



CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS IN DESIGNING RESEARCH GOVERNANCE



Analytical Grid

CONSIDER Project
(GA number 288928)

Deliverable D1.3
February 2013

Authors

Rainey, Stephen
FUNDP

Goujon, Philippe
FUNDP

Quality Assurance:

	Name
Review Chair	Karen Bultitude
Reviewer 1	Emilie Spruyt
Reviewer 2	Simon-Philipp Pfersdorf



Executive Summary

The analytical grid is a result of analysis of the theoretical background to civil society participation in research design. It is a distillation from more detailed research into, and critical analysis of, underlying themes in policy, history, society and philosophy as they appear in the (European) drive for participation in research. The grid permits a principled study of relevant cases and grounds tools of assessment that can inform policy design. Overall, the grid comes from a methodology that can be illustrated as follows:

	Action	Implementation
Overall problematic	Delimit field to a question: How do actors define and reach their expectations related to defining public interest when constructing norms in research projects?	Apply the question to the overall problematic to yield pertinent areas for study.
Theoretical background (Including assessment of other applied research)	Give content to Question	Analysis of theoretical backgrounds to pertinent areas of study, e.g. Aggregative democracy, Deliberative democracy, Governance models, actor selection, Participatory Approach aims
Grid (Parameter determination)	A derivation from the above two areas	A table of pertinent areas of study that can inform field analysis to yield insights related to the question. Also acts as a background against which to choose case studies.

Table 1: Method illustration

The grid of analysis is deduced from the set of concepts most relevant to the research question. The research question represents a focus on a determinate field within an overall problematic. For example, if we take the overall field of CSO participation and limit it in a question regarding expectations, we can immediately decide that governance is a relevant concept here, as it is through governance that expectations between parties in participatory endeavours are expressed and negotiated. Although these may appear to be a partial reading based on our prior interests, they are intended as organising principles for interrogating the area we set out to make sense of and to analyse. They come from the analysis presented in deliverable 1.2, *Theoretical Background* and represent that background focussed through our project research question. *The* subsequent analysis will demonstrate that each of these parameters, criteria or concepts is extremely internally diverse. Whilst they are concepts frequently called upon by participants in research projects, there is not consistency in what their significance is.



Having thus seen this, we can go deeper and determine that within governance, given this problematic of expression and negotiation, democratic uses of dialogue must be dealt with. This allows us to use the broad distinction between, for instance, representative and deliberative democracy. In mining these concepts, and analysing their origins, manifestations, potential and limits, we therefore determine fundamental notions that underwrite the very concepts constitutive of the field that our question inhabits.

These notions can therefore serve as parameters for a grid of analysis because, with respect to the research question, they are pervasive and their presence, absence and construal represent all the possibilities for addressing the question in terms of the analysis undertaken. They appear here relatively unexplained – their justification comes in the argumentation and reasoning that constitute the bulk of this deliverable.

<i>How do actors define and reach their expectations related to defining public interest when constructing norms in research projects?</i>				
Norms & Values	What norms? Whose?	What values? Whose?	Presupposed, ignored, excluded, constructed?	
Expectations	Of researchers	Of CSO participants	Of funders/ and other stakeholders	
Governance approach	Hierarchical, consultation, co-construction?	Aggregative, deliberative, dialogical?		
Public interest	Cui bono? (who benefits?)	How is it <i>progress</i> rather than simple sectoral advance?	Capacitation ¹	
Means of expressing interests	Mode of participation? Dialogue? Round table, focus group, questionnaire?	Impact: when are the means deployed – start, during, end, throughout?	Open ended or discrete?	Conflict resolution mechanism?
Research and its background	Funding source, aims, intentions?	Political context (widely construed).	CSO involvement <i>for what?</i>	

Table 2: Grid of Analysis

Using the grid allows a consistent orientation within the overall field of participation, and in particular within the section of the field most relevant to CSO participation in research design. It is also a means of assessment.

Methodologically, within CONSIDER, the grid provides a touchstone that ensures principled, coherent, salient information to be gathered. In particular, it ensures that CONSIDER answers the question it has set itself: *How do actors define and reach their expectations related to defining public interest when constructing norms in research projects?*

¹ 'Capacitation' here is used as a broad term alluding to the Louvain school as discussed in deliverable 1.2. It is related to learning, the general ability and disposition to assess and evaluate norms. Other terms such as 'empowerment' are relevant, but don't capture the generality here in that being empowered in a context implies that context's being known. Knowledge of the context in this sense is part of our exploration.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
1 INTRODUCTION	4
2 NORMATIVE ANALYSIS: RECAP	6
2.1 BUILDING AN IDEA OF ‘NORM’	7
3 THE USE OF AN ANALYTICAL GRID	12
3.1 EXAMPLE: STOPPING AT A RED LIGHT	12
3.2 EXAMPLE: GOVERNANCE	14
4 THE ANALYTICAL GRID AND CONSIDER	15
4.1 CONTEXT-CONSTRUCTION AND NORMATIVITY.....	16
4.2 NORMS & VALUES.....	18
4.3 EXPECTATIONS	19
4.4 GOVERNANCE APPROACH	21
4.5 PUBLIC INTEREST	22
4.6 MEANS OF EXPRESSING INTERESTS.....	24
4.7 RESEARCH AND ITS BACKGROUND	27
5 GRID APPLICATION IN CONSIDER’S RESEARCH	28
5.1 SELECTION OF CASE STUDIES	28
5.2 DATA ANALYSIS: ANSWERING THE QUESTION	31
5.2.1 Normativity and Value Complexity Example: Presuppositions	32
6 NEXT STEP	33
REFERENCES	34



1 Introduction

The previous deliverable, D1.2 *Theoretical Landscape* explored how best to account, on normative grounds, for the role of civil society in new modes of research governance. A normative approach is a means by which we can see the structures that underlie various approaches to CSO involvement. Through a kind of ‘tour’ of the theoretical landscape, D1.2 focussed specifically on the role of civil society in research governance, taking into account the tensions and complementarities between participatory approaches and deliberative approaches. This gave critical perspectives on the institutionalisation of CSO participation.

In summary, deliverable 1.2:

- gave an historical review of the dynamics that have made very salient both the role of civil society and legitimacy concerns in research and research governance. This was vital so as to be able to locate CONSIDER research in a relevant vein.
- dealt with the issue of how to conceptualise politics today – the necessity to acknowledge the processes of analysing its theoretical grounding foundation – dealing in short with the question: what is the actual theoretical grounding regarding civil society organisation participation and what are salient criteria to assess participatory experiences?
- determined the characteristics of our object of analysis in CONSIDER and justified the relationship between conceptual approaches and empirical field study.
- created the groundwork for a grid of analysis.

A grid of analysis, it will be recalled,² determines the scope of the empirical field and guides the classification of empirical findings such that, amid the diversity of various empirical encounters, consistent material can be gained. This consistency is framed by the question we set ourselves, and so this framing is a necessary part of answering that question, as opposed to trying to tackle an ill-defined or too-nebulous problem.

What a grid of analysis enables us to do is to create, among the hitherto arbitrary concepts associated with civil society participation, a principled order such that we can make use of them analytically. In pursuing further study of the field, we can use the grid as a lens through which to view matters and so we can organise our studies along principled lines. This includes creating the object of our analysis based on clear conceptual analysis. This analysis gives us parameters that constitute the grid, as a result of the normative methodology adopted in CONSIDER as a project, i.e. normative analysis and framings complemented and examined with empirical techniques such as grounded theory, producing rich, complex and integrated data sources with robust conceptual underpinnings.

The grid of analysis is deduced from the set of concepts most relevant to the research question. The research question represents a focus on a determinate field within an overall problematic. For example, if we take the overall field of CSO participation and limit it in a question regarding expectations, we can immediately decide that governance is a relevant concept here, as it is through governance that expectations between parties in participatory

² Deliverable 1.2, *Theoretical Landscape*, p.8ff.



endeavours are expressed and negotiated. Having thus seen this, we can go deeper and determine that within governance, given this problematic of expression and negotiation, democratic uses of dialogue must be dealt with. This allows us to use the broad distinction between, for instance, representative and deliberative democracy. In mining these concepts, and analysing their origins, manifestations, potential and limits, we therefore determine fundamental notions that underwrite the very concepts constitutive of the field that our question inhabits. These notions can therefore serve as parameters for a grid of analysis because, with respect to the research question, they are pervasive and their presence, absence and construal represent all the possibilities for addressing the question in terms of the analysis undertaken.

The grid of analysis permits the discovery of patterns and models in research based in our analysis of various types of trends in research. For our project, this finds an approach to data from within our sets of research projects. These are based on the appearance of the parameters of the grid within the projects we investigate. They are constructed from sources in the literature, via the grid of analysis, and augmented further through empirical discovery and interpretation. They serve to classify the empirical findings of research. This occurs via a critical appraisal of empirical data. In examining empirical findings, key questions are raised as to the reasons for the uses of tools, approaches etc. in CSO involvements. For example, we can ask why public debate is employed in some instance (for what, among whom, regarding what?) We then unpick the latent presuppositions in the uses of the tool or approach, determining patterns of uses. In terms of the grid of analysis, the patterns represent the occurrence within practice of the parameters of the grid. The models then label these patterns of occurrences via our judgements and interpretations of the field as we find it and as it relates to our research interests.

This permits a classification into models, demonstrating a link with theory, or with the literature, as well as showing a certain level of unity among the otherwise various activities seen in empirical study. This can then permit another step whereby logical sets of approaches can be formed based on analysis of the models, in terms of the relevant literature. This step reveals paradigmatic approaches and uses of tools. By determining limits and problems at this level, given it characterises most broadly any activity, we can draw upon the literature and the experience of researchers to recommend ways to overcome limits. This means there is a literature and practice-based mode of addressing the question set in the research.

The grid of analysis effectively creates a centre of gravity for studies so that we can arrange a response to the field study approach. Using the grid of analysis, we can relate the appearance of these concepts to the question we focus upon and can then make a step to diagnosing limits. We can do this as we analyse the import of the various moments in the table. From the description of this import we can then evaluate from the perspective of the concepts in the question. This allows us to take a critical stance. Since we use the same grid and the same question, we can apply this method across a variety of cases and discern critical consistency despite the variety of work examined.

In this deliverable, we advance from the determination of the relevant field and our focus within in order to create a grid of analysis, constituted by the parameters we found in our analyses of the theoretical landscape.

