meetings. Similarly, Belinda and Barbara now do business and pursue their dealings with both Council and the state not only using new social networks but also according to new – and equally idiosyncratic – understandings of government processes. Both women told me that, in spite of their frustration with the lack of outcome, Beta was a formative experience for them.

Chapter 12

1 This invocation of chaos/complexity theory is intended merely as a light-hearted extension of a metaphor. I do not mean to imply that metaprocesses are strange attractors in any strict sense, nor that committees should be analysed as chaotic or complex dynamic systems. Such claims would require mathematical proof that is far beyond both the scope of this enquiry and my abilities in this field.

2 For case studies supporting this traditional assumption, see Briggs 1980; Sarkissian et al. 1986; Grant 1994; Moore 1995; Ferraro 1996; Innes 1996a; Jackson 2002; Pimbert and Pretty 1997; Chabot and Duhaime 1998; Bickerstaff et al. 2002; Nichols 2002; Todd 2002.

3 Beta’s modes of decision making were noted and discussed by LAG members. However, this occurred only when an internal dispute arose about the appropriateness of the ‘numbers’ model, and discussion was, as far as I am aware, limited to the value of adopting ‘consensus’ (Chapter 4, 4.3.2).

4 Most of the ‘symptoms’ indicated in Table 11.2 are unsurprising. A possible exception is the indication that a lack of interruption is an unpromising sign, which appears to confound conventional understandings of ‘polite’ discourse.

5 Compare David Farmer’s (1995) directives for a postmodern public administration: imaginisation, deconstruction, deterritorialisation, and alterity. Leonie Sandercock (2003: 209) suggests a planning practice that is political, therapeutic, audacious, creative, and critical. My list attempts to translate these attributes into more accessible language.
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APPENDIX A:

Ethics Agreement
Agreement between Diana MacCallum (Diana), [DOMM / SOHE], and [Alpha / Beta].

This agreement outlines the rights and obligations of each party with respect to a research project to be undertaken by Diana towards her PhD. Academic supervision of the project will be by Dr Jean Hillier of the School of Architecture, Construction and Planning at Curtin University of Technology.

The research is concerned with participatory planning as a way of resolving difficult land/water use issues. It will focus on case studies that involve the participation of "non-technical" stakeholders directly in strategic planning processes.

The case study that is the subject of this agreement is the planning process for [project]. The research will aim to analyse this process in terms of how agreement is constructed between the various interests, for instance:

- How each of a range of interests/stakeholders is given a voice;
- How any conflicts arising between these different interests are dealt with; and
- How agreement is reached and decisions made at each procedural milestone;

The analysis will be of interest to planners and other stakeholders involved in similar projects in which the demands on an area are numerous and potentially in conflict. This includes DOMM / SOHE, other government departments, private developers and not-for-profit organisations.

Diana’s rights:

1. To attend meetings of Alpha / Beta as a silent observer;
2. To attend, by prior agreement, certain meetings of the task groups established by Alpha / Beta;
3. To analyse interaction and agreement-building at Alpha / Beta meetings;
4. To interview, under agreements with each individual; participants in the process outside the context of Alpha / Beta meetings;
5. Subject to the obligations under this agreement and any agreements reached with individuals, to use the resulting data and analyses for her PhD project, and to publish academic material from same.
Diana’s obligations:

Confidentiality
1. To maintain the anonymity of all participants, including the omission of any names or other identifying information from project documentation and all published materials;
2. Not to include in the research documentation any information regarded as incriminating or defamatory in such a way as to be identifiable with any person or group;
3. To maintain confidentiality of all sensitive information, including personal, commercial, spiritual and security-related information, as well as information stated to be confidential by its informant;

Detachment
4. To refrain from discussing the input of any informant with any other participant, unless specifically requested to by the informant concerned;
5. To refrain from advising any participant on a course of action with respect to the planning process;
6. To otherwise avoid, as far as possible, influencing the process;
7. To remain impartial throughout the process, especially in the event of any conflict;

Treatment of data
8. To protect as far as possible the security of all data against loss, theft, unauthorised access, modification, and disclosure;
9. To store all data under lock and key for five years following completion of the project as mandated by Curtin University’s ethics requirements, after which it shall be handed over to DOMM / SOHE for disposal or archiving as they see fit;

Respect
10. To obtain the informed consent of any task group established by Alpha / Beta before attending or recording their meetings;
11. To obtain the informed consent of any participant to interview them individually or to use any other data they may provide (for example correspondence, photographs etc);
12. To maintain respect for, and a position of non-discrimination towards, all views;
13. To declare any interest in the outcomes of discussion, should such arise;
14. To avoid imposing unduly upon the time, energy or other resources of any participant;

Feedback and Acknowledgement
16. To provide on request summaries of notes resulting from meetings;
17. To provide, and invite input from Alpha / Beta and DOMM / SOHE on, a final report summarising the research and conclusions regarding the planning process;
18. To respond to comments from Alpha / Beta and DOMM / SOHE, in particular to ensure the future usefulness of the report;
19. With due regard for confidentiality, to suitably acknowledge all input to the research in a form to be agreed upon with the participants;
General
19. In general, where not covered by the above, to abide by the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans (NHMRC 1999) and Curtin University's ethics requirements.

