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Regional Planning as Good Governance:

A Central Queensland Case Study

Abstract

Previous social science research has detected changes in ideas and practices of
government in Australia from the 1980s, most notably in the shift from a welfarist
mode of rule towards individualistic, market-based, programs and policies of neo-
liberalism. However, further changes have occurred since the late 1990s. Now,
regional frameworks of participation and decision-making that exist outside current
institutional arrangements are being assigned a role in coordinating development in
Australia’s regions. These additional changes suggest a quest for ways to govern
better, as embodied in Central Queensland A New Millennium (CQANM), a recent
regional planning process in the Australian State of Queensland. CQANM represents
an emerging conception of good governance as:

1. involving collaboration between a broad range of stakeholders from state and
   non-state sectors.
2. ensuring sustainable development and a balance of economic, social and
   environmental goals.
3. focusing on the regional scale despite the absence of any formal tier of
   government in Australia that is intermediate between State and local
governments.

Drawing on a case study of CQANM, this research seeks to identify the
characteristics and institutional form of this new mode of governance and explore the
ideas about effective governance embodied in these arrangements. Diverse literatures
from sociology, public administration, planning and political science focus upon the
changing role of the state, new understandings of democracy, and issues of scope (or
functional priorities) and scale (or spatial focus) as they relate to contemporary
governance challenges. The investigation of CQANM, as reported in this thesis, was
theoretically informed by such literature. It positions the new regional planning
process as a form of networked, deliberative governance. It also draws on other
currents of sociological thought, notably the Foucauldian ‘analytics of government’ framework. The latter provides an understanding of the multiple dimensions of contemporary discourses of governing. Specifically, it examines three elements: the questions authorities pose about the task of governing; the practices used to govern; and the rationales and justification for these. Together, these elements are understood to comprise a new (govern)mentality of rule. This framework provides an ideal analytical tool for this research with its aim of examining the purpose and operation of CQANM as a recent case of governance. More specifically, this thesis asks: How can we understand the mentalities of rule – or clusters of discourses about good governance – embodied in the specific arrangements and practices of CQANM?

Utilising a qualitative research methodology, this thesis has three findings. First, it established that there was not a single mentality of rule inherent in CQANM. Rather, three competing mentalities of rule coexisted and interacted in Central Queensland to shape the form of regional governance practiced there. These have been labelled hierarchical, market and networked governance. Each is a conception of good governance characterised by three distinctive discourses of democracy, development and planning. The regional planning process harnessed practices and ideas of these various discourses, incorporating them into a coherent system at multiple levels. Second, the research challenges notions of the state being the locus of political activity and supports findings of a more dispersed operation of governmental power. Finally, the study highlights the heterogeneity within the state, challenging portrayals of a unified and monolithic state. These findings illustrate the utility of an analytics of government approach for moving beyond institutional analyses. They also identify significant practical challenges for introducing an improved form of governance in a multi-discursive environment with dispersed power and considerable diversity. The thesis concludes that CQANM’s ambitious aspirations to govern democratically for sustainability were constrained by the persistence of entrenched, contradictory, discursive practices associated with alternative mentalities of rule.
# Table of Contents

ABSTRACT ................................................................................................................................. V

CHAPTER 1: CQANM, A VISIONARY PLAN ................................................................................. 1
A STUDY OF A ‘BETTER WAY OF GOVERNING’ ........................................................................ 1
CONTEXT OF GOVERNANCE .................................................................................................... 6
RESEARCH AIMS ....................................................................................................................... 9
STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS ................................................................................................... 12

CHAPTER 2: THE LANDSCAPE OF REGIONAL GOVERNANCE RESEARCH AND THINKING .............................................................................................................................. 17
THE SHIFT TO GOVERNANCE ................................................................................................... 19
NEW GOVERNING STRUCTURES, ACTORS AND PROCESSES ................................................. 21
THE NEW SCOPE OF GOVERNANCE .......................................................................................... 40
NEW SCALES OF GOVERNANCE .............................................................................................. 46
THE FRONTIER OF GOVERNANCE RESEARCH ......................................................................... 50

CHAPTER 3: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR EXAMINING REGIONAL GOVERNANCE ......................................................................................................................... 54
ANALYTICAL-DESCRIPTIVE APPROACHES: A FOCUS ON NETWORKS .................................. 57
NORMATIVE APPROACHES: A FOCUS ON PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY ................................ 60
THE ‘ANALYTICS OF GOVERNMENT’ APPROACH: A FOCUS ON MENTALITIES ....................... 74
THE VALUE OF EXAMINING MENTALITIES OF GOVERNMENT FOR THIS RESEARCH ............... 84
A SYNTHETIC CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK ............................................................................. 89

CHAPTER 4: THE RESEARCH PROCESS .............................................................................. 91
UNDERSTANDING RESEARCH PRACTICES – A RESEARCH PARADIGM .................................. 91
A CASE STUDY .......................................................................................................................... 96
DATA GENERATING .................................................................................................................. 98
DATA PROCESSING, INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS .......................................................... 116
QUALITY ISSUES – GENERALISABILITY, VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY ................................... 122
A LINK TO CONTEXT ................................................................................................................ 124

CHAPTER 5: INTRODUCING CQANM – GOVERNING THROUGH PLANNING REGIONALLY ......................................................................................................................... 126
EVOLUTION OF THE GOVERNANCE CONTEXT ........................................................................ 126
DESCRIPTION OF CQ A NEW MILLENNIUM (CQANM) .......................................................... 153
CQANM: A SOCIO-HISTORICALLY LOCATED PHENOMENON .................................................. 165
CHAPTER 6: THE OFFICIAL DOCTRINE OF CQANM - NETWORKED DELIBERATIVE GOVERNANCE .........................................................................................................................................................167

DEFINING ‘GOOD’ GOVERNANCE IN CENTRAL QUEENSLAND ..........................................................170
TECHNOLOGIES FOR PUTTING GOVERNMENTAL AMBITIONS INTO EFFECT ................................189
THE OFFICIAL DOCTRINE: DISCOURSES OF DEVELOPMENT, DEMOCRACY AND PLANNING .............210