The key steps taken in the last deliverable toward the development and implementation of an analytical grid included:

- 1) Determining the domain for analysis



- 2) Specifying the parameters relevant to study within the domain
- 3) Creating a grid for analysis for our empirical findings by taking into consideration
 - a) The field of inquiry (including determining the scope of the field)
 - b) The research problem

Deliverable 1.2 is central to delimiting the research scope in general and will here be expanded upon significantly, using the strong foundation built in D1.2's theoretical survey. This will be the analytical grid through which CONSIDER's ultimate means of assessment for participatory practice, and for policy advice will stand. The grid is necessary for grounding empirical study in that it establishes the criteria required to frame the field exercise. It determines the manner in which the different approaches function, in terms such as: what they aim to do; what conceptual basis this aim is predicated on; how the aim and its basis are mediated to the public; the normative basis for the approaches. Part of the animating features of CONSIDER's approach has been normative analysis. This mode of analysis is of central importance to the development of the grid and to the interpretation and use of the results from the previous deliverable. We must make these connections clear in order to demonstrate the coherence of the approach undertaken overall, and so we will spend some time spelling out the connections here.

2 Normative Analysis: Recap

In CONSIDER so far, in deliverable 1.2, we have been advocating normative analysis. We go on to link this to the development and use of what we have called an analytical grid, or grid of analysis. In the following sections, we will explain in detail key elements of the normative-analytical approach, connect it to the idea of a grid of analysis, and then go on to connect these ideas to CONSIDER's research in particular. We can begin this exploration with the general question *what is normativity?*

The notion of normativity, although broadly referred to in the fields of social sciences and philosophy, continues to give rise to various confusions. One of the main confusions is the reduction of the normative significance of a norm to its factual meaning. When someone says: 'It is prohibited to smoke in public places'. It is one thing to report in a descriptive way that smoking is prohibited (factual meaning of norm), it is another thing to commit or evaluate in a prescriptive way the binding force of the norm for one's conduct (evaluative/normative significance of a norm). We call the reductive stance towards normativity a positivistic reduction, and we suggest that, given the attachment of some scientists to what Weber calls 'axiological neutrality', many approaches to the social sciences represent reductive disciplines as regards normativity. This denial of normativity defined as the evaluative relationship to norms is almost a direct consequence of the requirements of the methodology of these approaches to social sciences.³

As a general, methodological note, we can here say that what interests us is normative analysis as a means of decoding implicit, tacit and other forms of value judgements that colour the perspectives adopted in the pursuit of gaining knowledge of a context. We reject neutrality and make it our business to oppose the reductive stance in favour of an engaged investigation of a constructed object of enquiry in order to be able to assess and build on limits discovered in that object of investigation. This is not to be concerned straightforwardly

³ CONSIDER deliverable 1.1, *Glossary*, p. 9 (http://www.consider-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/D1.1_Glossary-2012-06-27-submitted.pdf). The 'view from nowhere' implied by this kind of approach is challenged throughout the history of ideas, broadly construed, and not least in Weber's own intellectual successors, such as J. Habermas in *Knowledge and Human Interests*.



with *understanding what seems normal or natural for a group or groups*, but to deal with *what criteria underlie judgements about the value of norms*.

2.1 Building an idea of ‘norm’

Where does normativity come from? There is no single source of normativity, nor is there a unique domain in which normativity is relevant. Norms are a transversal phenomenon and exhibit various traits, depending upon circumstance, context, the nature of enquiry and many other factors. We can illustrate this with reference to some simple examples. We provide increasingly complex examples as we go on, starting with the simple in order to make the point as clearly as possible. The stakes at this stage and in the paragraphs that follow are *pedagogical*.

In mathematics $7+5=12$ is so given the laws of mathematics. This can be interpreted in empirical terms (Mill, 1843)⁴: seven objects placed in relation with five more results in twelve objects overall. It can also be interpreted psychologically (Mill, *ibid*, Jeffrey 1989, 132; Massey 1991, 186)⁵: thinking of seven things in combination with five more prompts us to think of twelve overall. This is also interpretable objectively (Frege 1953)⁶: seven plus five makes twelve, regardless of what anyone thinks of it. This seems straightforward, but the point is that we appeal to some basis other than the formula in order to understand the meaning of the formula. Moreover, the basis we use contributes to what we understand by the formula and how we understand it. The conceptual background informs the interpretations that are open to us to make even in a field such as mathematics, which is pre-reflectively thought of as unproblematically universal.

We appeal to some basis other than a formula in order to understand the meaning of that formula. The basis we use contributes to what we understand by the formula and how we understand it. The conceptual background informs the interpretations that are open to us to make even in a field such as mathematics.

In terms of human behaviour the role of various norms is even more apparent. From anthropological studies there have been gathered reams of material on how different groups of people respond to their differing environments.⁷ Culture, tradition, history, geography and other factors combine in myriad forms to elicit, enable or problematise different ways of being in the world. These are describable in a simple sense, of course. However, to understand the significance of these ways of being requires a different focus – a focus upon what normative basis behaviours take as given. Traditions can be tied to such things as preserving the environment, promoting intermarriage among social groups, securing dynasties, disseminating specific knowledge and so on. Descriptions as such won’t capture this, and the specific significances of particular ways of being will be revealed through more detailed, normative analysis.

⁴ Mill, John Stuart, 1843, *System of Logic* (9th ed). Longmans, 1875.

⁵ Mill, *ibid*, Jeffrey, R., 1989., *Formal Logic: Its Scope and Limits*, New York: McGraw-Hill. Massey, G. J., 1991. “Some Reflections on Psychologism,” in T. Seebohm, D. Føllesdal and J. Mohanty (eds.), *Phenomenology and the Formal Sciences*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 183-94.

⁶ Frege, Gottlob, 1953, *Foundations of Arithmetic*, Oxford: Blackwell. Transl. by J. L. Austin.

⁷ See for instance Bernard, H. Russell, *Research Methods in Anthropology*. Altamira Press, 2002.



This is a methodological principle in anthropology utilised to avoid ethnocentrism.⁸ In so avoiding this adherence to an investigator's presumed scheme of norms, the possibility is opened of interpreting behaviour in terms of its enactors. In so doing, the significance of the behaviour to those who behave is available to the investigator. As a practical methodological principle, this has clear benefits. But it has a deep philosophical foundation in epistemology.

In epistemological terms, the question at stake revolves around the very status of a claim, proposition or cognitively significant content as knowledge. Part of the epistemological investigation of such items can be the foundation upon which the item rests, the contribution it makes to an overall web of meaning, or the role it plays in a broad scheme of interpretation and interpretability.⁹

In CONSIDER we have begun to undertake analyses of the conditions from which civil society organisations' participation in research design have emerged. We did this explicitly in deliverable 1.2, *Theoretical Landscape*. The outcomes of our analyses included a basic set of concepts, tabulated to indicate relevant and important areas for analysis in the overall problematic of CSO participation in research design. The importance of these analyses were to permit the building up of evaluative categories in a workable grid of analysis, relevant to the field of study overall, and our question in particular. This is illustrated here with reference to one parameter (governance) that we discovered as centrally important. This illustration is not a final grid, but is instead an illustration of some of the complexity we will go on to discover as we create the grid of analysis for CONSIDER. The explication of this complexity will be gradually explored through further discussion, and with two examples (section 3).

Governance Approach: Standard Model Revised-Standard Model	Expectations: Managing relations with public, Communication with public		
	Aggregative, deliberative, dialogical: Aggregative	Means of expressing interests: Public meetings, press releases, publicity	Public interest, research and its background: Public education, furthering research ends, dissemination strategy
			Values and norms: Value-exclusion sought, research norms presupposed

⁸ For interesting discussion of this, see Scholte, B., 'Toward a Reflexive and Critical Anthropology' in Hymes, D., *Reinventing Anthropology*, Pantheon books, p.431ff
<http://www.unc.edu/~aparcio/WAN/ScholteToward.pdf>.

⁹ See Descartes' *Meditations*, Quine's *Word and Object* and Davidson's *Objective, Intersubjective, Subjective* as illustrative of these respective positions.



Governance Approach: Democratic-Inclusive Co-Construction	Expectations: Accountability, legitimacy, Fairness		
	Aggregative, deliberative, dialogical: Deliberative, dialogical	Means of expressing interests: Consultation, Deliberation, Public Debate	Public interest, research and its background: Inclusion of public in research design and practice, consider social impacts and engagements as part of research
			Values and norms: Reflexivity on values and norms among all participants (Context construction)

Figure 1: Concepts from D1.2 relevant to CSO research problem

Part of the thrust of deliverable 1.2 was to set about locating the drive for, intentions behind, and meaning of notions of participation. We did this in terms of policy (primarily European policy), and scientific research. The philosophical drive of this work was to begin the processes described above in terms of mathematics, anthropology and the epistemological background to each: The plan is to use these resources to understand the significance of the possibilities for civil society participation in research design so that we can engage with the status quo and build upon it in a principled fashion.

One aim of CONSIDER is to produce policy advice in the field of civil society participation in research design. We cannot hope to do this with any lasting legitimacy if we act only upon appraisals of ‘best practice’ or benchmarking without a connection to the drives, intentions and meanings of policy in this area. To do so would be like the anthropologist who refrains from ‘getting into the milieu’ of the group under observation – it would be a solipsistic, a partial or a blunt approach to approach the field solely on the basis of our own preconceived ideas. Using a consistent and reasoned basis for analysis, moreover, permits the assessment of analyses in consistent terms: analyses can be evaluated relative to one another, using the specific analysis of the grid. This is the importance of CONSIDER’s normative approach.

To translate from deliverable 1.2 to now, we have approached the field with questions such as: “Where does the normativity come from?”. For our efforts, we gained insights into important strands of the overall field, historically, politically, and philosophically. Our approach was summarised in the following table, from D1.2:

	Action	Implementation
Overall problematic	Delimit field to a question: How do actors define and reach their expectations related to defining public interest when constructing norms in research projects?	Apply the question to the overall problematic to yield pertinent areas for study.
Theoretical background (Including assessment of other applied research)	Give content to Question	Analysis of theoretical backgrounds to pertinent areas of study, e.g. Aggregative democracy, Deliberative democracy, Governance models, actor selection, Participatory Approach aims
Grid (Parameter determination)	A derivation from the above two areas	A table of pertinent areas of study that can inform field analysis to yield insights related to the question. Also acts as a background against which to choose case studies.