DOMM's / SOHE's rights:
1. To request copies of the data to be used at any time;
2. To refuse or withdraw consent, with justification, for specific information to be used in the research;
3. To withdraw consent, with justification, for the research project;
4. To negotiate with Diana changes to the terms of this agreement, within the boundaries of Curtin University's ethics requirements.

DOMM's / SOHE's obligations:
1. To inform Diana promptly when issues arise, for example when consent is refused or withdrawn to use any data, or in the event of concerns regarding Diana's role;
2. Not to request any information regarding the persons or views of any participants in the research, including DOMM / SOHE staff;
3. To provide Diana with access to any information on the public record, and other non-confidential data pertaining to the planning process for [project].

Alpha's / Beta's rights and those of its members:
1. As a committee, to request copies of the data to be used;
2. As a committee, to refuse or withdraw consent with justification for specific information to be used in the research, or for particular meetings/parts of meetings to be recorded;
3. As a committee, to withdraw consent with justification for the research project;
4. Any member may refuse or withdraw consent for specific information regarding him/herself to be used in the research, without giving any reason;
5. Any member may refuse to participate in individual interviews or other research activities outside of Alpha / Beta or [related] meetings.

Alpha's / Beta's obligations and those of its members:
1. Through DOMM / SOHE or the Alpha / Beta Chair, to inform Diana promptly when issues arise, for example when consent is refused or withdrawn to use any data, or in the event of concerns regarding Diana's role;
2. Not to request any information regarding the persons or views of any participants in the research.
APPENDIX B:

Informed Consent Form
Your assistance in gathering information about stakeholder participation in practice is sought. The following information outlines the purpose and methods of my study. If you are willing to be involved in this inquiry, I would appreciate your signing the consent form (see over).

**Purpose of the Study:**
The study is being undertaken for my PhD in urban & regional planning to explore the use of methods of public and stakeholder participation as a way of overcoming the problem of conflicting demands on land and water. In particular, it will examine the model of the "stakeholder committee", and, using case studies from [Scrubfield and Harbortown], analyse how the planning process works towards agreement between the various, potentially conflicting interests.

**Study Methods:**
The information for these case studies will come from my observation and tape recordings/notes of stakeholder committee meetings, supplemented by one-to-one interviews with the members. The purpose of the interviews is twofold:
- to give members an opportunity to present their views in a more informal setting than that of the meetings, and
- to compare my perceptions of the process with those of you, the people most intimately involved.

I would like to tape-record the interviews/meetings to ensure that there is an accurate record of what is said. However, even if you do not consent to be tape-recorded your participation would still be appreciated.

**Please note:**
- If you agree to be involved in this study, you may withdraw at any time, without prejudice, and information you have contributed will be withdrawn at your request.
- Your involvement in this study will only require you to provide your comments, ideas and thoughts on the topics, and will not involve any risk to you.
- No records or recordings from interviews or meetings will be made available to anyone other than you without your written request.
- Your participation will be completely anonymous, and any sensitive information will be kept confidential.
- Tapes, transcripts and interim reports will be kept secure for five years, after which they will be destroyed.
- A copy of this information/consent form, and of any transcripts or reports from the interviews/meetings, will be provided to you at your request.
- Please contact me if you have any questions about this study.

**YOUR INVOLVEMENT IS APPRECIATED, THANK YOU**

DIANA MAC CALLUM  
C/- School of Architecture Construction and Planning  
Curtin University of Technology  
GPO Box U1987  
PERTH 6845  
ph:
Consent to participate: Research project on participatory planning

I/we ________________________________________________________________

consent to participate in the research project being undertaken by Diana MacCallum on participatory planning. I/we have read the information provided and my/our questions have been answered to my/our satisfaction.

I/we agree that the data I/we contribute may be analysed and used as source material for Diana’s PhD and other materials, including conference papers and publication in academic journals, provided that names and other identifying information are not used. It is understood that this data will be retained under lock and key for five years after completion of the project, as required by the joint NHMRC/AVSS Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice, following which, unless otherwise requested by me/us, it may be destroyed.

This consent is subject to the understanding that:
- this consent may be withdrawn or altered without prejudice at any time;
- my/our anonymity and the confidentiality of any information nominated by me/us as sensitive will be fully protected;
- I/we may refuse consent for the use of specific personal information, without giving reason;
- Diana will provide me/us with a copy of the transcript or a summary of any interviews or meetings prior to using it in her research if I so request;
- all views will be treated with respect and non-discrimination;
- my/our participation will be at my/our convenience.

I/We do/do not consent for interviews/meetings to be tape-recorded.

Signed: ___________________________    Date: __________________

Name: ___________________________    Position: __________________

Address: __________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

Phone: ___________________________    Email: _______________________

(Note: contact details are included for the purpose of feedback and arrangements only. They will not be published or forwarded to any other party.)
APPENDIX C:

Tabulated Case Study Summaries
## Alpha: summary of process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting/date</th>
<th>Substantive/procedural achievements</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Getting Started</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| M1: Aug. 00 | - Brief committee on process and interests.  
- Exclusion of port requested.  
- Inclusion of Muddy Bay requested. | - Solidarity among members.  
- Unhappiness begins to form around the port's demands. |
| M2: Nov. 00 | - Brief committee on Indigenous interests.  
- Exclusion of port requested.  
- Inclusion of Muddy Bay requested.  
- Draft Vision.  
- Draft Strategic Objectives.  
- Draft lists of Ecological and Social Values.  
- Draft Generic Management Objectives.  
- Clarify external consultation process. | |
| **Phase 2: Words** | | |
| M3: Feb. 01 | - On legal advice, conditionally agree to exclude port.  
- Draft Objectives for Social Values.  
- Question external consultation methods. | - Unhappiness and interest consolidates around the consultation process.  
- Members form alliance against DOMM with respect to process.  
- Growing mistrust of DOMM.  
- Growing boredom with meetings. |
| M4: Apr. 01 | - Agree on changes to port boundary.  
- Seek view of the Minister for Fishing re Muddy Bay.  
| M5: June 01 | - Draft Pressures, Targets, Management Objectives, and Strategies for remaining Ecological Values.  
- Draft Requirements and Strategies and revise Management Objectives for most Social Values.  
- Presentation by museum on ecological assets. | |
| M6: Aug. 01 | Cancelled. | |
| **Phase 3: Maps** | | |
| M6: Dec. 01 | - Confirm draft Management Objectives and Strategies for Social Values.  
- Positions put by national environmental lobby group and a local environmentalist.  
- First draft of Zoning Scheme. | - Reinvigorated interest in substantive matters.  
- Substantial feedback from public consultation.  
- Solidarity replaced by traditional sectoral conflicts.  
- Members strategically adopt bureaucratic/other framings as required.  
- Members repudiate responsibility for Indigenous consultation. |
| Mar. – April 01 | - Public consultation organised by DOMM:  
- Staffed shopping centre displays;  
- Static displays at libraries and workplaces;  
- Presentations to workplaces and clubs. | |
| M7: May 02 | - Presentation by DOMM and government partners on extent and impact of recreational fishing.  
- Position put by a local fishing club.  
- Second draft of Zoning Scheme.  
- Resolve to leave Muddy Bay decision to the Minister for Fishing.  
- Set indicative boundary. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July – Oct. 02</td>
<td>- Public consultation organised by DOMM:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Static displays;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Presentations by request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public meetings organised by SFDA (Sep – Oct).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8: Nov. 02</td>
<td>- Presentation by researcher studying the benefits of zoning in other marine reserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Position put by a local recreational diver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Position put by a group of commercial aquarium collectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Third draft of Zoning Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Amend reserve boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9: Feb. 03</td>
<td>- Position put by Mark that zoning is inappropriate. Mark’s withdrawal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Request by Matt on amending zone boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Final draft of Zoning Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Finalise reserve boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Amendments to management plan text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Advice to Minister for Marine Management, including re the need for further Indigenous consultation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And Beyond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 03 - Aug. 04</td>
<td>- Further SCG consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Minister seeks advice from ministerial colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. - Dec. 04</td>
<td>- Negotiations with recreational anglers and Scrubfield local MP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Significant amendments to plan, reducing overall percentage of no-take area by 75% and excluding commercial uses from one third of the reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 05</td>
<td>- Release of the revised plan for 4 months’ public comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10: Feb. 06</td>
<td>- Final Alpha meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resolution of dissatisfaction with post-Alpha process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Amendments to Zoning Scheme, largely returning to the version agreed to at Meeting 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mobilisation of recreational anglers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local MP enlisted against the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Little involvement of other Alpha members until final meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Beta: summary of process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting/date</th>
<th>Substantive and procedural achievements</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Settling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chair: Cr Burt, Larry (project manager) as deputy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **M1: Sep. 00** | - Confirm membership.  
- Decide against engaging a consultant.  
- Clarify current zoning situation.  
- Position put by port manager opposing residences in Lumbervale.  
- Revise group objectives. | - Establish positive working relationships.  
- Establish respect for one another's needs.  
- Tentatively agree upon guiding principles. |
| **M2: Nov. 00** | - Len (CEO) and Cr Bob (Mayor) in attendance.  
- Revise group objectives and put to Council for approval. | |
| **M3: Dec. 00** | - Commence examining opportunities and constraints of potential light industry sites (matrix supplied by Sue).  
- Announcement of port’s intention to conduct PPS.  
- Background priority of port’s buffer needs. | |
| **M4: Mar. 01** | - Prioritise 5 potential light industry sites. | |
| **Phase 2: Action** | | |
| - Chair: Len (Larry away in hospital).  
- Stan replaces Sue as DOP representative.  
- Cr Brad replaces Crs Burt and Bill as Council’s representative. | | |
| **M5: Oct. 01** | - Confirm priorities for light industry sites and choose ‘Site 3’ for action.  
- Resolve to involve state in progressing Export Estate. | - Enrol SOHE CEO and Councillors to program.  
- Differentiate between technical and steering roles. |
| **M6: Nov. 01** | - Negotiation with DOI officer, Scott.  
- Resolve technical project team to develop structure plans for Export Estate and Site 3. | |
| **M7: Jan. 02** | - Put preferred sites to Council.  
- Suggestions for structure planning. | |
| **M8: Mar. 02** | - Agree to prepare an industrial strategy (HIS).  
- Agree to engage consultant.  
- Announcement of commencement of PPS. | |
| **Phase 3: Preparation** | | |
| - Chair: Larry, Lance as deputy.  
- Barry replaces Cr Brad as Council’s representative. | | |
| **M9: Apr. 02** | - Consider old consultant brief. | - Reframe and background previous work of the group.  
- Formalise idiosyncratic rationality of Beta’s deliberations. |
| **M10: May 02** | - Reject old consultant brief. | |
| **M11: July 02** | - Endorse new consultant brief. | |
| **M12: Sep. 02** | - Select Colin as HIS consultant. | |
| **M13: Oct. 02** | - Discuss consultant program and requirements. | |
### Phase 4: Harbourtown Industrial Strategy
- Chair: Cr Barry, Larry as Deputy.
- Consultant: Colin.
- Bruce replaces Barry as LAG president/representative.
- Barry remains on Beta as Council’s representative.
- Liam replaces Lance as *ex officio* support.
- Stan (DOP) leaves his position and is not replaced.