CHAPTER 7: COEXISTING DISCOURSES OF REGIONAL GOVERNANCE ........................................217

THREE DISCOURSES OF DEVELOPMENT: CONTRASTING PROBLEMATICS ................................219
THREE DISCOURSES OF DEMOCRACY: CONTRASTING ACTORS AND TECHNOLOGIES ..................230
THREE DISCOURSES OF INFORMED PLANNING: CONTRASTING TECHNOLOGIES .........................247
A TRIO OF (GOVERN)MENTALITIES IN CENTRAL QUEENSLAND ..................................................261
REGIONAL GOVERNANCE AS DISCURSIVE COMPETITION .............................................................265

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION – REGIONAL PLANNING AS GOOD GOVERNANCE IN CENTRAL QUEENSLAND ........................................................................................................................................276

REVIEWING THE RESEARCH FRAMEWORK .....................................................................................277
REFLECTIONS ON THE FINDINGS .....................................................................................................278
CQANM EXHIBITED MULTIPLE INTERACTING MENTALITIES OF RULE ........................................280
FRACURED AND DISPERSED POWER BECAUSE OF THE INTERPLAY OF DISCOURSES ..................282
DECONSTRUCTING THE MONOLITHIC STATE ....................................................................................288
SUMMARY OF THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION ................................................................................291
IMPLICATIONS AND CHALLENGES FOR THE PRACTICE OF REGIONAL GOVERNANCE .................294
FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES ....................................................................................297

LIST OF REFERENCES ..........................................................................................................................299

APPENDICES .....................................................................................................................................336
List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Issues in the regional governance literature ............................................. 19
Figure 3.1 Conceptual framework to examine mentalities of rule .............................. 86
Figure 4.1: Groups of people involved in the CQANM planning process ................. 107
Figure 5.1: Queensland Regional Planning Projects (to 2000).................................. 140
Figure 5.2: The governance landscape of Central Queensland ............................... 147
Figure 5.3: Map of the Central Queensland region showing municipal and shire
councils involved in the regional planning project.............................................. 154
Figure 5.4: Membership of the Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC) . 156
Figure 5.5: Operating structure of CQANM........................................................... 159
Box 6.1: Observers and apologies for sample RPAC meeting............................... 197

List of Tables

Table 4.1: Summary of field trips.................................................................................. 100
Table 4.2: Attributes of the 50 people interviewed ..................................................... 110
Table 5.1: Details of Queensland Regional Planning Processes ............................... 141
Table 5.2: Summary of characteristics of major regional governance bodies in
    Central Queensland 1995-2006 ........................................................................ 148
Table 6.1: Extract from ‘Key Issues in Planning for Central Queensland’s Future’.
    .......................................................................................................................... 172
Table 6.2: Summary of the mentality of networked governance in Central
    Queensland.............................................................................................................. 212
Table 7.1: Summary of three coexisting mentalities of regional governance in Central
    Queensland.............................................................................................................. 262
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Area Consultative Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATSIC</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHDC</td>
<td>Central Highlands Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRRUPP</td>
<td>Central Highlands Regional Resource Use Planning Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>Central Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQANM</td>
<td>CQ A New Millennium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQLGA</td>
<td>Central Queensland Local Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQARGMF</td>
<td>Central Queensland Regional Growth Management Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQROC</td>
<td>Central Queensland Regional Organisation of Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQRPAC</td>
<td>Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDO</td>
<td>Central Regional Economic Development Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLGP</td>
<td>Department of Local Government and Planning (Qld Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td>Department of State Development (Queensland Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVDA</td>
<td>Dawson Valley Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environment Protection Agency (Queensland Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPG</td>
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<td>ROC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPAC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRDL</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>VROC</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
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Chapter 1: CQANM, a Visionary Plan

Make no little plans, they have no magic to stir men’s [sic] blood


In the mid 1990s, in Central Queensland, a group of civic-minded friends and colleagues were hatching a plan that was by no means little. The vision formulated in late-night sessions over glasses of wine was no less than a conception of a better way of governing. This was no Guy Fawkes conspiracy for revolution, but a considered reflection about alternatives that might remedy the shortcomings of past approaches to governing and respond to the particular circumstances and demands of the time and, indeed, the approaching millennium. It was a vision that prioritised collaboration, democratic participation and ecological sustainability as vital to achieving their aspiration of Central Queensland becoming, ‘the most diverse and prosperous region in Australia’ (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 7). This thesis explores this vision and the attempt to implement a better way of governing through a regional planning process called Central Queensland A New Millennium (CQANM).

A study of a ‘better way of governing’

For most of the time since Federation in 1901, Australians have been governed centrally from the national and State\(^1\) capitals. Authority has mainly been exercised in a top-down fashion by an interventionist and re-distributive welfare state. The central command of resources was managed through legal and bureaucratic measures of a highly specialized and segregated series of government departments or agencies and a hierarchy of federal, State and local governments whose legitimacy was based on electoral representation. Notions of equality and fairness, combined with the idea of the state’s obligations to its (white) citizens, placed Australia among the world’s most progressive welfare states (McKnight 2005: 81). Public order and security, as

\(^1\) In this thesis the term ‘state’ is used in two senses. The first, capitalised, refers to a sub-national territory within Australia – such as the State of Queensland and Queensland State government. In the second sense, used later (with lower case), the state is the broad set of public institutions and actors that are responsible for governing society as a whole, and distinct from the private sector and civil society.
well as balanced development of the national economy, were the priorities for
government planning and public policy. Key resources to support these public policy
domains included physical resources like primary products or exploitable natural
resources, and major public works such as railways and other infrastructure,
including the ambitious scheme to provide hydro-electric power constructed in the
Snowy Mountains area of New South Wales in the 1950s. Policy development relied
on technocratic expertise, skills and knowledge, and usually occurred behind the
closed doors of the bureaucracy. This masked the political pressure exerted on the
state by narrow and elite interests to approve development proposals or adopt
particular policies (Gleeson and Low 2000; Pusey 1991). Beyond those restricted
circles, relationships were predominantly impersonal, hierarchical and adversarial,
leading to polarisation of views on most policy issues.