Figure 2: Steps in the CONSIDER methodology – theory to grid

We were also in the position to be able to narrow that broad field into a focussed question: *How do actors define and reach their expectations related to defining public interest when constructing norms in research projects?*

What does it mean in a project to so set ourselves a question? We have identified the problem of our project – this means that there is a great deal of theoretical thinking connected with it. For example, deliberation, proceduralisms, public interest, norm-construction and so on are all implied by our question, and each has with it an associated literature.

Now the problem is how to select the parameters. Inductive methods can't easily reveal their own presuppositions. One methodology can reveal differences in outcomes when contrasted with another. A moment of judgement is required as to which is better, and with respect to what. This judgement call draws upon material not within the research methodology itself. At this moment of evaluation, norms and values are drawn upon that inhabit presupposed framings. Under the uncertainty of novelty, potentially unexamined prior decisions can affect research trajectories. From the broad literatures associated with our focus we need to hit upon those most germane to our aims. We can't choose the parameters based purely on the fact that we have found them either in literature, assessment of prior practice, nor in our empirical work via induction. Instead, we try to determine what we are looking for through emphasising the role of *construction* – we need a criterion or criteria of choice among the potentially unbounded parameters that will be available. We have to use a criterion of choice grounded in our wide appreciation of the overall objective of research we want to reach.

In short, we need to ground the choice of the parameters related to a theoretical frame that justifies those choices. Among key concepts we already know of as important in CONSIDER are problems concerning the limits of deliberation approaches in relationship to limits of deliberative approaches regarding governance (in connection to the trends that seeks to overcome the limits of the aggregative democratic paradigm). So, this broader debate in the literature serves as a theoretical frame that needs explored should the criteria for choosing parameters from this concept.

From the general background, having analysed important aspects of it in general, we derived these key concepts upon which our research would run. From analysis of *these* we went on to derive parameters and areas of reflection that, in being related directly to our question will speak directly to the core, fundamental issues upon which our research runs. The normative analysis that furnishes our grid is a practical outcome from our overall analytical stance and the perspective on the problematic that we are developing.

Having thus opened the door on some of these broad underlying themes, we now must consolidate some of the most pertinent among them and then go on to relate this directly to the task at hand in CONSIDER. We begin to do this now by bearing with some of the themes just mentioned, along with some discussion and clarification on what we have termed an 'analytical grid'.

The determination of a problem has specific consequences for what we need to study and our means of working. This can be summed up as follows:

- Using procedures grounded in principle we can:
 - Detect patterns in practice which are instances of grid parameters
 - Models label sets of instances
 - Paradigms – relating the two to the literature
-
- Feedback and testing of parameters making up the grid of analysis
 - Case Study: Patterns
 - Grounded Norm Analysis: Models
 - Feedback among partner approaches: testing and refining
- From these resources map the normative horizons employed in CSO participation
- Continuity between theoretical and practical approaches

Diagrammatically, we can illustrate this methodology as follows:




Figure 3 Depiction of Method

3 The Use of an Analytical grid

In order to explore the analytical grid's use, we will here develop increasingly involved examples in order to demonstrate the point. We will be explaining the theoretical underpinnings through a basic sample problem, concerning stopping at a red light. After this we will develop another use with reference to one of the parameters of study revealed in the previous deliverable, the governance concept. Following that, we will explore in detail the nature and relevance of the parameters that appear in CONSIDER's analytical grid. We will link this to the theoretical background and the overall problematic and method taken on by CONSIDER.

3.1 Example: Stopping at a Red Light

When we seek to address any question, we can find innumerable ways of interpreting our task. For example, if we ask 'Why should we stop driving at a red light?' the answer can focus on the law. In that case, the answer would be that we should stop at a red light because the law says we should. The answer could instead focus on ethical considerations. We should stop at a red light because to fail to stop would be to take unfair chances with the safety of others. We could interpret the question in terms of sheer practicality too and suggest that stopping at red lights is a good idea because that is what is expected of us. So we should stop at red lights because failing to do so would make coordination among drivers difficult.

Among these different approaches none can be said to be exhaustive or irrelevant. Legal, ethical and practical dimensions are each relevant and overlapping. What is at stake in using one interpretation over another is the emphasis that each is given. Given this, and making the assumption that in trying to answer a question we don't seek to give partial answers, a means of dealing with these various perspectives ought to be developed. Such a means we label an 'analytical grid.'

In terms of stopping at red lights, it ought to be the case that we try to find a way of giving as much consideration as we can to the different approaches and emphases that we can. In doing this, an answer to the question is provided that is flexible. For some purposes, legal emphasis is more important than ethical, for instance. Other purposes may be best served

by thinking about the ethics of driving. With a broad approach to a question, the answer given can be utilised after the fact for different purposes. By contrast, if the question is approached with one fixed view presupposed, the answer we get will be partial and framed by collateral presuppositions. A distortion of the breadth of an answer to a question will limit the quality of the outcome.

<i>Why should we stop driving at a red light?</i>	
Dimension	Explanation
Legal	Stopping at reds is a legal requirement and we are all subject to the law.
Ethical	We put others at risk if we fail to stop at reds.
Practical	If we fail to stop at reds the overall coordination among drivers is jeopardised, causing serious practical problems.

Figure 4: Sketch Analytical Grid for Red Light Question

In general, these dimensions can clearly overlap – one need only mention the perennial tension between positive and natural law theorists in order to highlight the links between ethics and law. Nevertheless, the distinctions at play offer differences of emphasis, leading to considerations and conclusions of significantly different types. Moreover, owing not least to the realities of bounded rationality, no one can predict in advance the entire spectrum of possibilities that may be relevant to the answering of any given question. In figure 1, the section labelled ‘dimensions’ is therefore in principle unbounded – we can’t say in advance what would represent a ‘complete’ list of dimensions. It is also important to remember that the dimensions and their descriptions offer not a tick box, or an instrumental reduction of a field. Instead, what is offered is a point of departure for reflection, related to a broad field of theoretical and other background material. Taken as such, the grid serves to characterise analysis in a structured way.

Legal, ethical and practical dimensions are obviously important, but we could easily come up with further dimensions: perhaps *psychologically* it is good to stop at red lights as obeying signals from the outside world inhibits the potential for narcissism. *Aesthetically* we could argue that stopping at red lights is an inherent part of what ‘driving’ is, and therefore to stop at reds represents part of the art of driving. For this reason, it is essential to make a clear focus for a question and to limit the attempt to answer it strictly to a definite set of concepts. In order to make this structured analysis useful and interesting, it must be related to a focussed question. Thus, speaking of the ethics of potential law-breaking would remain nebulous and open-ended were the task not, as here, located within a pre-defined problematic, *viz.* ‘should I stop at red lights?’. Although more complex in fact, in principle, this sketch scenario is no different to the CONSIDER project trajectory overall.

We will now use a specific example from CONSIDER to illustrate this more. We will take the concept of governance and explore it in similar fashion to this red light question. The increasing complexity will be obvious, and the exercise will serve to illustrate the task CONSIDER has set itself.

3.2 Example: Governance

One key parameter gleaned from the analysis of the theoretical landscape behind CONSIDER's problematic is the governance approach taken in research. Drawing upon the theoretical landscape, in deliverable 1.2 we were able to point to at least four broad distinctions in governance approach taken in research.¹⁰ These were referred to as the 'Standard Model,' the 'Revised-Standard Model', the 'Democratic-Inclusive' model and the 'Co-constructive' model. Following the example just examined regarding red lights, we can make a sketch grid of analysis as follows:

<i>What is the governance approach used in the research?</i>	
Dimension	Explanation
Standard Model	The Standard Model presents a traditional top-down approach, which is based on the knowledge of experts. Normativity here comes from the knowledge and opinions of the experts involved in the decision-making. In this model, the disagreements between the experts and the public are perceived as irrational due to the non-expert's lack of knowledge. There are various reasons for the public being considered irrational, such as cognitive bias, the lack of comprehension of technical subjects, and aversion to novelties and risk. This model fits perfectly into the classical distinctions between facts and values. Experts have an objective ethical approach to risk whereas the risks perceived by the public are marked by a greater degree of subjectivity.
Revised Standard Model	In this model, which is the extension of the standard model, the emphasis is placed on the interaction between the regulation process, social groups and media. It is assumed that public perception of risk is usually inadequate. Risks are often overestimated; however, the efforts to educate the public about scientific risks are not straightforward. As a result, the public will feel unprotected by law and decision-makers, which will lead to more political pressure to act. The top-down structure remains in place, but with political mediation.
Democratic-Inclusive (Consultation)	This model brings into question the fundamental thesis of the standard model, namely the opposition between the irrational public and the rationality of the experts. The distance between experts and non-experts is not connected with the level of knowledge, but with the difference in the perception of risks and goods from research. The public asks wider questions with regard to risk because they are no longer confronted with abstract scientific theoretical risk, but with real risk. It is no longer correct to consider that only experts are rational. Moreover the experts' perception of risk takes into account their connections with industry and commercial interests etc.
Co-constructive	This model distinguishes itself by questioning the way in which expertise is employed. The works of the new sociology of sciences have progressively come to blame the traditional conception of

¹⁰ These models are developed on the basis of work carried out by P. B. Joly (2007) and Callon, M., Lascoumes, P., Barthe, Y. (2001) Callon, M., (1998), 'Des différentes formes de démocratie technique', *Annales des Mines*, January 1998, pp. 63-73, and for the same references related to governance model (standard models etc...) Joly, P.-B. (2001) 'Les OGM entre la science et le public? Quatre modèles pour la gouvernance de l'innovation et des risques', *Economie Rurale*, 266, pp. 11-29.



	science as a revelation of universal, independent truths of the social system they produce. Top-down governance disappears as a horizontal nature enters, concerned with permitting voices to be heard on every aspect of research: from problem-setting, through methodology, to uses of outcomes.
--	---

Figure 5: Governance dimensions and explanation

When we seek to address the question of governance within a research project under scrutiny, we can focus on these dimensions, along with the explanation provided to give them content. The point of doing this is at least threefold:

- 1) The scrutiny we apply is consistent across cases. This permits comparisons among assessments.
- 2) We locate the scrutiny within a relevant pedigree, according to the theoretical landscape, and
- 3) We relate the active research practices to the question at hand – we retain relevance to the adopted problematic.