| M14: Jan. 03 | Discuss project with consultants. | Reopen group decisions to negotiation. |
| M15: Mar. 03 | Presentation of Colin’s report on Stage 1 of HIS. | Sediment positions on Lumbervale in documents. |
| M16: Aug. 03 | Presentation of Colin’s report on Stage 2 of HIS. | Reposition port management and LAG as antagonists. |
| | Presentation of Port Planning Study (PPS). | |
| M17: Oct. 03 | Consider response to Stage 2 report. | |
| M18: May 04 | Presentation of Colin’s report on Stage 3. | |

### Phase 5: In public
- Chair: Larry.
- Only one meeting, attended only by SOHE and LAG representatives.

| July - Oct. 04 | Plan released for public comment. | Planning process displaced by political manoeuvring. |
| Nov. 04 | Harbourtown planning workshop held by Minister for Planning. | |
| M19: Mar. 05 | Consider report on public submissions. | |
| | Agree on recommendations to Council. | |
| Mar. 05 | Council laid HIS ‘on the table’. | |
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Reference and lexical relations

Key sources: Halliday 1985: 312-339; Eggins 1994: 95-105

Reference and lexical relations are the two main resources for ideational cohesion in texts. Reference tracks specific people, things, and events through a text; while lexical relations shape and sustain the text’s ideational focus, through the appearance and reappearance of words whose meanings are linked in various ways.

Reference

Reference generally refers to the use of resources such as pronouns (I, you, she, they, it, and so on), deictics (the, this, those, here, there, other, and so on) and proper nouns (Diana) whose meaning depends on a presumption that both the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader know what or who is being talked about. That is, reference resource retrieve shared understandings (referents) from the utterance’s context.

Halliday classifies reference according to the different elements of context from which referents can be retrieved:

- **Homophoric** reference retrieves meaning from the general context of culture; that is, the referent is presumed to be known to all members of a society:

  *the moon; the Prime Minister.*

- **Exophoric** reference retrieves from the immediate context of situation; anyone who is part of the conversation can be expected to understand:

  *me; this committee; Debbie; over there [pointing].*

- **Endophoric** reference retrieves meaning from the text itself, and is the category that creates textual cohesion. Endophoric reference itself is considered to have four main types:

  - **Anaphoric** – the referent has already appeared in the text:

    *Let’s talk to Debbie. She will be able to help.*

  - **Cataphoric** – the referent follows the reference:

    *This is my idea: we could hold a public meeting.*

  - **Esphoric** – the referent follows the reference as part of the same phrase:
the idea I had;

that room where the meeting was;

other committees than Beta.

Bridging – the referent does not appear in the text, but is retrievable because lexical relations establish an expectation:

I heard you were in the conference room. How was the meeting?

Lexical relations

Lexical relations are relations of expectancy between (lexical) words. In the above example, the phrase ‘conference room’ sets up an expectation that the text might also contain the word ‘meeting’. This means that, in a cohesive text, words keep bringing the audience’s attention back to one or more focal topics. Lexical relations fall into a number of categories:

Taxonomic relations derive from classification or meronymy (part/whole relations – anatomy). They tend to relate words from similar grammatical classes (nouns with nouns, verbs with verbs, and so on). Taxonomic relations include:

Hyponymy – the relationship of a sub-class to a superordinate class:

industry / general; fish / snapper.

Co-hyponomy – the relationship between two sub-classes of a single superordinate:

light / general (industry); snapper / salmon.

Synonymy – words have the same/similar meaning (this extends to simple repetition of words):

shire / municipality; business / business.

Antonymy – words encoding a contrast with each other:

wet / dry; good / bad.

Meronymy – the relationship of a part to a whole:

committee / member; fish / fin.
Co-meronymy – the relationship between two parts of the same whole:

fin / tail.

Collocation is a relationship between words that are typically associated, and may relate words from the same or different grammatical classes. For instance:

- an action (verbs) may be collocated with a typical doer (noun) of that action – bark / dog – or with a typical recipient – catch / fish; implement / strategy;
- things (nouns) may be typically associated with certain qualities – sun / bright;
- things and/or events (nouns) may usually be found together – bureaucrat / office; dinner / restaurant or
- lexical items might combine predictably to form common phrases – committee / meeting; agenda / item.

Collocational relations depend not only on context of culture (as in the above examples), but on context of situation. Texts may regularly collocate lexical items, thereby construing particular contextual relations. For example, Fairclough (Fairclough 2003: 131) notes that ‘New Labour’ texts tend to collocate the word ‘work’ with (among other things) ‘back to’, ‘into’, and ‘desire to’ (back to work; into work; desire to work), in marked contrast to ‘old Labour texts’ which tended to use different collocational patterns such as out of work; right to work.
Appendix E:

Appraisal
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**Key sources:** Martin 1995; White 2002; Iedema and Grant 2004

Appraisal is a catch-all to describe semantic and lexicogrammatical resources for expressing (inter)subjective positions, emotions and values. As such, it is considered to be part of the interpersonal dimension, complementing exchange (see Appendix F). The standard appraisal framework consists of three broad sub-systems: attitude, engagement and graduation. This appendix gives only a simple overview of a very detailed and still-developing system.