During the 1980s and 1990s, changing government policy and practice (especially of
the Federal Government and non-Labor State Governments) demonstrated a rejection
of top-down strategies, government protectionism and subsidies, and of the
Keynesian welfare state. Instead, so-called neo-liberal approaches to governing were
adopted with their preference for minimizing the state’s role and allowing market
forces free rein (Jamrozik 2001; McKnight 2005). Many former government
functions were privatised and governments at all levels contracted private enterprise
and civil society organisations to take over direct provision of many services and
programs. This promoted what could be called transactional relationships such as
bilateral partnerships and coalitions (Langford 2002). As well, there was
considerable promotion of, and reliance on, strategies of self-help and enterprise by
individuals, community groups and businesses at a local, community level (Beeson
and Firth 1998; Somerville 2005). Government programs and policies encouraged
such individual and community action through measures such as regulations and
contracts. More subtle techniques were also used including competitions, incentives,
performance monitoring, training programs and the standard range of socialisation
techniques through agents such as the media. An example of an indirect incentive is
the Can-Do Community awards\(^2\) that recognise and reward communities for desirable initiatives in line with government priorities. Such programs prompted an upsurge of localism and a return to place-based notions of close community relations. Some of the manifestations of local, self-help action included: Landcare, Neighbourhood Watch, locality action groups and the Tidy Towns Competition\(^3\). Many involved collective action by local councils, businesses, industries, service clubs, and even churches and schools. In the outsourcing of social services, too, new alliances and self-help initiatives were the order of the day. An example of this was an Ability Cycle Challenge fundraiser – organised by a community organisation (Hartley Lifecare) and two Federal Government departments (Centrelink and Family and Community Services) – to raise funds for people with physical disability. Chambers of Commerce and individual industries worked to increase local productivity and enhance the competitiveness of local economies in the global economy. Associated with this was the formation of a plethora of unconnected, local, often voluntary, organisations as a reactive response to specific public concerns. The scope of government policies and planning concentrated on facilitating economic competitiveness and protecting individual liberties. The key resources to support this were technology and financial and human capital. The latter included distinct capacities – both skills and knowledge – associated with market operations and private enterprise including statistical data, compliance regimes, audit practices and entrepreneurial expertise. As Rhodes (2000: 64) has claimed:

\[
\text{The dominant narrative of the 1980s and 1990s told the story of how corporate management and marketization triumphed over bureaucracy. It is a story which ignores the need for negotiation in and between networks.}
\]

\(^2\) These awards, administered by the Federal Department of Family and Community Services, gave $10,000 to one community in each State that showed they had ‘pulled together to develop creative solutions to problems in their area’ (FaCSIA).

\(^3\) This is one of the national competitions run each year by the Keep Australia Beautiful Council. It ranks towns on all aspects of their local environment. The Council boasts partnerships with a number of State and federal government departments, corporate sponsors and local councils.
However, there is evidence of further changes in the process of governing, and this thesis focuses on this, more recent, phenomenon. From the late 1990s, notions of citizen engagement, multi-stakeholder networks and collaboration have featured in the political agenda. Today, many programs and policies rely on institutional interdependence, coordination of planning and pooling of resources to produce optimal results in the form of long-term sustainable systems. As well, there are many examples of collaboration between institutions from various levels of government and from the market and civil society (often at a regional level). All levels of government and the private sector now value different capacities – such as negotiation and networking skills – and more diverse forms of knowledge. The prominence of management consultancies has given way to consultancies in public participation and community consultation. Perfunctory compliance with statutory requirements for public notice and feedback are no longer the benchmark in policy development, infrastructure planning or project management. Instead, considerable time and resources are dedicated to elaborate processes to involve citizens and stakeholders in these activities. All levels of government in Australia have instituted new policies, programs and practices along these lines. For instance, the Federal Government has held consensus conferences on significant public policy issues, while the Queensland State Government has established a Community Engagement Division within the Premier’s Department\(^4\) and an e-democracy unit within the Department of Communities. Local governments, individually or in regional groups, have also instituted practices like citizen reference groups, and emphasise transparency and eschew tokenism much more.

Private enterprises, likewise, are using techniques such as social and environmental impact assessments to supplement their traditional cost-benefit analyses and are employing skilled communication professionals to help them gauge and respond to stakeholders rather than public relations and marketing professionals to foster public acceptance of project designs. The rationale for these changes is that good government should give equal priority to a broad scope of economic, social and environmental issues and should involve a wide cross-section of state and non-state actors in planning for the future. Given the involvement of these additional players in

\(^4\) After the 2006 State election this division was moved to the Department of Communities.
this approach to governing and planning, key resources are communication flows,
stewarding natural resources and the relationships and norms often called social
capital (Putnam 1995). It was a vision of this third mode of governing that was
articulated in Central Queensland and that led to the project called CQANM.

These observed shifts can be divided broadly into three approaches to governing:
first, top-down state intervention; second, local forms of community self-help; and
finally, regional networks of collaboration. They will be familiar to readers who have
lived in Australia for some decades. In sociological terms, they can be understood as
changes in forms or modes of governing. The notion of governance, understood as
distinct from government (Pierre and Peters 2000), is a central focus of this thesis.

When the tasks of governing – including directing the economic and political life of
society through planning, allocating resources, public administration and formulating
laws and public policies – are narrowly conceived as the activities of the formal
institutions of the state, they are designated government5. Governance, in contrast,
while it still refers to the process of ruling, is a broader term that conveys the
involvement of other actors in these vital public tasks. According to Pierre and Peters
(2000: 1), the value of the concept governance lies in

... its capacity – unlike that of the narrower term ‘government’ – to cover the
whole range of institutions and relationships involved in the process of
governing.