As with the red light example, these dimensions represent points of departure for reflection: there is work to be done in interpreting the dimensions with relation to the matter under investigation. For instance, researchers may not avow having any particular governance approach at all in play in a project. It would therefore be a job of CONSIDER research to evaluate the data we gain in order to discern *de facto* patterns of governance (including the possibility that governance may manifest in an inconsistent or variable way). The point of having set ourselves a specific question, meanwhile, ensures not that we have gained an exhaustive list of possible parameters for the problematic overall, but that we have connected the thematic areas we investigate to a grounding theoretical background and focussed it through the lens of a clear problematic. Needless to say, as this issue of governance is just one part of the overall question we are interested in, the overall picture will be more complex.

The point should be clear – as a question becomes more complex, this aspect of the challenge of making an analytical grid will grow. CONSIDER has set a question that is highly complex. We must now relate the idea of the analytical grid to CONSIDER’s question and connect this deliverable with earlier work in deliverable 1.2 in order to demonstrate the coherence of the approach undertaken, as well as its validity.

In terms of our research outputs, the reflections undergone here have at least two focal points: the setting of questions (in order to elicit information from the subjects we use in our research) and the analysis of information (in forming a view on the information we have gained). Each of these aspects will be covered in greater detail in section 5, below, following a deeper look at each of the parameters present in the grid. With this deepened treatment of the parameters and the rationale of their potential for deployment in eliciting and in analysing information, the intention is to show the importance and the efficacy of the grid. The grid is both theoretically and operationally important.

4 The Analytical Grid and CONSIDER

CONSIDER has set itself the following question in response to the problem just outlined of the potential unboundedness of inquiry. The use of a narrow question is to orient the project



within a specific trajectory in the overall field of enquiry. Without such an orientation, research could remain unguided, open-ended and prey to unstated assumption. The question upon which CONSIDER runs is:

“How do actors define and reach their expectations related to defining public interest when constructing norms in research projects?”

In so focussing our interest, the research consortium has picked out a set of issues whose constituent concepts shape a field of inquiry within the potentially limitless field of CSO participation in research design. In D1.2, the question above was expanded as follows. Coming from our narrowly focussed question:

“...we have the problem of **norms and values**, here focussed in terms of expectations. **Expectations** can be met, managed or addressed as part of a **governance approach**. That governance approach must employ various methods in order to facilitate the tabling of differing points of view (**aggregative, deliberative, dialogical** motivations for governance). This tabling will constitute a broad perspective on **public interest** with respect to the research at hand and so the **means of expressing interests** with relation to the **research and its background** must be borne in mind.”¹¹

Given the function of the question as an orientation within a broad problematic, there remains scope for further specification of approach within the question. The elaboration above of the concepts of the question provides focal points that can be used to centre our research efforts. These are important as even within the focussed question we set ourselves, it is possible that research becomes unguided or unprincipled in the way we handle the specific concepts that the question deploys. In order to ensure that we answer our question, we thus have to relate these key concepts that constitute the question to the theoretical landscape explored in deliverable 1.2.

We can use this question and its elaboration now in order to present in table form, as above, a grid of analysis upon which CONSIDER’s research ought to be founded. In this grid, the questions’ elaboration is followed by departure points for reflection, guiding questions designed to reflect further upon the constituent concepts of the CONSIDER question. These are rooted in the theoretical landscape of deliverable 1.2. The grid as it appears here appears as if a conclusion to a chain of reasoning we have only so far tentatively and descriptively outlined. In effect the grid will require more fine-grained discussion and appreciation. This will occur throughout this deliverable, but in order to continue the process of clarifying what the grid *is* we present it here, and will elaborate as we proceed upon what it represents, what it means and what it facilitates the project to do overall.

4.1 Context-construction and Normativity

Having focussed upon a question, and seen the importance of the parameters as constitutive of the grid, we can begin to think of its use as a tool to construct the context of our research work. When we use this grid, we are trying to establish what is happening *vis a vis* CSO participation in research design. Using the grid, grounded in analysis of the field, we are trying to establish if, why, how this participation is carried out.

¹¹ D1.2, *Theoretical Background*, p. 8.



Because the grid has parameters grounded in theory and connected to our research question, we have the means to interpret participatory actions in projects in ways significant for our research aims. We can call this contextualising the research we carry out. We can call it this because we aim not just to describe what we find according to ad hoc, perhaps unstated assumptions, but to understand what we find according to the significance it holds for the projects under investigation.

Although the concepts constituting the grid may appear to be a partial reading based on prior interests, they are intended as organising principles for interrogating the area we set out to make sense of and to analyse. The subsequent analysis will demonstrate that each of these parameters, criteria or concepts is extremely internally diverse. Whilst they are concepts frequently called upon by participants in research projects, there is not consistency in what their significance is.

We can go on to assess what we find according to the broad theoretical framings in which the concepts occur in research. This means we have a tool of analysis and of assessment of CSO participation in research design that is not prey to the often-made mistake of failing to pay attention to the assumptions made by researchers themselves. We don't presume a context, and we approach our research with normativity as a problem to be dealt with, rather than assumed as a solution.

In the grid we develop here, with this open method in mind, each box is a point of departure for thinking about the titular aspect of the row. It is not a tick-box, but a creative moment of reflection on what we have given ourselves as a stake in research via our project-problematic and focussed question. The focal points here presuppose familiarity with the theoretical background already explored.

<i>How do actors define and reach their expectations related to defining public interest when constructing norms in research projects?</i>				
Norms & Values	What norms? Whose?	What values? Whose?	Presupposed, ignored, excluded, constructed?	
Expectations	Of researchers	Of CSO participants	Of funders/ and other stakeholders	
Governance approach	Hierarchical, consultation, co-construction?	Aggregative, deliberative, dialogical?		
Public interest	Cui bono? (who benefits?)	How is it <i>progress</i> rather than simple sectoral advance?	Capacitation	
Means of expressing interests	Mode of participation? Dialogue? Round table, focus group, questionnaire? ¹²	Impact: when are the means deployed – start, during, end, throughout?	Open ended or discrete?	Conflict resolution mechanism?
Research and its background	Funding source, aims, intentions?	Political context (widely construed).	CSO involvement <i>for what?</i> (cf. The Cardoso Report ¹³)	

¹² See Fung, A., *Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance*, for a fuller discussion of these sample modes (<http://www.archonfung.net/papers/FungVarietiesPAR.pdf>), as well as CONSIDER D1.2, *Theoretical Landscape*.

¹³ <http://www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/PUBS/GG-2006.HTM>.



Figure 1: Analytical Grid Concepts for CONSIDER's Question

We now go through these parameters individually to clarify their meaning and importance. The intention here is to provide explanation of how this grid can materially be put to work within the CONSIDER project. The grid is supposed to inform research, and to do so by framing enquiry, thus it should play a role in case-study selection, questionnaire-forming and data analysis. These roles will be discussed further in section 5, but for now we focus on the parameters themselves, explaining what they concretely entail, how they connect to the theoretical landscape explored in deliverable 1.2, and how they should guide the research actions in CONSIDER. It should be noted, as with the example of the red light, that these parameters along with their explication can merge, cover the same ground and be used to prompt reflection. These penumbral functions of the parameters are useful in keeping research open, but linked to a theme – in our case our question. The overall result of using the grid for analysis should therefore be thought of as useful in establishing a holistic perspective on constructing and examining the matters being researched.

4.2 Norms & Values

Norms & Values	What norms? Whose?	What values? Whose?	Presupposed, ignored, excluded, constructed?
---------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	--

Referring back to the theoretical background delivery, we can locate CONSIDER's discussions of norm and value within the critical appraisal of the Louvain School in deliverable 1.2. This school of thought is centrally concerned with how governance measures understand the perspectives of citizens. This essentially concerns how the perception of norms and the role of values shape the possibilities for action from citizens' perspectives.

In CONSIDER's research, when we ask what and whose norms are at play, we are asking about power relations in the governance of research. We are also seeking a perspective on what is being presupposed (the content presupposed) by each stakeholder or stakeholder group in the object of investigation. Given the theoretical survey already undertaken, we know that values operate within the perspectives of citizens also. So we must ascertain what values as well as what norms occur in the perspectives we reconstruct as we research.

Established limits in norm-construction come in the form of presuppositions that routinely inform each of them. These presuppositions, discerned by the incisive analyses of the Louvain school, are as follows:

Intentionalist presupposition - the effects of the norms are supposed to be deducible from the simple intention to adopt the norm. Additionally, there is the presupposition that the actors in a participatory approach will have the capacity and intention to contribute to the participatory discussion.

Schematising presupposition - involves Kantian schemes (rules), in which the operation of the application of a norm is a simple formal deductive reasoning on the basis of the rule itself. The determination of the norm is linked to these rules, such as ethical guidelines, or laws, or other external sets of rules.

Mentalist presupposition - is so named because it relies on the mind having a set of rules (or schemes, in Kant's words), that predetermines the effect of a norm, and does not depend on any exterior context (to that of the thinker). This is commonly



seen when participants in a participatory approach come to the setting with their own particular ethical framing, or with some preconceptions as to what ethical issues might arise.

As noted by the analysis of Lenoble and Maesschalck as regards governance and norms,¹⁴ it is the failure to account for the epistemological position of the social actor. These presuppositions facilitate the failure to construct norms in that they underwrite inattention to the material that informs the perspective of any given social actor. This failing means the actions of those being investigated cannot be understood in their own terms, according to their own normative horizons. CONSIDER must bear such analysis in mind when attempting to construct the normative horizons of those we research. This normative horizon represents the *perspective* of those we want to research.

Once so constructed, we must then ask how these perspectives have been constructed in the first place: have the norms and values been presupposed, ignored, excluded, constructed? Recalling the methods critically assessed in D1.2 *Theoretical Landscape* this means examining the processes of appreciating different perspectives as they occurred within the approach to research that we analyse.

For example, we can ask of a given case whether research projects that had CSO involvement presumed arguments were sufficient to engage with CSO perspectives, i.e. whether it was thought that logic was considered a pre-eminent *modus operandi* in CSO participation. We can further investigate whether alternatives were conceived of or sought out. Taken as a whole, we get a view on how the perspectives of stakeholders involved in research projects are perceived and thought to operate within specific projects. This part of the analytic grid, characterising these sorts of perspectives, provides the insights with respect to these matters.