**Attitude**

Attitude attaches value to things, people and processes by reference to emotion or social/cultural norms. There are three sub-systems – affect, judgement and appreciation – as the following table summarises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Typical realisations</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affect:</strong></td>
<td>Mental processes of reaction</td>
<td>love, please, interest, etc.</td>
<td>hate, disgust, frighten,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterisation of phenomena with reference to emotion.</td>
<td>Attributives of affect</td>
<td>happy, proud,</td>
<td>bore, annoy, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comfortable, etc.</td>
<td>sad, scared, angry,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worried, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judgement:</strong></td>
<td>Attributes and epithets</td>
<td>honest, just, clever,</td>
<td>corrupt, mean, odd,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of people and their behaviour with reference to social norms.</td>
<td>Adverbials</td>
<td>brave, normal, etc.</td>
<td>rude, false, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-systems relate to social esteem (normality, capacity, and tenacity) and social sanction (veracity and propriety).</td>
<td>Nominals</td>
<td>honestly, bravely, etc.</td>
<td>stupidly, nastily, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material processes</td>
<td>win, help, etc</td>
<td>coward, liar, tyrant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cheat, sin, deceive, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appreciation:</strong></td>
<td>Attributes and epithets</td>
<td>beautiful, important,</td>
<td>ugly, insignificant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of objects and products with reference to aesthetic and similar systems of social/cultural value.</td>
<td>Abstract nominals</td>
<td>harmonious, etc.</td>
<td>disjointed, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-systems include reaction (impact and quality), composition (balance and complexity) and valuation.</td>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>beauty, symmetry,</td>
<td>monotony, failure, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>precision, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>work (well), attract,</td>
<td>fail, damage,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>balance, simplify, etc.</td>
<td>undermine, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from White 2002

Iedema’s and Grant’s analysis of appraisal in institutional settings indicates that such settings create particular classes of emotivity which they label ‘performative’,
contrasting with the 'authentic' appraisal system summarised above. In the attitude sub-system, performative appraisal expresses responses in terms of institutional categories and functions: it 'performs' the speaker's/writer's role in the organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Authentic’ emotivity</th>
<th>Performative emotivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affect</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘primal’ emotion:</td>
<td>‘Civil’ emotion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I’m angry about ...</em></td>
<td><em>I am concerned that ...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judgement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/social evaluation of people</td>
<td>Institutional evaluation of processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>They were stupid.</em></td>
<td><em>Their actions were inappropriate.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appraisal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/social experience of artefacts:</td>
<td>Functional assessment of tools/technologies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>This thing is fantastic.</em></td>
<td><em>This thing works.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Iedema and Grant 2004

**Engagement**

Engagement systems position a text inter-subjectively. That is, they express the speaker/writer's engagement with their utterance and with their audience. Traditionally, engagement has been described under the general headings of polarity (positive ‘yes’ – negative ‘no’) and modality: modalisation (epistemic modality) expressing probability and usualness; and modulation (deontic modality) expressing obligation, inclination and capability. Modality is a key resource for expressing power relations: low value tends to indicate the subservient relationship of speaker to audience.

Typical realisations of modality, exemplified in the following table, include:

1) modal verbs,
2) modal adverbs and mood adjuncts,
3) modal metaphors,
4) projection,
5) judgement attributives, and
6) complex verbal expressions.
White reinterprets engagement as performing levels of heteroglossia/dialogicity or monoglossia/monologicity. That is, low value modalisation and projection represent a dialogic ‘opening’ of the text to other voices.

Other engagement resources include the use of vocatives, salutations, slang, dialects and languages of solidarity, and so on, which directly express relations between participants in the discourse.

**Graduation**

Graduation, the third appraisal sub-system, refers to resources that grade or scale meanings, raising or lowering an utterance’s interpersonal force or sharpness of focus. In the above table, for instance, the dimension of ‘value’ graduates the modality system. ‘Value’ is reframed by White as *implicit* graduation, and operates also with respect to attitude: for example, ‘*adore*’ vs. ‘*like*’; ‘*ghastly*’ vs. ‘*unpleasant*’; ‘*brilliant*’ vs. ‘*smart*’.

The following table illustrates the *explicit* dimension of graduation.
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Exchange


Exchange, or conversational structure – the negotiation of meanings in dialogue – relates to discourse-semantic cohesion in the interpersonal dimension. A system for describing discoursal exchange has been developed by Suzanne Eggins and Diana Slade, based on research into casual conversation. For the purpose of my enquiry, which is predominantly concerned with conversation in (semi-)formal settings, I have adapted their framework slightly. What follows summarises my adaptation.

Text can be broken down into clauses or sentences, which can be characterised in the interpersonal dimension according to their speech function: statements, questions, offers and requests. This basic set of interpersonal functions was described by Halliday in terms of two fundamental functional distinctions, as in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity exchanged</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Goods and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role in exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>This is a teapot.</em></td>
<td><em>Would you like this teapot?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Is this a teapot?</em></td>
<td><em>Give me the teapot!</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Halliday 1985: 69

As the table above might suggest, each basic speech function has one or more congruent grammatical forms which are identifiable by the mood structure of the clause. However, some functions, commands in particular, are often ‘disguised’ as questions or statements (‘Could I have this teapot?’; ‘I was wondering if I could have this teapot’). Halliday treats such incongruent forms as a type of ‘grammatical metaphor’.