In investigating governance practices in Australia, the present study uses CQANM as
a case study to conceptualise and theoretically characterise a specific emerging
approach to governance. CQANM was a regional planning process, jointly initiated
by the Queensland Government and the local governments of Central Queensland, in
an attempt to develop better ways of governing. It was undertaken between February
1999 and November 2002 and was recognised for excellence in planning by the
Planning Institute of Australia because of its innovation and creativity,
environmental quality, community benefit and technical competence. Planning is

5 As well as this sense of government as a political process, when used as a noun, the government
refers to the collection of formal institutions of the state – in the legislature, bureaucracy and judiciary.
integral to governance as it can be seen as both the domain of governance and an approach to governance (Gleeson and Low 2000: 4-5). CQANM is, therefore, an appropriate focus for learning the most recent thinking about regional planning and emerging practices of governance in Australia. At a theoretical level, the case study highlights the implicit questions that governing authorities pose as they conceptualise their task. From a practical perspective, the challenges of achieving coordination and plans for sustainable development are demonstrated. In both respects, the research explores how various actors involved in governing, understand, and seek to implement, the attributes of what they regard as better (or good) governance.

**Context of governance**

There are a number of interrelated factors and new circumstances underlying the re-thinking of modes of governing profiled above. These new circumstances include what Adams and Hess (2001) and others (for example, Amin and Hausner 1997; Cohen 1999) have identified as the perceived failures of both the welfare state and economic rationalism some of which are outlined in Chapter Two. This assessment of failure is widespread despite an intense focus by some practitioners and researchers on instances of successful economic development and apparent determinants of that success such as information technology, learning, industry clusters and competitiveness (Cooke and Morgan 1993; Lovering 1999; Rainnie 2002).

Another significant circumstance is the perceived environmental crisis. It is now argued by many that the narrow focus of governments and of private sector operators on economic goals has had negative environmental consequences (Dryzek et al. 2003; McCormick 1995). As a result, a ‘triple bottom line’ approach that balances economic aspirations with responsible natural resource management and equity objectives is seen as imperative (see for example Dale and Bellamy 1998; National Natural Resource Management Taskforce 1999). The 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development and the so-called Brundtland Report (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987) gave international recognition to these issues, and all Australian governments have subsequently responded by
endorsing the National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development (Dore and Woodhill 1999).

A third influential dimension to current circumstances is an increasing emphasis on active citizenship and participation by civil society. In Australia there has long been a desire for greater community involvement and participation in decision-making (National Conference on Regional Development 1974). In the last decade, there have been calls from both radical and conservative sides of politics in Australia (for example, The Greens and Pauline Hanson’s One Nation Party) for citizens to have more say in decisions formerly the sole province of the state. As well, governments have encouraged active citizenship emphasizing mutual obligation and the responsibilities of citizens (Kearns 1995; Marinetto 2003). Sceptical observers have argued that this tactic allows the state to reduce costs by shifting responsibility for service delivery onto individuals or the community sector and to coopt potential political opposition (Kearns 1995; Pusey 1991; Sawer 2003). Whatever the motivation, these trends have boosted interest in the role of non-state players and in new methods of consulting and engaging wide cross-sections of citizens (Carson 2001; Hillier 2002b).

All of these circumstances are associated with an increasing emphasis on ‘subsidiarity’ or devolution to sub-national levels of government (Davis and Rhodes 2000; Gleeson and Low 2000; Hutchcroft 2001). While the principle of subsidiarity has often led to local initiatives, these lack coordination and impact (Somerville 2005). Hence, there is growing recognition of the region – a space between the local and the State – as an appropriate sub-national scale of action for many governance tasks. There has also been a new interest in the strategic role of spatial planning to ensure desirable developmental outcomes within these spaces as well as overall coherence and integration of action. The new circumstances, therefore, entail changing roles for all three sectors – the state, the market and civil society – within those sub-national spaces. This implies a new institutional framework to deliver balanced, triple-bottom line development requiring an extended scope of matters to be governed.

In a number of established professional traditions – including regional (and urban) planning, community development, economic development, and natural resource
management – recent approaches employ the concepts and language that underpin new modes of governance. There is a similar convergence in these disparate traditions in ideas about the following three aspects:

1. The appropriate scale of governance – with an emerging emphasis on a regional (rather than a national, State or local) focus.
2. The appropriate institutions of governance and people to be involved in them – especially involvement of non-state actors from private enterprise and civil society.
3. The appropriate focus of governance as multidimensional involving integrated economic, social and environmental concerns.

Within the context just outlined, Australian governments are creating new regional frameworks of participation, collaboration and decision-making outside current institutional settings to coordinate development in metropolitan and non-metropolitan regions. This exemplifies a new form of governance that seeks to address the perceived inadequacies of previous approaches and to implement many attributes of good governance as understood by various players.

Although this study examines a regional planning process intended to exemplify good governance, the object of study is not the resultant plan (the Central Queensland Regional Growth Management Framework). The plan is a means to an end – shaping action to ensure coordination, development control and sustainability – in short, a conception of good governance. This study is not an evaluation of how well that end was achieved. Nor will it provide the essentially empirical evaluation of the planning process typically undertaken on conclusion by the implementing agency, in this case the Queensland State Department of Local Government and Planning. Such evaluations are not usually theoretically informed and are subject to tight timeframes and various other constraints. This study focuses on the ideas and practices of the planning process, as an instance of governance, and on the institutional arrangements shaped by and shaping that process. This focus is significant, because, while the specific trends outlined above are recognised among scholars and practitioners, empirical and analytical research on such manifestations beyond the ad hoc evaluation of specific programs just mentioned, has mainly
provided descriptive accounts of new forms, or normative blueprints for a better alternative. Understanding of the rationales underpinning the process and significant dimensions of these new forms is therefore incomplete.

Consequently, this research is concerned with exploring ‘a set of contested, localized, conjunctural knowledges’ (Daly 1997: 351) about CQANM as an example of how contemporary Australians govern and are governed. By showing, in a theoretically-informed manner, how we think about and practice governance, this research aims to provide a coherent explanation of the restructuring, rescaling and refocusing of governance identified above. It will scrutinize understandings not only of who governs, but also of the demarcation of authority in spatial and policy terms. In particular, it will explore the role of non-state players in governing regional territories. In this way, the research contributes to the literature providing a theoretical framework for assessing planning or governance and will also consider the claim that ‘a decisive new model of governance has not yet emerged’ (Gleeson and Low 2000: 186).

Research aims

According to the Terms of Reference for the CQANM regional planning project, its aim was to:

Facilitate a co-ordinated and co-operative approach across all levels of government and key regional stakeholders to the resolution of regional planning issues in order to achieve better planning and development outcomes for the region (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 152).