4.3 Expectations

Expectations	Of researchers	Of CSO participants	Of funders/ and other stakeholders
--------------	----------------	---------------------	------------------------------------

In thinking about expectations as they appear within research, we have various aspects that are relevant: researchers, CSO participants, funders and other stakeholders. Besides establishing what these expectations might be, we as researchers must ask why these expectations are formed, upon what basis, how they are manifested in the research. We must ask of each of these parties what the expectations are for the CSO participation within the research. We must ask this across a range of dimensions. For example, what is the expected impact of the CSO participation upon the research? Is it for problem-setting, problem handling, as an information source, as a legitimising force for the research overall, and so on. Our review of the theoretical landscape provided material on this in that it pursued the political agendas for inclusion as part of the general thrust and oscillations within 'technoscience'.¹⁵

'Expectation' is a useful concept in beginning to look at different levels of relevance in analysing the deployment of participation in research. Expectation is such that it has a double perspective: it is informed by presuppositions and it is predictive of empirical outcomes. So in looking to expectations at different levels of relevance to our problem area, we can gain insights into the theoretical underpinnings of the actors at the level in question

¹⁴ Lenoble, J. and Maesschalck, M., *Toward a Theory of Governance: the Action of Norms*, p. 33.

¹⁵ Cf. CONSIDER D1.2, p. 14ff.



through their stated aims and through their supposed, hoped-for outcomes. When we talk about CSO participation, we have different domains of relevance.

As the body responsible for research in the European Research Area, the European Commission's pronouncements upon the character of and modes of implementation of CSO participation will be a fruitful basis to inform the normative-analytic process of CONSIDER. We can also draw upon the plentiful documents related to CSO participation that originate from bodies such as the OECD, UN and other global actors (i.e. with a scope wider than European policy.)

In projects that utilise CSO participation in their proceeding, we can get a picture of how the pronouncements of the Commission, via policy, are interpreted and implemented. We can also see why CSO participation is sought (in what kinds of projects and for what reasons) as well as asking *what's in it for the benefactors from research and addressees of consultations*.¹⁶

From a societal level, there is a perception that research, science and policy-making exercises increasingly approach civil society for their input on various matters. From this perspective again we can ask why, when and how these inputs are sought. A useful distinction to be borne in mind here is that between *civic engagement* and *active citizenship*.¹⁷

In the former case, the public can be thought of as getting involved on issues that matter to them. There are no broader commitments presupposed to the political process. Voluntarism and particularism are central here. Consultation, demonstration and so on, on the basis of a reaction to some issue or set of issues, is sufficient for civic engagement.¹⁸ Active citizenship suggests something more concrete and structured. It involves an approach to public life that entails the adoption of duties and involvement with the public sphere per se as a *modus vivendi*. It is a response to the 'rights side' focus of many contemporary citizens and represents a re-balancing emphasis upon the notion that bearers of rights are bearers of responsibilities *eo ipso*.

From each of these levels, we will be in a position to gain descriptive information (thus inform the initial step of the normative-analytic approach) as well as determining the characterisation of the reasoning and structures at play in CSO participation as it is intended, implemented and perceived. This all goes toward furnishing our understanding of the two thematic notions mentioned above, viz. 'Why CSO participation and what limits do assumed backgrounds entail?'

Altogether, moreover, this will militate against the problematic assumption of a unified, singular notion of 'CSO participation' that could easily be assumed as an object of enquiry. In fact, through careful attention to our method and to the nuances of the domain of enquiry, we work toward constructing the object of enquiry. In this case, CSO participation has aspects that are irreducible to any one of the above parameters, but is essentially reliant upon each of them.

¹⁶ The forms of CSO participation will include 'consultation' but can't be thought of as limited to that concept. Thus 'consultation' here appears as a placeholder rather than a fully-fledged adjective.

¹⁷ See Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman, "Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory," *Ethics* Vol. 104, No. 2 (Jan., 1994), pp. 352-381, University of Chicago Press for a treatment of the issues surrounding this.

¹⁸ Ruzza, C., "Organised civil society and political representation in the EU arena," in *Civil Society and International Governance The role of non-state actors in global and regional regulatory frameworks* (Eds. David Armstrong, Valeria Bello, Julie Gilson and Debora Spini) p. 61-62.



Expectations are important in the business of analysing research practice and policy as they frame the perception of the various stakeholders. For instance, should CSO inclusion be thought of as merely a ‘tick box’ or hoop to be jumped through in order to make research seem relevant to funding bodies’ agendas, we can see an uphill struggle for CSOs who might regard their role in a somewhat more operative fashion. Indeed, the potential clashes in role-perception among funders, researchers and CSOs, if unacknowledged, could serve to render unsatisfactory research outcomes for all involved. Since we seek to be in a position to table policy advice, we need to engage with this potentially problematic aspect of research design.

4.4 Governance Approach

Governance approach	Hierarchical, consultation, co-construction?	Aggregative, deliberative, dialogical?
----------------------------	--	--

As outlined in section 3.2 above, the role of governance within and without research has an arch role in enabling and foreshortening the scope of research practices. With specific reference to the theoretical background explored in CONSIDER, we should be centrally concerned with the issues highlighted here in section 3.2, and also with the notions of deliberation, aggregation and dialogue: these each in different ways affect the possibilities for research outcomes.

For example, we must enquire into the arrangements of the research with regards to CSO participation – is it hierarchical, consultative or co-constructive? In each of these forms of governance structures we will be able to determine flows of power as between, for instance, agenda-setters and sources of information, researchers and other stakeholders, research consortia and the public at large. The types of governance structure at work within research (again, referring to section 3.2 and to the deliverable 1.2 for more details) has impacts upon the possibilities for research, in particular with respect to how contexts, norms and values and legitimacy of research are construed.

Where we see a hierarchical structure with expert researchers at the top, and wherein (non-expert) dissent from below is seen as want of education, we discover a typical ‘standard model’ of governance. In such an arrangement we know that the nature and reality of norms is presupposed or ignored, value is suppressed and context is presupposed. Given the broadest aims of inclusion, as detailed in deliverable 1.2, we can see instantly that this would be in tension with those broad aims. Thus, it is important that we get this information in order to be able to determine the scope of such arrangements within our field (how representative such governance is in our field) and to be able to assess the research practices that employ such arrangements.

We must also look into the difference between an aggregative and a deliberative approach to CSO involvement, which can be that between asking for support for a proposition versus discussing the content of that proposition to arrive at a mutually agreed position. These issues are the same that animated the discussions of Habermas’ and Rawls’ views on social reality (D1.2, section 3). The difference here is between being asked to agree or disagree with something, versus being asked to discuss the very idea. We can recall at this point the differences discussed in deliverable 1.2 between weak and strong proceduralism:

Weak proceduralism

- Focuses on the way that actors adjust their norms and strategies of behaviour by taking into account the viewpoints and new knowledge
- Clear definition of rules of interactions among citizens
- Proceeds on a basis of assumed equilibria emerging among citizens

Strong proceduralism

- Focuses on the formal criteria of a process oriented towards common understanding
- Clear definition of the constitutional principles for public debate (transparency, equal participation etc.)
- Proceeds on a basis of negotiated equilibria emerging from procedures enacted by citizens

In seeking to establish what modes of engagement are enabled, missed or attempted in the governance of a project, we can locate that project's research within these broad trends, and move toward understanding the pattern it embodies. In practical terms, this means reflecting upon and asking about the issues we have identified as central trends in CSO participation in general, and in particular those that inform our question.

In taking such areas as these as focal points for our analysis, we are cutting to the deep basis for the outcomes from governance decisions – among the stakes are the boundaries for power, influence, impact and use of results from research. These factors come in the fabric of research design and so analysis ought to be pointed at them in order to enable their identification and assessment.

4.5 Public Interest

Public interest	Cui bono? (who benefits?)	How is it <i>progress</i> rather than simple sectoral advance?	Capacitation
------------------------	---------------------------	--	--------------

Similar to expectations, the idea of public interest must be examined in research. Publicly-funded research is supposed to bring outcomes beneficial to the public who fund it. According to European Research, Innovation and Science Commissioner Máire Geoghegan-Quinn,

“Knowledge is the currency of the global economy... If Europe wants to continue to compete in the 21st century, we must support the research and innovation that will generate growth and jobs, now and in the future. The high level of competition for EU funding makes sure that taxpayers' money goes to the best projects that tackle issues that concern all of us.”¹⁹

Research project consortia therefore have a duty to act on ‘issues that concern all of us’, but that necessarily means *constructing a view* on what a concern is and how the concern affects ‘us.’ Without analysis of how these constructions are carried out, this aspect of research remains a black box.

For example, were research to be predicated upon a notion of public interest that is both tacitly assumed and unquestioned, one would have to ask how ‘public’ such an interest could really be taken to be. This raises the problematic area of the capacity of the research

¹⁹ EC press release, ‘Largest number of calls ever for next round of FP7,’ 2012-07-10, http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=FP7_NEWS&ACTION=D&RCN=34831.



consortium to know what public interest is, and the chances of any means it deploys to discover it to succeed.

'Capacitation', here is used as a broad term alluding to the Louvain school as discussed in deliverable 1.2. It is related to learning, the general ability and disposition to assess and evaluate norms. Other terms such as 'empowerment' are relevant, but don't capture the generality here in that being empowered in a context implies that context's being known. Knowledge of the context in this sense is part of our exploration.

Issues related to this problem arose in the so-called 'Cardoso Report',²⁰ which sought to clarify the practices of participatory governance. It came under criticism for embodying three competing theoretical frameworks. A critical appraisal of this report distinguishes three thematic cores that pervade the thought of the report's authors.²¹

Functionalism:

"Centralized, territorially based governments should be replaced by separate systems of governance for each task, or function, that society requires. Some functions are best handled at the local level... Decision-making should be the responsibility of those who are directly involved, as producers, administrators, or consumers."

Neo-corporatism:

"Neo-corporatism is comparable to functionalism in that it has been described as a system of functional representation. It differs markedly from functionalism in acknowledging that different interests may be in conflict with each other and in recognizing that governments are the focal point for the political resolution of such conflicts... The neo-corporatist approach lays heavy emphasis on the role of the government in the economy. Similarly, both at the UN and for the Panel, the concept of partnerships is heavily biased toward country-level, development projects. A related aspect of the neo-corporatist model is for companies to be close to political authority. Historically, the UN has not officially dealt with individual companies in its policy-making processes, other than through their membership of non-commercial associations. Under Kofi Annan's leadership, this started to change, notably with the Global Compact."