In dialogue, each speech function sets up an expectation regarding the audience’s reaction: statement → acknowledgement; offer → acceptance; question → answer; request → compliance. That is, clauses/sentences have not only a speech function, but also an exchange function. Exchange analysis describes the latter function in
terms of moves. When considered as moves, the above analysis becomes more complex, because the lexicogrammatical form of the reaction can depend on the form of the initiating move. Moreover, cultural considerations can generate extensive politeness-motivated sequences of moves for a single, simple exchange:

1. (a) *Excuse me, David,* (b) *what do you think of this teapot?*

2. *I like it very much.*

3. *Would you like it?*

4. (a) *I'd love it.* (b) *Are you sure?*

5. (a) *Of course.* (b) *Here you are.*

6. (a) *Wow!* (b) *Thanks.*

7. *You're welcome.*

Consequently, the variety of move choices in conversation is large and systemically complex. Firstly, the ‘basic speech functions’ outlined above, considered as moves, can be further broken down:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech function</th>
<th>Discourse purpose</th>
<th>Congruent form</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Give fact</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td><em>This is a teapot.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give opinion</td>
<td>Statement +appraisal</td>
<td><em>I like this teapot.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project fact*</td>
<td>Statement +engagement/+future</td>
<td><em>I think the teapot will break.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project opinion*</td>
<td>Statement +projection/+appraisal</td>
<td><em>He wants the teapot.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Give goods/services</td>
<td>Modulated interrogative</td>
<td><em>Would you like this teapot?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Demand fact: closed</td>
<td>Polar interrogative</td>
<td><em>Is this a teapot?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand fact: open</td>
<td>WH-interrogative</td>
<td><em>What is this?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand opinion: closed</td>
<td>Polar interrogative +appraisal</td>
<td><em>Do you like this teapot?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand opinion: open</td>
<td>WH-interrogative +appraisal</td>
<td><em>What would you like?</em> <em>What should I do?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Demand goods/services</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td><em>Give me the teapot!</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Eggins and Slade 1997: 194 (items marked * added by me for this enquiry)

These basic speech functions constitute the system of opening moves. In addition, such moves may be preceded by an attention-seeking move such as ‘Excuse me, David’ in the example above. In formal settings, attention-seeking moves may be
made through a third party, such as the chairperson of a meeting (‘Through the chair’; ‘To David’). These moves are labelled Attend2 and Attend3 respectively in my analysis.

Following an opening move, the speaker may continue his/her turn with further moves, or the audience may react. The following table summarises the choices for continuing moves:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuing move</th>
<th>Discourse purpose</th>
<th>Sub-system</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>Check the interactive status of the conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td>You know? Right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolong</td>
<td>Provide further information</td>
<td>Elaborate: clarify, restate or exemplify (i.e., e.g.).</td>
<td>That is, it’s for making tea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Append</td>
<td>Provide further information following an interruption to the turn</td>
<td>Extend: add extra information (and, but).</td>
<td>My mother gave it to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance: qualify or modify or explain with additional detail (so, because).</td>
<td>A Japanese teapot, to be precise, because of the shape of the spout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda*</td>
<td>Summarise the entire preceding turn or phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>So now it belongs to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Eggins and Slade 1997: 201 (items marked * added by me for this enquiry)

The choices for reacting moves are more complicated. The listener may either respond directly to the speaker’s move, moving the negotiation towards closure, or s/he may interrupt the negotiation in a range of ways. ‘Interrupting’ reactions are called rejoinders.