This demonstrates that a new mode of governing with a triple agenda of new actors, scale and scope, and possessing many of the facets identified above, has been attempted by State and local governments in Queensland. Their quest for improved regional governance is consistent with a broader concern in Australia, as elsewhere, that governments are ‘running out of solutions’ (Beer 2000). The expectation that the involvement of stakeholder groups, and collaboration between different levels and
sectors of government could provide solutions to contemporary problems and lead to improved planning and long-term positive and sustainable outcomes for the region has not yet been subjected to rigorous research. This thesis, in an attempt to begin this process, will examine the purpose and operation of the planning process in Central Queensland considering CQANM as a case study of governance. Specifically it will:

4. Reveal the institutional form of regional governance showing how autonomous state and non-state actors engage in processes of governing.
5. Identify the characteristics and spatial focus of this new form of governance in Queensland, compare these with the wide array of contemporary characteristics identified in the literature and profile any coherent patterns that are in evidence.
6. Theorize this form of regional governance in terms of a Foucauldian analytics of government framework (explained below) to understand contemporary discourses of governing and their effects.

The research aims not just to describe the ‘actually existing’ but also to ascertain what Gordon describes as, ‘the changing shape of the thinkable’ (1991: 8). With this expression he highlights the influence of people’s imaginings, ideas, assumptions and beliefs about new and improved forms of governance. Hence the focus is on identifying the thinking about government that is embodied in these arrangements and elaborating the reasoning, systems and practices intrinsic to CQANM. This necessitates examining common actions, interactions, ideas, contentions, practices and language used in relation to the regional planning process. In Dryzek’s (1997: 8) terms, these constitute the discourses of regional governance.

A discourse is a particular, shared, way of representing part of the world – whether the material world; the mental world of thoughts, feelings and beliefs; or the social world of practices and interactions (Fairclough 2003: 26, 124). Different discourses will represent the same part of the world from different perspectives, and, in any situation, there will be different combinations of discourses articulated in various ways (Fairclough 2003: 26, 124, 126). This conception of discourse is of fundamental importance to the theoretical perspective and the methodology of this
thesis because of the concern with the combination of discourses embedded in the forms, language and practices of CQANM. These, in turn, constitute a notion of good governance, or ‘a style of thinking quintessentially concerned with the art of governing’ (Gordon 1991: 14) as will be elaborated later. Such a combination of discourses about good governance has been called – by Miller and Rose (1990) and by Dean (1999a) – a mentality of rule, and by Foucault, governmentality (1991a). In the context of this understanding of discourse, and to meet the specific aims listed above, the research addresses the following question:

How can we understand the mentalities of rule – or clusters of discourses about good governance – embodied in the specific arrangements and practices of CQANM?

The relevance of providing an answer to this research question lies in increasing the understanding of a new governance landscape involving diversification of focus, scale and institutions. This has particular utility since the governance arrangements appear to hold potential with respect to policy formation and the practice of integrating environmental, economic and social issues at the regional scale. As well, there will be practical outcomes since increased understanding will enhance the capacity of the State Government's Department of Local Government and Planning to implement planning processes that meet three criteria. They will: involve a broad cross-section of the region’s population in identifying and articulating regional priorities; foster collaboration within, between and beyond various levels of government; and establish a ‘triple bottom line’ perspective that considers equally the social, economic and environmental implications of potential courses of development. As the Department’s intention is to replicate innovative aspects of CQANM in later planning processes or updates of regional plans, the research has practical utility. The insights provided by this research have potential relevance to future policy and practice in wide-ranging areas throughout the State of Queensland and the nation. Theoretical and practical alternatives will emerge for altered structures and practices of governing that will better serve the interests of regional citizens and contribute to coordinated, integrated and sustainable development. Arguably, the most-pressing challenge facing non-metropolitan Australia is how to plan for a future that is economically productive, socially viable and ecologically
sustainable (Gray and Lawrence 2001; Lawrence et al. 1999). An elaborated understanding of the model provided by CQANM can inform responses by governments and other actors to this challenge.

**Structure of the thesis**

This chapter has introduced the phenomenon of an emerging form of governance and some factors underlying changes to modes of governing. Chapter Two reviews the diverse, but linked, bodies of writing and research about the nature of contemporary governance. First, the chapter examines literature relating to the role of the state in contemporary forms of governance considering the critique of state-centred systems of governance. Complementing this examination of the role of the state is research into the role of non-state actors from the private sector and civil society. A particularly relevant body of literature in this respect deals with citizen participation and the nature of more democratic forms of governance. The chapter reviews four broad variants of this participatory democracy, concentrating on more deliberative forms of democracy. The chapter also examines the general literature about the increasing complexity of governance tasks as well as works dealing with specific dimensions of an expanded scope of governance that includes issues of environmental protection, social inclusion and a balanced, integrated form of sustainable development as collective responsibilities. As well, it identifies the contradictory pressures of globalisation and devolution as drivers of change in Australia and elsewhere in the Western world. That section reviews documentation of a shift from top-down, national strategies to more localised forms of action, and, even more recently, to collaborative action at a regional scale. The chapter concludes by identifying a number of widely agreed characteristics of contemporary governance and notes the inadequate conceptualisation and theorising to date of these widely recognised trends.