Democratic Pluralism:

"With the democratic revolution of the 1990s, a clear majority of the world's governments have become democracies, and participation of civil society in the UN is supported as an extension of democracy at home. Both at the country level and at the UN, there are three interrelated requirements for a system to be democratic: there must be transparent decision-making processes; there must be procedures for diverse opinions to be expressed to the decision-makers; and there must be accountability for the decisions taken. In principle, democracy is about the rights of individuals to control those who govern them, but in practice most individuals can exercise influence only through groups. When there is a great diversity of groups, each exercising some influence, and policy proposals can be initiated by their members, we have democratic pluralism."

Contradictions Between the Three Theoretical Frameworks:

²⁰ http://archive1.globalsolutions.org/programs/intl_instit/latest_news/Cardoso%20Report.html.

²¹ Willets, P., The Cardoso 'Report on the UN and Civil Society: Functionalism, Global Corporatism or Global Democracy?' in the *Journal of Global Governance*, Vol. 12, 2006, pages 305-324.



“A belief in democratic pluralism involves the assertion of principles that are compatible with neither functionalism nor neo-corporatism... Functionalism aims to restrict participation to experts. Such an emphasis on expertise, knowledge, and experience is not necessarily anti-democratic. Indeed, to explore issues, with the participation of "world specialists" and ministers, in roundtables that "would inform and be informed by global public opinion", is to contribute to democratic debate. Functionalism becomes anti-democratic when political controversy is denied or suppressed, when access to policy-making is "depoliticized", when policy networks are limited to "relevant" actors... Neo-corporatism restricts participation to organized vested interests, resolves conflicts by bargaining between those interests, and ignores the general interest. The neo-corporatists will actively seek out the major organized sectional interest groups but be unconcerned if the poor, the weak, or advocates of the general public interest do not participate.”

We have to examine the context within which participation emerges. The framing this context brings will consist in factors such as formal rules, procedures and so on that mark out the course and the content of the concept of participation in research design – this can foreclose on particular interpretations just as much as it can enable others. Mapping what these limits are and how they influence the trajectory permits us to develop a critical stance on it. This mapping can be facilitated by sourcing texts on *how* CSO selection is carried out (if set methods exist) and on different manners of CSO participation (the ‘*how*’ of implementation). We must establish whether CSOs belong to a list, are sought through advertising vacancies, are seen as research peers or data sources. We must ask whether they can enter the proceedings at any point, must work according to a pattern and if so set by whom.

Deliverable 1.2, annex 1, contains an extensive list of concepts, their realisation in research, and commentary upon those realisations. These can be used as a reference in order to contextualise and inform this enquiry process.²²

The stake here is not to compare any notion of public interest against some ideal sort, of course. Once more, in the spirit of open research and analysis, it is to open the door on what can easily remain concealed and so to provide a breadth of material upon which future advice can be founded. The difference between sectoral advance and broader progress is central here: does research design include a means for assessing the impact of cross- or inter-sectoral voices such that no unjust power asymmetries (for example) warp research toward narrow sets of interests?

4.6 Means of Expressing Interests

Means of expressing interests	Mode of participation? Dialogue? Round table, focus group, questionnaire?	Impact: when are the means deployed – start, during, end, throughout?	Open ended or discrete?	Conflict resolution mechanism?
--------------------------------------	---	---	-------------------------	--------------------------------

Stating aims in research design can be easier than implementing those aims. In analysing the means of expressing interests in a research project we are examining the modes of participation open to stakeholders as well as any balance of power. For instance, where dialogue appears, is this in a roundtable meeting, a focus group, via questionnaire, or

²² <http://www.consider-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/D1.2-theoretical-landscape.pdf>, p.71.



something else? The differences for impact among the different forms of dialogue are clear. Not least among these is the potential for agenda-setting. Some examples of constraints upon these factors appear in a report by CARE.²³

	Normal tendencies	Needed reversals
Behavior	Dominating	Facilitating
	Lecturing	Listening
	Extracting	Empowering
	Professionals set priorities	Poor people set priorities
Bureaucracy	Centralize	Decentralize
	Standardize	Diversify
	Control	Enable
Modes of learning	From “above”	From “below”
Analysis and action more by	Professionals, outsiders	Local people, insiders

Figure 6: Factors constraining citizen participation in governance

The table here shows some tendencies that occur wherein dialogical encounters characterise a part of research. Alongside the tendencies is a set of ‘reversals,’ or correctives to the tendencies. It isn’t the case that one should be thought of as ‘better’ than the other, more that these represent a spectrum along which participatory practices can fall, and so a dimension with which to investigate the practice when it is observed. In our context here, these can represent things to look for in the examination of how interests are expressed, with respect to the power relations, openness, data use and so on, that affect that interest-expression.

These clarifications must be sought where we see that ‘deliberation,’ ‘consultation’ or any such dialogical method of participation is deployed. The stakes in asking such questions relate to the character or quality of that type of participation as it occurs in a specific project.

For instance, where a questionnaire is deployed as a means of information-gathering, the agenda is set entirely by the question-setters – the context of information discovery is bounded by the possibilities the question-setters determine. So, where questionnaires are a means of information-gathering, we must investigate further into *how the questions were set*. This will include reference to the presuppositions of the researchers, the audience chosen as recipients of the questionnaires, the use of the data acquired and so on. The extent to which the questionnaire represents ‘dialogue’ is therefore problematised through the use of the grid analysis. So too for other forms of dialogical engagement – public meetings, roundtables, focus groups and so on.

The extra detail acquired in pursuing the matter beyond simply accepting that ‘dialogue’ is at play permits the assessment of the possibilities for impact within the project, the practical import of that measure. We can therefore make judgements about the effectiveness and legitimacy of the measure itself. No procedure is ever neutral, nor is any process without presupposition. This can be seen in the way in which it is possible that words like ‘dialogue’ or ‘participation’ seem simple and straightforward, but really imply a set of highly varied

²³ Chambers, R., “Putting Participatory Governance into Practice,” in *An Inventory of Civil Society Resources and Tools*, 2001, Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE), <http://zunia.org/uploads/media/knowledge/care.pdf>, p. 88.



options and values, in principle and in practice. This can be tacit and so can be revealed by analysis in a way not necessarily open to participants. For example, we can both look for and assess these things on the basis of our analysis from deliverable 1.2, with ‘Arnstein’s Ladder’ and the OECD’s typology of participation:²⁴


<p>1 Information & transaction</p> <p>Government  Citizens</p>	<p>government informs citizens (one way process)</p>
<p>2 Consultation</p> <p>Government  Citizens </p>	<p>government consults with citizens (citizen’s responses generally predetermined by government via multiple-choice, closed – question options)</p>
<p>3 Deliberative Involvement</p> <p>Government  Citizens </p>	<p>government engages citizens in consultation process (citizens encouraged to deliberate over issues prior to final response)</p>
<p>4 Government – led active participation</p> <p>Government  Citizens </p>	<p>government instigates consultation and retains decision-making powers</p>
<p>5 Citizen-led active participation</p> <p>Citizens  Government</p>	<p>citizens are actively engaged in decision-making processes, alongside government; citizen decisions become binding; citizens share ownership and responsibility over outcomes</p>

Figure 7: OECD Participatory Classification

We don’t here endorse or criticise the accuracy or anything else of the typology. We don’t use it ourselves except as a high-profile, internationally-based indication of the recognised multiplicity of approaches contained within the simple word ‘participation’. The aim for us is to deal directly with this problematic, and to go deeper than this or any other typology goes: we should get to the normative horizons embedded within the very idea of these types in order to get to the heart of the matter. It is the normative horizons *embedded within* that constrain the possibilities of any type of participatory action.

Similarly, the moment at which the means are deployed – before the project’s beginning, at the start, during, at the end, throughout – can shape the possibilities of impact in the project. Whether the means are open-ended or discrete ties into this as well. These are structural features of research design that can be looked for, over and above promises and good intentions in funding proposals. Determining these different aspects of research design and looking at the various outcomes different arrangements lead to, will give us a perspective on how patterns occur within research design and research outcomes.

Another important aspect to interest-expression within multi-stakeholder groups is that of conflict resolution mechanism: something to deal with inconsistent or incoherent data among the group(s) with whom participation proceeds. The presence and constitution of such a mechanism can tell us as researchers about problems or challenges to different types of research design, from within consortia as well as from external sources.

²⁴ OECD, 2001, *Citizens as Partners: Information, Consultation and Public Participation in Policy-making*. Paris, OECD.



4.7 Research and its Background

Research and its background	Funding source, aims, intentions?	Political context (widely construed)	CSO involvement for <i>what?</i> (cf. The Cardoso Report ²⁵)
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

In thinking about CSO participation in research design, especially with the intention of proposing policy advice, it is essential that part of our enquiry focuses on the funding sources. The aims and intentions of funding sources will themselves be bound up in and presuppose various values and ideals. These will constrain the possibilities for research funding for projects, and thus will impact upon the ways in which CSOs can and can not appear within research projects and research consortia. The importance of this parameter of research is underlined here:

- 1) **Social research model:** Civil society is consulted about its views on a public policy or research goal owing to its function as a non-state actor 'representing' public concern or interest in that particular issue;
- 2) **Deliberative democratic model:** CSOs take a more active role in setting the agenda for policy interaction in this approach but it still involves only a limited number of people and tends to be confined to a particular stage in the policy process (e.g. agenda setting, policy formulation or policy evaluation); and
- 3) **Localised model:** Taking into account the contextual, complex and fluid nature of the relationship between public policy institutions, experts and wider civil society, this approach identifies layers of influence and ways in which different circumstances will affect the way in which an interaction is formed and sustained. It promotes interaction between civil society and policy actors on an iterative medium- to long-term basis, and civil society involvement at multiple junctures in the policy cycle.²⁶

The political context of CSO involvement is of central importance.²⁷ For instance, there are those who think of CSO interests as appealing to very small groups of people, and therefore that CSO participation with organisations, and we can include research consortia here, amounts to a token gesture (Trachtman and Moremen, 2003:228).²⁸ The point works both ways, in fact, as a potential criticism of narrowly interested, non-representative CSOs, or for cynical organisations who wish to be seen to be participatory without doing the heavy lifting. For example, if a policymaker seeks to deploy participatory practices to boost the legitimacy of an undertaking, we can ask of this expectation how it will be fulfilled by participation (e.g. is representativity at stake, or mere numbers) and we can question the character of the legitimacy (e.g. is it more legitimate in having taken into account participants' views, or merely in virtue of having asked participants' views).