Responding moves are chosen simultaneously from two systems: they may be either supportive or confronting, and they may develop, reply to, or merely display attention to the previous move:
The resulting choices for responding moves are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding move</th>
<th>Preceding move</th>
<th>Supporting</th>
<th>Confronting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display attention</td>
<td>Attend2</td>
<td>Engage</td>
<td>Disengage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes?</td>
<td>No.; silence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend3</td>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>Disallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>No. Wait.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any other opening</td>
<td>Register</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mm, uh huh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Any other opening</td>
<td>Elaborate</td>
<td>Elaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(as for prolonging/appending moves)</td>
<td>Extend</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Give fact</td>
<td>Acknowledge</td>
<td>Disavow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I know. Yeh.</td>
<td>I didn't know that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demand fact: closed</td>
<td>Affirm</td>
<td>Negate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. That's right.</td>
<td>No. That's wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project opinion.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actually, it's a coffee pot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand fact: open</td>
<td>Answer:</td>
<td>Withhold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand opinion: open</td>
<td>That is a teapot.</td>
<td>I can't tell you. I don't know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give opinion</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demand opinion: closed</td>
<td>Yes. I agree.</td>
<td>I don't think so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project fact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Thank you.</td>
<td>No thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Comply</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Okay, sure.</td>
<td>Sorry, no.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejoining moves arise from interactional 'problems', and interrupt the negotiation by either tracking or challenging preceding moves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rejoining move</th>
<th>Sub-system</th>
<th>Discourse purpose</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Elicit repetition of misheard utterance</td>
<td>What? Pardon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarify</td>
<td>Elicit additional information needed to understand</td>
<td>Which one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirm</td>
<td>Verify information</td>
<td>Is it really?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probe</td>
<td>Provide additional details for clarification purposes.</td>
<td>Because of the spout, you mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Detach</td>
<td>Terminate interaction</td>
<td>Hmph! So there!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebound</td>
<td>Question relevance, legitimacy or veracity</td>
<td>I'm not interested in teapots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counter</td>
<td>Dismiss authority of other speaker</td>
<td>What would you know about teapots?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Eggins and Slade 1997: 213
The resulting choices for responding moves are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding move</th>
<th>Preceding move</th>
<th>Supporting</th>
<th>Confronting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display attention</td>
<td>Attend2</td>
<td>Engage Yes?</td>
<td>Disengage No.; silence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend3</td>
<td>Allow Yes.</td>
<td>Disallow No. Wait.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any other opening</td>
<td>Register Mm, uh huh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Any other opening</td>
<td>Elaborate Extend</td>
<td>Elaborate Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(as for prolonging/append moves)</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reply</td>
<td>Give fact</td>
<td>Acknowledge I know Yeh.</td>
<td>Disavow I didn’t know that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demand fact: closed</td>
<td>Affirm Yes. That’s right.</td>
<td>Negate No. That’s wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correct Actually, it’s a coffee pot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand fact: open</td>
<td>Answer: That is a teapot.</td>
<td>Withhold I can’t tell you. I don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand opinion: open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give opinion</td>
<td>Agree Yes. I agree.</td>
<td>Disagree I don’t think so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demand opinion: closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project fact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Accept Yes. Thank you.</td>
<td>Decline No thanks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Comply Okay, sure.</td>
<td>Refuse Sorry, no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejoining moves arise from interactional ‘problems’, and interrupt the negotiation by either tracking or challenging preceding moves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rejoining move</th>
<th>Sub-system</th>
<th>Discourse purpose</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Elicit repetition of misheard utterance</td>
<td>What? Pardon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarify</td>
<td>Elicit additional information needed to understand</td>
<td>Which one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirm</td>
<td>Verify information</td>
<td>Is it really?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probe</td>
<td>Provide additional details for clarification purposes</td>
<td>Because of the spout, you mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Detach</td>
<td>Terminate interaction</td>
<td>Himph! So there!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebound</td>
<td>Question relevance, legitimacy or veracity</td>
<td>I’m not interested in teapots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counter</td>
<td>Dismiss authority of other speaker</td>
<td>What would you know about teapots?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Eggins and Slade 1997: 213
Following a rejoining move, responses can either resolve the ‘problem’ (by supplying or confirming information, or by repairing disagreement), or sustain it (by refusing to resolve or repair, by refuting challenges or by counter-challenging).

In examining the meetings associated with my case studies, I found a need to account for the structure of negotiation at a ‘higher’ level than the move, as speakers made elaborate, ‘culturally’ motivated preparations and mitigations for various basic speech functions (see Chapter 7 introduction). I resolved this need by supplementing the move-level analysis with the identification of ‘strategic blobs’ – composite moves – of conversation. The following extract, from the analysis underwriting Chapter 8 (8.2) of the thesis, illustrates this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speaker</th>
<th>move #</th>
<th>move type</th>
<th>text</th>
<th>composite/macro move</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>O:give opinion P:enhance: give opinion</td>
<td>[explains his department's position on how they want Export Estate to develop]... Cos I think that is very important, to ah, make sure that they're not constrained, um, in any way, from perhaps stopping industries and port facilities.</td>
<td>O:give opinion [The people in my department think that the use of Export Estate should not stop industries and port facilities]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>R:agree</td>
<td>Yeh! And that, that's a very important point. And, and certainly Sue Smith ah, has done a, a lot of work, in ah, in ah, in assessing those sorts of issues. And of course Sue was intimately involved in, in the preparation of the um, ah, <em>Harbournorth Planning Study</em> which was done a few years ago, and which, which really gave a broad brush ah, concept of, of where those industry development and infrastructure corridor needs might be.</td>
<td>R:-rebound:give opinion [We have already considered these points. They are redundant.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>P:extend: give fact</td>
<td>[goes on to explain again the Shire's current problem and need for general industrial land] And ah, [sighs] ah, really, that's er, - as far as the item three point five, which is, this is leading onto - ah, the, the most favoured site for that er, sort of industry area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2c</td>
<td>P:elaborate: give fact</td>
<td>And although we might have a, a residential component.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2d</td>
<td>P:extend: give fact</td>
<td>Ah, the other side of the coin, ah er, er is um, ah, to identify an area for general industry, which wouldn't, obviously, have a, a residential component.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2e</td>
<td>[P:elaborate]</td>
<td>[We in this committee think the State should make Export Estate into a general industry area.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2f</td>
<td>P:extend: give opinion</td>
<td>And ah, [sighs] ah, really, that's er, - as far as the item three point five, which is, this is leading onto - ah, the, the most favoured site for that er, sort of industry area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R:register</td>
<td>Mm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Continue P:extend: demand opinion</td>
<td>is the site that's currently identified Export Estate. And ah, what we need ah, and what we're seeking at the moment from, ah, s er, Realty Australia, and from Office of Development, is an indication of where that is, and how the ah, they might view ah, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>P:extend: demand opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R:register</td>
<td>Mm hm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>establishment of that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>R:register</td>
<td>Oh right.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>general industry zoning there, in the context of the original, the original concept of ah, of ah Export Estate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>R:register</td>
<td>Yeh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G:

Theme and information
Theme and information


The thematic structure of an utterance gives it its character as message, in Halliday’s terms. The theme is what the message is about. In English, the theme of a clause is easily identified as whatever comes first; it is the ‘starting point’. The remainder of the clause is called the rheme. That is, a key lexicogrammatical resource for textual meaning is word order.