Chapter Three considers diverse strands of governance theory in sociology examining three traditions of theorising of governance. The first part of the chapter explores descriptive analytical theories that have examined the changes to the form and function of the state in the last quarter century. It highlights a common characterisation of three forms of governance – hierarchical, market and networked
(Rhodes 1997). There have also been normative theoretical perspectives on governance that provide a second body of theory outlined in the chapter that links to the participatory democracy work identified in Chapter Two. Aspects of three particular theories in this vein are drawn on for what Layder (1998) calls sensitising concepts – that is, conceptual elements with analytical value. Theories of deliberative democracy, especially as elaborated by John Dryzek (2000a); the model of empowered participatory governance proposed by Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright (2003b); and collaborative planning encapsulated by Patsy Healey (1997). However, it is a third body of theorising – the Foucauldian derived work of theorists like Mitchell Dean (1999a) and Nikolas Rose (1999) – that provides the conceptual foundation and overall analytical framework of this thesis. The analytics of government undertaken by these theorists elaborates Foucault’s (1991a) concept of ‘governmentality’. This concept draws attention to ways of thinking about government that are embodied in specific attempts to govern – the thought that animates practices of governing. It allows exploration of the relationship between descriptive and normative categories – including networked governance, collaborative planning and deliberative democracy – in a manner that detects the rationalities or mentalities inherent in the surface manifestations as well as in the rhetorical ideals of the case study. It views these rationalities and mentalities as material and institutional practices rather than as political ideologies. The final part of the chapter argues the value of examining the various dimensions of mentalities of government for this study of the discourses and forms of rule embodied in CQANM. It provides an analytical framework of three broad components of a mentality of rule that can be used as a heuristic device throughout the thesis. The first of these components has been called the ‘problematics of government’ (Gordon 1991), a term which conveys concern with reflections about the problems of governing including questions authorities pose for themselves about:

- What is the task and intention of governing? (objectives)
- At what scale? (territorial or spatial focus)
- Who or what should be governed? (demarcation of objects of rule)
- By whom? (institutional forms and key actors)
The technologies of government provide the second conceptual dimension, the routines, practices and techniques used for governing (Rose and Miller 1992). The logic and justification inherent in the discourses and practices of governing are the rationalities of government (Rose and Miller 1992) and provide the third, and final, tool for this analysis.

Chapter Four details the research approach and methodology adopted for the thesis. It outlines the qualitative methodologies used to gain an in-depth understanding of regional governance in the CQANM case and how that regional governance was discursively constructed. In reconstructing how people think about, speak about and enact, regional governance, the study explores social practices and analyses the strategies and social relations functioning in and expressed by particular discourses (Schwandt 2000: 197). The first section of the chapter outlines the types of insights sought in undertaking the research and the underlying assumptions of the constructivist paradigm used. The second section discusses the case study methodology adopted for this research and indicates how it supports the research aims and the theoretical framework. The single case study has an established record as a research tool in sociology and specifically in researching practices of public administration, regional planning and decision-making processes (Yin 1994: 13). In the third section, aspects of data generation including sampling techniques and the specific methods of interviewing and document selection are discussed along with related ethical and methodological considerations. The fourth section details the approach to data processing and interpretation used to examine the discourses surrounding CQANM and the planning process. The chapter concludes with a discussion of issues of quality in the research, including the question of generalisability.

Any exploration of these subjective representations needs to take into account the context of wider social circumstances that influence the production, understanding and interpretation of the 'situated' discourse of planning and governance (van Dijk 1997: 11). The historical, political, administrative and policy context of the CQANM project reflected broad national, and even international, trends and debates with respect to the challenges involved in governing and the conceptions of good governance practices. An understanding of these contexts and the specific details of
the Central Queensland regional planning project are therefore important in identifying the contours of regional governance in the case study. This is provided in the first half of Chapter Five. The second half of that chapter describes CQANM itself as a process and as a regional body. It gives details of the groups of actors involved and stages in the planning process.

The presentation of the findings of this research begins in Chapter Six, with an examination of the official discourse of CQANM using the analytics of government framework detailed in Chapter Three. The mentality of regional governance, expressed in the rhetoric, embraced and blended discourses of collaborative planning, deliberative democracy and sustainable development. These discourses were embodied in the institutional practices endorsed in the rhetoric.

This official discourse informs the subsequent discussion, undertaken in Chapter Seven, which presents other discourses evident in the case study. It outlines competing discourses that regional governance involved – in respect of matters such as democracy, development and informed planning. These discourses that were articulated by different actors within the networks of rule can also be understood through an analytics of government. Each constellation of different ideas and practices constitutes a mentality of rule and Chapter Seven identifies two alternatives to the official doctrine, thereby providing a conceptual summary of three co-existing mentalities. The chapter illustrates some of the effects of the heterogeneity of discourses underpinning this instance of regional governance. It identifies that the interplay of these competing discourses is inextricably linked to the different forms of knowledge regarded as valid and to the power relations exercised in the planning process.

Finally, Chapter Eight synthesises the findings and analysis of the case study material, identifying three generalisations and reflecting on their significance for our understanding of regional governance. First, the research provides a typology of three competing mentalities of regional governance and highlights specific relations of power and strategies for exercising power that resulted from these co-existing and interacting rationalities. Second, the research adds to the literature that challenges notions of the state being the locus of political activity and supports findings of more
dispersed operation of governmental power. Third, the chapter highlights the heterogeneity within the state, challenging portrayals of a unified and monolithic state. The chapter concludes the thesis by highlighting the implications and challenges for the practice of regional governance that are raised by this new understanding.
Chapter 2: The Landscape of Regional Governance

Research and Thinking

Many sociologists argue that new ways of governing are among the profound transformations occurring worldwide at the end of the second millennium (Beck 1999; Castells 2000; Giddens 1994). For example, Castells (2000: 694) suggests current social change is defined by ‘the demise of the nation-state’ and the dramatic transformation of power apparatuses as states are ‘rearranged in networks of shared sovereignty’ formed by various institutions, levels of government and non-government organisations all ‘interacting in a negotiated process of decision-making’. This chapter reviews research and writing dealing with these innovations that involve a revival of interest in joined-up government, participation, devolution and related changes. The relevant literature is partial and diverse. As for many topics, the pattern of knowledge has not developed in a logical and cumulative fashion (Kendall and Wickham 1999: 7). Rather, a number of bodies of work, often within different disciplines, provide insight into many ostensibly discrete aspects of governance that are actually intertwined in ways not always apparent. Because of this, Lynn, Heinrich and Hill (2001: 9, 13) have asserted that governance research is necessarily interdisciplinary. The disparate topics of relevance include the role of the state, forms of democracy, regionalism, planning, and economic development. Each of these constitutes an individual piece of a larger jigsaw puzzle. While some scholars make links between two or three of the puzzle pieces, whether, or how, they all fit together to form a coherent picture of contemporary governance is not clear.