On a substantive, political level, the problems appropriate to and objectives of CSO participation (why select CSOs and for what?) will form a slightly different focus. The 'for what' part of this is related to the intention behind the inclusion. Again, the cynical point is that which is made most easily: in an effort to push through a controversial issue,

²⁵ As discussed at <http://www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/PUBS/GG-2006.HTM>.

²⁶ Jones, N., Tembo, F., *Promoting Good Governance through Civil Society-Legislator Linkages Opportunities and Challenges for Policy Engagement in Developing Country Contexts*, p. 5, http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.istr.org/resource/resmgr/working_papers_barcelona/jones.tembo.pdf.

²⁷ The global research and innovation regulations context, including questions of HR management, employment, precarity etc. are of clear importance here. This, we can predict, will be borne out in empirical investigation where such matters can be discovered.

²⁸ Trachtman, Joel P., and Philip M. Moremen, 2003, Costs and Benefits of Private Participation in WTO Dispute Settlement. *Whose Right Is It Anyway?* *Harvard International Law Journal* 44 (1):221-250.



participation can be reduced to consultation and be used to inform a marketing strategy for that issue – using public opinion to subvert itself. This would be despite the many edifying potentialities for participatory approaches, needless to say. Or again, in some matter that catches public attention such as nano-, security issues, nuclear or GM, an imperative could be felt to include people in order to score political points (intentions needn't be cynical, but the cynical point is stark and straightforward to make.) This being so, a range of issues would enter the frame as the kinds of problems for which participation become a *sine qua non*.

Characterised in this way, this parameter connects to one target for policy advice. It is thus imperative that in our analytical grid, shaping our research, we provide an avenue through which information on this can flow. Failing to do so would mean offering ungrounded advice based in ad hoc assumptions, or worse, missing this target altogether. In short, broadly speaking, we must address in our research the question, “For *what* is CSO participation sought, by whom?”

5 Grid Application in CONSIDER's Research

The analytical grid as here laid out should be seen as the outcome of different factors. It is a deduction from the broad theoretical background underlying the various issues that can cause challenges in CSO participation in the widest sense. The deduction from this background to the parameters of the grid is itself based upon a research question CONSIDER has set itself. This deductive fusion thus provides us with a lens through which to view the field we are interested in, via the concepts that inform our specific research interests. This is the broadest way to state the function of the grid. We must spell out in detail two specific functions of the grid within the research now as they are vital to the overall coherence of the project's trajectory.

The use of the grid as here indicated has at least two key practical functions besides the orienting function already described. These functions are interlinked, overlapping and mutually reinforcing, but the two practical functions must be spelt out quite clearly in order to underline the importance of the orienting function. The two practical functions will thus be discussed in turn. They relate to the selection of case studies in the CONSIDER project, and to the means of data analysis throughout the project. In the first instance, these twin functions serve to construct the object of our investigation – the grid functions to shape the territory we want to explore – in the second, it serves to provide us with analytical concepts such that we can establish the context and significance of what we find in our research, relative to the research problematic and specific question.

5.1 Selection of Case Studies

Part of what CONSIDER promises as an outcome is that it will develop modes of appreciating CSO participation in research design that will permit novel assessment tools to be developed. These novel tools will permit policy planning in general and participatory practice assessment in particular. The project has committed itself to surveying all FP7 research projects, and to investigate around 30 relevant projects in-depth case studies.

The question remains, however, how to make the study we will undertake representative of the problematic we seek to address.²⁹ For instance, projects in FP7 generally are not set up

²⁹ Deliverabel 2.1, *Methodology Definition and Observation Tools* covers this in greater detail (http://www.consider-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/D2.1_Methodology-2012-07-05.pdf).

in a way to permit a wide variety of CSO involvement: the funding procedures that must be complied with make for limited modes of involvement, and permit prospective consortia to draw upon a narrower than complete range of potential stakeholders. The policy shifts from risk-awareness, through the introduction of universal ethics assessments, up to the present shift to 'responsible innovation' have brought with them ever more complex realisations of the challenges for inclusive governance in research in Europe.³⁰

The makeup of the very construction of FP7 means that the varieties of involvement we might hope for cannot necessarily occur. This creates a challenge for CONSIDER, then, as the idea of statistical representativity (i.e. drawing upon information from a representative batch of FP7 projects) might yet fail to yield a batch of projects for analysis that have the features relevant to the very ideas we have carefully sought to enquire about with the formulation of our question. After all, part of the aim of CONSIDER is to offer the possibility of reform, so it is natural to expect a field inadequate to our ambitions for that field – if we expected an ideal arrangement, there would be no impetus for us to pursue alternatives.

Representativity: In answering our question, we must seek those areas of the field most key to what we are interested in – a different sense of 'representativity' from that which might be thought of in terms of *completeness*. This means scrutiny must be given to *criteria*.

The grid of analysis offers a means with which we can circumvent the potentially problematic aspects of this issue. Statistical representativity is respect for the structure of a domain given various criteria. We don't seek completeness in CONSIDER (i.e. we don't seek to cover 'all' research and CSO participation, whatever that could mean). We instead have to focus our attention on a problem area. In answering our question, we must seek those areas of the field most key to what we are interested in. We can draw upon statistical data as a source of information. But the sense of representativity here is one that seeks to represent well the breadth of practices, ideas, critiques, impetuses and so on that are of greatest interest for the project question. This means taking care to construct our criteria that we will use to structure our domain. A range of notions associated with 'purposive sampling' will help to clarify the ambition here. Relative to the field of results we construct based in theoretical thinking and empirical sampling, we can draw upon:

Homogenous samples – selection of individuals or units of investigation with similar characteristics.

Heterogeneous samples – selection of individuals or units that are widely divergent, to classify themes that cut across a range of cases (also referred to as *maximum variation*).

Extreme case samples (or deviant) – selection of individuals that are unusual or special, allowing researchers to identify issues relating to the topic being investigated by examining exceptions.

Typical case samples – selection of individuals that typically represent the issue being explored, i.e. 'average' cases.

³⁰ See D1.2 *Theoretical Landscape* for more on this.

Critical case samples – selection of individuals that highlight a phenomenon because they are central to its production or delivery.³¹

Using the key concepts derived from our question, elaborated upon and tabulated, we have broad areas of interest that we can seek in the field we will have exhaustively mapped out. Using the grid in this way permits us to use the work we have done in orienting ourselves to the field and delimiting a question to once more home in on the concepts within the field that will allow us to grasp our goal of developing assessment tools and policy groundings for ongoing participatory work.

Using the conceptual grid of analysis, we can sift through our survey of all FP7 projects, our more detailed survey of those with participatory elements, and fix upon those which align with what we are looking for in our conception of what is key in participation *per se*: this in turn is based in our theoretical landscape and so gives our conception validity in terms of the history, policies, philosophies and so on of participation in research design. Using again the analogy of the red light question above (section 3.1), we can use our analytical grid as a means of determining a meaningful set of dimensions from which we want to understand participatory practices in research design. We apply this to the field in order to draw out case studies relevant to our own research design.

Interpreting the parameters from the grid for use as choice criteria

Build a sample that reflects interesting cases in terms of the question

Parameter	Meaning for CSO	Meaning for Case- selection	Level 'community,' National, European (International)	Field
...

Table 3 Parameters as selection criteria (example)

The value of doing this is at the very least to be seen when the project comes to develop patterns, models and paradigms of CSO participation in research design. Having collected empirical data on relevant projects, a model of CSO participation in research that is directly keyed to our own question and that is relevant to the broad impetus of participation in research design can be developed. This model, representing relationships and causal effects of factors influencing CSO participation, will allow for comparative analysis of such to determine the role CSOs play in realising participation objectives (where such objective are reached). As no such model currently exists, planning, implementing and evaluating CSO participation in research is troublesome and ad hoc. The use of the CONSIDER grid, applied to the field, permits the creation of what is required in order to improve this situation.

³¹ Excerpt from: *Qualitative research: An overview and general issues* by Stephanie Tierney (<http://www.researchdirector.org.uk/merg/documents/Qualitative%20Research.pdf>).

Having gotten the sources right in that the projects CONSIDER will draw upon will be selected by means of the analytical grid, and thus keyed to our problematic and the thrust of participation in general, the grid's second main application becomes salient – its data analysis role.

5.2 Data Analysis: Answering the Question

We have to think about what form our data analysis will take. In the discussion of analytical grids above, it is noted that 'dimensions' are in principle unbounded. What is also the case is that the terms that *do* emerge as labels for the various dimensions of interest in any grid are in themselves uninterpreted. In each of the examples of grids above there is significant glossing of the dimensions. In the simple example of the red light question, the gloss is minimal, amounting to little more than a few explanatory words on how the dimension ought to be considered relevant to the question as it appears. Given the noted inflation of complexity with CONSIDER's question, naturally our dimensions also become more complex. Moreover, CONSIDER is a research project and so we would seek not to overdetermine the meaning of our animating principles. For instance, if we become too taken with sampling too early in the project, we risk missing nuance as we reconstruct the field in terms of frequencies of uninterpreted, formal terms such as 'consultation'. We would risk sacrificing significance in the name of a different sort of rigour. Conversely, of course, were we to continue nebulous debates about our very animating principles, we would risk making no progress by any measure. The point is that an innovative methodology requires maintenance and vigilance as it progresses.

Overdetermining these would amount to hobbling the project before we began: if we are to remain in an exploratory mode, not merely presupposing answers and validating them through foreshortened methods, we must remember that the glosses in the CONSIDER grid of analysis represent points of departure. They are loci of reflection upon the dimensions as described in the first column of the grid. The importance of D1.2's theoretical landscape was thus to give us the general competence to appreciate the complexity of the areas of thought, and the breadth of thought, associated with the dimensions that appear in the grid. In a sense, the dimensions and their explanations represent coded versions of the wide-ranging discussions from the theoretical survey.