Mark caught this fish on Sunday. [message about Mark]
This fish was Mark’s Sunday catch. [message about this fish]
On Sunday, Mark caught this fish. [message about Sunday]

What Mark did on Sunday was catch this fish. [message about what Mark did on Sunday]

A clause may contain more than one type of theme. All full clauses have a topical theme, which is identifiable as the first element with a transitivity function (Appendix H) – either as a participant in the process, or a circumstance such as ‘on Sunday’. Clauses may also have:

- textual themes (such as conjunctions or continuity adjuncts – ‘so …’; ‘first, …’; and so on); and/or
- interpersonal themes (such as mood, polarity or modality adjuncts – ‘Are you …?’; ‘No, …’; ‘Maybe …’) preceding the topical theme.

Parallel to theme-rheme structure in an utterance is information structure, the interplay between what is known or given, and what is new. As the ‘starting point’ for the message, theme is often conflated with the given:

What did Mark catch? \( \rightarrow \) Mark caught this fish. ['Mark' is given]
Whose fish is this? \( \rightarrow \) This is Mark’s. ['This' is given]

However, this correlation is not obligatory:

Who caught this fish? \( \rightarrow \) This fish was caught by Mark. ['This fish’ is given]
\( \rightarrow \) Mark caught this fish. ['Mark’ is new]
Information structure is not realised by word order, then, but by stress and intonation, in the expression plane: the new element takes tonic prominence.

\[ \text{Who caught this fish?} \rightarrow \text{This fish was caught by Mark.} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{Mark caught this fish.} \]

The given is retrievable from previous text or from the context of situation or culture; thus it provides for textual cohesion. It is likely to be elided or realised by reference (Appendix D):

\[ \text{Who caught this fish?} \rightarrow \text{That one was caught by Mark.} \]

\[ \rightarrow \text{Mark caught this fish.} \]

For written texts, where stress and intonation are not explicit, Martin (1992: 452) identifies the New with the final clause constituent. Either of the following two texts would ‘work’ as a spoken utterance, but the second would be highly marked in written mode:

\[ \text{This is a fish. It was caught by Mark.} \]

*\[ \text{This is a fish. Mark caught it.} \]

Martin extends the notions of theme and new to the discourse-semantic level, and notes that strong written texts tend to repeat the clause level pattern below at the paragraph and text levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Rheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is, paragraphs tend to have a ‘hyper-theme’, and texts a ‘macro-theme’, which predict the lower-order themes, anchoring the text in its key meanings. The resulting overall pattern constitutes the text’s method of development. Similarly, there is likely to be a text-level ‘macro-new’ and paragraph-level ‘hyper-news’, into which lower-order news accumulate, articulating the point of the text.

Method of development and point have not been extensively analysed in spoken discourse, but monologues, such as often occur in meetings, can sometimes ‘mimic’ written texts in this regard (see, for example, Fragment 11.7 in this thesis).
Appendix H

Transitivity
Transitivity

Sources: Halliday 1985:106-143; Eggins 1994: 227-270

In SFL terms, transitivity is the lexico-grammar of representation: that is, it realises ideational meanings. The transitivity system construes the world in terms of a range of processes, of the participants in those processes, and of the circumstances in which processes occur.

Halliday's system identifies three major and three minor process types for English, as illustrated by his famous diagram:

In this model, process types are generally identifiable on the basis of how they work lexicogrammatically, not simply on intuitive understanding of what they seem to mean. The grammar of transitivity is complex and need not be explained in detail here. Rather, I will briefly note two key potentials of the transitivity system that are central to shaping formal discourse. To support this outline, the following table summarises the participants associated with each process type.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process type</th>
<th>Category meaning</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Doing, happening</td>
<td>Actor, Goal, Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>Behaving</td>
<td>Behaver, Phenomenon, Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Sensing, feeling, thinking, perceiving</td>
<td>Senser, Phenomenon, Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Saying</td>
<td>Sayer, Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational:</td>
<td>being, having, symbolising</td>
<td>Carrier, Attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identified, Identifier / Token, Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Passivisation**

Certain material, mental and behavioural processes take two obligatory participants; these processes are realised by what traditional grammars call transitive verbs. The use of the passive voice allows a speaker/writer to achieve one or both of two things: to thematise the goal or phenomenon of the process; and to render the actor, senser or behaver ‘invisible’. For example:

*Passivisation is extensively used in technical discourse where the results, rather than the agents, of processes are considered their most important aspect.*

**Nominalisation**

Halliday treats nominalisation as a form of grammatical metaphor, which reframes processes as things. It is seen as a critical technology of written discourse, particularly in scientific and other technical texts, because it allows the physical and cognitive worlds to be subordinated to the abstract world of cause and effect. Specifically, nominalised material, behavioural and mental process typically become participants and/or circumstances in existential and relational processes:

*Passivisation and nominalisation are crucial to the development of abstract meanings.*