This disjointed state of the literature complicates the task of outlining a progression of scholarly precedents to the present study and is represented diagrammatically in Figure 2.1. It shows a number of the topics covered in the literature that relate to one or more of the dimensions of change. Rather than follow the cumulative contribution of one school of researchers, or one particular discipline, this chapter seeks to capture the essence of governance research from multidisciplinary perspectives. This will allow the changes in practices of governance that have been dealt with separately, as issues of public administration, political science or geography for instance, to be understood as a coherent mentality of rule. The discourses about governance inherent
in the changes and the way the changes respond to the various problems of governing will be examined together. Despite the challenge of finding a neat fit between diverse strands of theory and research, when all these literatures are viewed together, there is clear evidence of a new governance landscape involving changes in a number of dimensions: focus, scale, institutions and processes.

The search for useful insights, knowledge, and approaches across a range of relevant disciplines and professional fields identifies common themes. These themes relate to a general trend to adopt new ideas and processes of governing that do not rely exclusively on state mechanisms and powers. Described in the literature as a shift to governance, this new way of governing will be discussed in the first of the sections below. As argued there, the shift to governance involves three dimensions of change that will then be dealt with in turn. These three dimensions – actors, scope and scale – are shaded pieces in Figure 2.1. First, the literature relating to questions of who should have a role in governing leads to an exploration of the contributions about contemporary governing structures, processes and actors. These deal with issues such as the role of the state (some say reduced, others say transformed), and an enhanced role for market and civil society actors leading to forms of collaboration between state and non-state actors. This involvement of a range of non-state actors links with writings about a ‘democratic deficit’ (Hindess 2002). Because the democratic involvement of citizens also raises the issue of the public interest and the growing consciousness of new collective problems, this points to a second body of literature relating to trends in the scope of governance. Ideas about the significant problems, and issues confronting governing authorities are constantly evolving and writings about recent expansion of functions of government and increased policy complexity are reviewed. Thirdly, works that address contemporary scales, or levels, of governing are reviewed because changing definitions of the territories deemed appropriate spaces to govern have been documented. Finally, the chapter contextualises the current research as part of this diverse literature, given that the research and writing reviewed here do not provide a definitive understanding of the ‘new governance’ theme (Langford and Edwards 2002: 13). Since these interlinked processes, and the challenges they pose for authorities, must all be responded to simultaneously (Beck 1999: 2-3), the effect of dealing with the literature on
individual dimensions separately, is misleading and potentially confusing. The final section of the chapter therefore draws together these disparate pieces of the puzzle.

**Figure 2.1: Issues in the regional governance literature**

![Diagram showing issues in the regional governance literature]

**The shift to governance**

The previous chapter briefly introduced the quest for better ways of governing that has led to a transformation in approaches from top-down state intervention, to local forms of community self-help and to regional networks of collaboration. Rather than the direct exercise of formal powers by the hierarchies of state institutions, situations where society is governed by a combination of state and non-state actors are becoming more prevalent (Rhodes 1996). In recognition of this, many analysts suggest that traditional forms of government have been displaced or modified and they apply the label ‘governance’ to the new modes of governing. This broader term does not imply a change in the goals and tasks of governing authorities, however it
does suggest changes in the techniques employed and the actors involved (Stoker 1998: 17). While there is a broad consensus that new forms of governance are emerging, there is disagreement about the nature and extent of the state’s role in planning, policy-making, regulation, program implementation and the various processes of governing within these emerging arrangements. One view is that ‘pure’ governance occurs when non-state actors perform societal coordination without any state involvement (Jordan et al. 2005). A contrasting interpretation regards the state as always the principal governance actor and argues that we are witnessing a changed, but not necessarily diminished, role for the state (see for example Pierre and Peters 2000). These varied views partly reflect the absence of a universally accepted definition of governance. For instance, Hirst (2000) provides five different interpretations while Rhodes (1996: 652) gives six, concluding that governance refers to:

[S]elf-organizing, interorganizational networks [that] complement markets and hierarchies as governing structures for authoritatively allocating resources and exercising control and co-ordination.

Most definitions of this significant sociological phenomenon do, however, share a reference to patterns of rule and decision-making exercised by a combination of state and non-state actors where the boundaries between and within sectors have blurred (Bevir et al. 2003; Kooiman 2000; Marsden and Murdoch 1998; Pierre 2000; Stoker 1998).

The transformation to governance has been attributed to a number of coincidental and sometimes interlocking, but not necessarily consistent, forces of change. One of the significant forces leading to a reassessment of the role of the state in governing is globalisation, with its contradictory impulses to foster local and global action (Brenner 1999). As well, there is increasing pressure for government that is more responsive to citizens and, thirdly, a perception that a change in the way government has operated is needed to deal with new problems and risks. These new problems include environmental challenges, a globalised, consumer economy and entrenched social divisions and inequities in more diverse societies (Gleeson 1998; Jenkins and Hague 2004). All of these forces of change link in some way to the prevalence of
neo-liberal thinking with its emphasis on global competitiveness, limited intervention by the state, and privileging of economic concerns over social and environmental ones (Beeson and Firth 1998). As well, each of them poses a challenge for those seeking to govern. Concerns about democratic responsiveness lead to questions about who has a role in decision-making, policy setting and other governmental activities. The new environmental consciousness, the new economy and widening social inequities, pose challenges about the scope of governmental activities – the tasks and issues for which those charged with governing are responsible. These new areas of responsibility, and global-local tensions, pose challenges about the scale of governmental action.