Having used the grid to interpret the field such that we secure a *purposive* representativity of case-studies that will permit the answering of CONSIDER's question, we then have a further interpretive challenge. As we accumulate information, we will be open to the field and so will receive a huge amount of data from a large number of sources. Naturally, our research interests and question are our own, not those of the researchers in the field we seek to assess. This means that we will be required, as a consortium, to interpret the findings we come across in terms that are salient to our own research. For example, in the grid we see the following:

Norms Values	&	What norms? Whose?	What values? Whose?	Presupposed, ignored, excluded, constructed?
-------------------------	--------------	-----------------------	------------------------	--

Figure 28: Extract from CONSIDER's analytical grid

It is very likely the case that within research consortia using CSO participation, the idea of something like 'norm and value construction of the actors in context' did not arise in such a form of words. The grid is the product of our own analysis (hence 'analytical' grid) and so we must be prepared to use it as a tool in understanding the issues relevant to us within the real world of the field of CSO participation in research design. This is where we see the role of the explanatory boxes as points of departure.

As we begin to investigate the realities of the field as we encounter them, in order to remain relevant to our problematic, we must ask ourselves whether and how the projects we encounter are seeking to construct the norms and values of participants in context *whether they know it or not*. It is part of the point of our research to do just this: to construct a view on the field that may not already be explicit and in so doing to permit assessment of that very field. And so it goes for each of the dimensions in our grid and each of the focal points pointing to their explanation – the complexity of each parameter must be developed, from its meaning to its consequences. At stake is the question: *what counts as data in CONSIDER?* As this is a subtle point, and a vital one already touched upon in section 4.1 and 4.2 in particular, we will elaborate once more on the significance of what's at stake.

5.2.1 Normativity and Value Complexity Example: Presuppositions

The reasons that we have to filter according to relevance, that is, those reasons we have to accept or refuse a proposition in any given discussion are not necessarily equal to the reasons why we accept or refuse those reasons. For example, I could accept that astrology is predictive of my prospects, citing supposed past successes, but refuse to let failures of prediction dent my conviction, even though the rational structure is symmetrical. My reasons for refusing the reasons to reject astrology are based in something separate from my reasons to accept successes as verifications. Understanding these reactions requires empathy more than formal logic – at play is the practical logic of the individual. It involves understanding the framing of an issue from a perspective.

Somewhere, formal reason runs out and the framing that constitutes a way of seeing the world steps in – the deep sense of self including all that one's convictions connote. One's being, in a thick sense that includes upbringing, cultural/religious convictions, feelings of indebtedness to a past, honouring legacies etc. While this is clearly important in comprehending who/what a person is, it is only comprehensible if we step back from a primarily argumentative mode of discourse and regard framing not as an aggregative report of experiences had between various times, but rather as the authentic self-portrayal of a human being in terms of a life lived – i.e. we need to use a recognition principle in order to understand the information encoded by the manner of framing.

Since the notion of framing at work here will only be relevant in terms of a life lived, via specific interpretations of life-events by an agent, an interpretive dimension is required in order to comprehend it. The place of framing can be seen as illustrated by the following problem, by way of example.

In discourse ethics, when matters of justice arise and competing, contradictory arguments are aired, it is required that the parties involved will submit themselves to nothing but the force of the better argument. But the acceptance of arguments will itself be conditional on values embedded within an agent's way of seeing things. Thus, frames don't fit within argumentation, but rather argumentation decentres the expressive authenticity of the perspective from a frame. 'Decentring' means the way in which actors must move away



from their own contexts of action when considering questions of what is true or right: “An absolute claim to validity has to be justifiable in ever wider forum, before an ever more competent and larger audience, against ever new objections. This intrinsic dynamic of argumentation, the progressive decentring of one’s interpretative perspective, in particular drives practical discourse”³²

This problematic of constructing norms in contexts requires that we look deep into the theory of normativity and action. Among the problems with this has been the consistent way in which the relations of norms to contexts are construed and the predominance of an argumentative conception of reason. Here, in the preponderance with one variety of rationality among others that engenders contextual reduction, we have a serious part of the theoretical problem. Thus we cannot avoid pursuing this line of analysis given we require a theoretically sound and efficient manner in which to address our central problem. The grid of analysis, in being developed with such problems in mind, permits CONSIDER to employ a better methodology not impaired by taking a too-narrow view of things.

The second practical function of the grid can thus be seen as consonant with the other uses, but with a simultaneously reflective, analytic and creative aspect. In short, it is an *interpretive tool* in this use. Once more, the point is to keep CONSIDER within its specified research track, relevant to the animating drives of the field of participation in general and to permit consistency among the various assessments the project will be making. Moreover, this illustrates several aspects of the consistency of the project overall: the importance of the earlier deliverable on the theoretical landscape in giving context and content to the breadth of relevant concepts, the glossary in providing a codex of important terms and concepts, the complexity of our survey and the challenges for our empirical work.

6 Next step

What remains now in the overall trajectory of the project is the preparatory analysis of actual theoretical solutions (a review of the existing solutions related to participatory thinking and theories). This step is absolutely necessary to be able to determine first the problems and blind points of actual practices and second to be able to justify and determine in which way we will be able to affirm that what we propose is really innovative (how could we determine what we do is original without looking to existing solutions?). Besides this, without the complementarity of theoretical and empirical strands of research in dialogue, we won’t be able to tell if we are diagnosing new problems, or using new means of diagnosis. We need hypotheses and interpretive strategies and awareness of what the problems, issues etc. *mean* if we are to be able to provide advice on how to move from diagnosis to treatment and if we are to know that what we do is something new.

In diagnosing problems, if we remain at that level, we replicate work already done in many books made not least by the EC itself. Our unique selling point for CONSIDER is, at the very least, the promise of addressing the kinds of issues already obvious to the EC. If we just diagnose, we don’t deliver as a project. But if we seek to address issues without detailed interpretation and reflection on our data, we deliver suspect and/or illegitimate advice, relative to our already-existing preconceptions and tacit assumptions. We explicitly state the risk of this kind of eventuality in CONSIDER’s formulation and in WP1 deliverables to date, promising to do better. So this part of the project represents a major juncture wherein theory, analysis, empirical engagement, interpretation and assessment come

³² Habermas, J., 2005, Truth and Justification, transl. Fultner, B., Cambridge, MA: MIT Press p. 109.



together. On the basis of this crucial moment, based in the understanding of the problem we set ourselves and explored in literature and will explore in practice, we will go on to make recommendations and assessments aimed at securing better understandings of CSO participation in research design.

References

Bernard, H. Russell, *Research Methods in Anthropology*. Altamira Press, 2002.

Chambers, R, "Putting Participatory Governance into Practice," in *An Inventory of Civil Society Resources and Tools*, 2001 Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE), <http://zunia.org/uploads/media/knowledge/care.pdf> p.88.

CONSIDER deliverable 1.1, *Glossary*, p. 9. (http://www.consider-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/D1.1_Glossary-2012-06-27-submitted.pdf).

Deliverable 2.1, *Methodology Definition and Observation Tools* covers this in greater detail (http://www.consider-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/D2.1_Methodology-2012-07-05.pdf).

Descartes' Meditations, Quine's *Word and Object* and Davidson's *Objective, Intersubjective, Subjective* as illustrative of these respective positions.

EC press release, 'Largest number of calls ever for next round of FP7,' 2012-07-10, http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=FP7_NEWS&ACTION=D&RCN=34831.

Excerpt from *Qualitative research: An overview and general issues* by Stephanie Tierney (<http://www.researchdirectoriate.org.uk/merg/documents/Qualitative%20Research.pdf>).

Frege, Gottlob, 1953, *Foundations of Arithmetic*, Oxford: Blackwell. Transl. by J.L. Austin.

Fung, A, *Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance*, (<http://www.archonfung.net/papers/FungVarietiesPAR.pdf>).

Habermas, J., 2005, *Truth and Justification*, transl. Fultner, B., Cambridge, MA: MIT Press p.109.
http://archive1.globalsolutions.org/programs/intl_instit/latest_news/Cardoso%20Report.html

Jeffrey, R., 1989. *Formal Logic: Its Scope and Limits*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jones, N., Tembo, F., *Promoting Good Governance through Civil Society-Legislator Linkages Opportunities and Challenges for Policy Engagement in Developing Country Contexts*, p. 5.
http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.istr.org/resource/resmgr/working_papers_barcelona/jones.te.mbo.pdf

Lenoble, J. and Maesschalck, M., *Toward a Theory of Governance: the Action of Norms*, p. 33.



Massey, G. J., 1991. "Some Reflections on Psychology," in T. Seebohm, D. Føllesdal and J. Mohanty (eds.), *Phenomenology and the Formal Sciences*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 183–94.

Mill, John Stuart, 1843, *System of Logic* (9th ed). Longmans 1875.

OECD, 2001, *Citizens as Partners: Information, Consultation and Public Participation in Policy-making*. Paris, OECD.

P. B. Joly (2007) and Callon, M., Lascoumes, P., Barthe, Y. (2001) Callon, M., (1998), 'Des différentes formes de démocratie technique', *Annales des Mines*, January 1998, pp. 63-73. and for the same references related to governance model (standard models etc...) Joly, P.-B. (2001) 'Les OGM entre la science et le public? Quatre modèles pour la gouvernance de l'innovation et des risques', *Economie Rurale*, 266, pp. 11-29.

Rainey, S., Goujon P., CONSIDER, Deliverable 1.2, *Theoretical Landscape*.

Ruzza, C, "Organised civil society and political representation in the EU arena," in *Civil Society and International Governance The role of non-state actors in global and regional regulatory frameworks* (Eds. David Armstrong, Valeria Bello, Julie Gilson and Debora Spini) p. 61-62.

Scholte, B., 'Toward a Reflexive and Critical Anthropology' in Hymes, D., *Reinventing Anthropology*, Pantheon books, p. 431ff.

<http://www.unc.edu/~aparicio/WAN/ScholteToward.pdf>

Trachtman, Joel P., and Philip M. Moremen, 2003, "Costs and Benefits of Private Participation in WTO Dispute Settlement. Whose Right Is It Anyway?," *Harvard International Law Journal* 44 (1):221-250.

Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman "Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory," *Ethics* Vol. 104, No. 2 (Jan., 1994), pp. 352-381, University of Chicago Press.

Willetts, P., The Cardoso 'Report on the UN and Civil Society: Functionalism, Global Corporatism or Global Democracy?' in *Journal of Global Governance*, Vol. 12, 2006, pages 305-324, <http://www.staff.city.ac.uk/p.willetts/PUBS/GG-2006.HTM>.