New governing structures, actors and processes

There is widespread acceptance that a range of actors are now involved in governance. Fundamental to understanding the different governance actors and processes is the conception of three sectors of society: state, market and civil society. At the risk of conflating different understandings, it can be argued that each of these sectors implies both specific actors and specific styles of interaction, or, as Edwards (2004: 36) says, they are about ‘forms and norms’. The state sector consists of the formal structures of government and hence the relevant actors are politicians and public service bureaucracies at all levels of government. They rely on hierarchical, impersonal, rule-based relationships underpinned by legalistic, regulatory and, in Australia, often adversarial processes. Private sector actors are all the businesses, industries, firms and producers in the marketplace who utilize equally impersonal relationships of individual consumer choice, exchange and contract. Civil society, also referred to as the non-profit, voluntary or community sector, ‘contains all associations and networks between the family and the state in which membership and activities are voluntary’ (Edwards 2004: 20). The emphasis on voluntarism implies optional and consensual relationships, though not necessarily unpaid ones. Without going into the range of interpretations, this third sector is generally characterised by relationships of trust, cooperation, tolerance and mutuality (Deakin 2001: 7; Edwards 2004: 39). Each sector can also be regarded as an arena of social action (Deakin 2001). In this case, the private sector aligns with the economy or marketplace, and civil society with what is called the public sphere. As Edwards (2004: 54-55)
suggests, the notion of a public sphere implies ‘a whole polity that cares about the common good and has the capacity to deliberate about it democratically’. These three sectors – being simultaneously parts of society, types of relationships and arenas of action – are not distinct, unconnected and mutually exclusive. For example, individuals are actors in multiple sectors: as public servants or politicians in the state sector; as employers, workers and consumers in the private sector; and as members of a union, religious organisation, self-help group or non-government organisation in civil society.

Current modes of governing, which do not rely exclusively on the authority and expertise of the state, pose problems for traditional ways of understanding rule solely in terms of the activities of the state sector (Herbert-Cheshire and Lawrence 2002). Consequently, scholarly examinations of these actors adopt diverse perspectives. One body of work is state-centric – it seeks to explore the changes in the role of the state evident in new governance arrangements (Jessop 2002; Rhodes 1997). Another body of work focuses more on non-state actors and has developed understanding of the nature and extent of involvement of private sector and civil society agents as well as the forms and processes that facilitate this (see for example Amin and Hausner 1997). A significant sub-theme of writing about non-state actors focuses specifically on new opportunities for citizen involvement and processes allowing broader influence on governance outcomes (Fung and Wright 2003b; Healey 1997). Each of these is discussed below.

A changed role for the state vis-à-vis market and civil society institutions

One of the debates within the literature is over the relative importance of state, markets and civil society in governance. There is always interaction of the three sets of actors, relationships and arenas to achieve governmental goals. However a shift in the balance, and hence in the relative role of each sector is integral to the significant changes represented as the rise of governance. This section outlines key directions of thought with respect to the role of one of these sectors – the state. The unambiguous consensus that changes are occurring in this balance, in the role of the state and in the form of government in modern democratic states is associated with contradictory and disputed interpretations. For some writers, the changes are largely explained by the changes occurring within capitalism. Jessop (2002: 248), for example, identifies a
transition in post-Fordist capitalism from the Keynesian welfare nation-state to a Schumpeterian workfare post-national regime. He analyses changes in both form and function of the state and concludes they represent a transition to a new form of coexistence of capitalism and welfare. A related notion of coexistence with roles for both state and market sectors is labelled ‘hybrid governance’ in the writings of Higgins and Lockie (2002) and Stenson and Watt (1999). This has also led, for instance, to characterisations of ‘third way’ politics as an alternative whereby an active state complements the essential function of markets and pursues social programs within a framework of mutual obligation and shrinking government budgets (Giddens 2000).

Other scholars have suggested that, rather than paralleling and complementing changes within capitalism, the transformations are a result of perceived failures of capitalism (or free market polities) but also of the central planning associated with state-dominated polities (Adams and Hess 2001; Amin and Hausner 1997; Cohen 1999). The critique of state-centred systems of governing identifies four main, interrelated, problems: large public institutions (or big government); the adversarial nature of the institutions; remoteness from citizens; and the displacement of goals as ‘post-material’ issues come to feature more prominently in policy concerns (Pierre and Peters 2000: 141). These problems, which are purported to explain the failure of the state, have prompted reduction in the size of the state sector. Some literature shows a trend away from ‘big government’ with large public bureaucracies, state-owned enterprises, extensive welfare programs and centralized, top-down control by the state.

A hollowed-out state?

One strand of academic discussion focusing on the trend to reduce the size of the state has alluded to the hollowing out (Jessop 1990; Rhodes 1996), or even demise, of the nation state as argued in Ohmae’s definitively titled The End of the Nation State (1995). Of the drivers of change identified above, globalisation is the one usually cited as diminishing the role of the nation-state. It is said to have resulted in a shift of power to an institution, or set of institutions, at another level (Held et al. 1999). On the one hand, globalisation is portrayed as diminishing the autonomy of nation states in favour of supra-national, global bodies – including intergovernmental
organisations and transnational institutions – which usurp state power (Emy and James 1996; Hirst and Thompson 1995; Strachan 1998). On the other hand, others have highlighted the increasing role of sub-national, community or local-government-level bodies in governance (for example Herbert-Cheshire 2000; Jones et al. 2002). A third direction in which state power is seen to be diffused is horizontally – towards a host of national, regional and community institutions operating at arm’s length from elected officials and the public service bureaucracy (Pierre and Peters 2000). This sub-national landscape, rich in autonomous organisations at multiple levels, has received considerable attention in the literature. Some scholars regard the profusion of bodies and their overlap in terms of both scale and function as creating ‘congestion’ (Sullivan and Skelcher 2002: 21) and a ‘governance mess’ (Lowndes and Sullivan 2004: 52). Paradoxically, the same phenomenon has been described as an ‘institutional void’ (Hajer 2003: 176) because the processes of governance do not adhere to the conventions, rules and norms of formal, political institutions. Both characterisations – ‘crowded’ and ‘void’ – focus on the emergent situation as being somewhat anarchic (or beyond the capacity and influence of established institutions of government), and imply that the multiplicity of other actors to some extent replaces, or undermines, state authority. Besides this decentring of government, the literature suggests that the boundaries between institutional structures are no longer as rigid as they were in the past, though this boundary spanning has had only limited success in achieving coordination and integration (Delanty 1999: 52; Langford and Edwards 2002: 13).

A transformed state: enabling and coordinating?

Despite concern about the problems caused by displacement of traditional decision-making institutions (of parliament and the public service) by congested and weakly institutionalized decision-making domains, there are many writers who reject the notion that the state is an anachronism and that governance is now self-organising, inter-organisational networks (Peters 2002: 130). They highlight ways the state maintains a role in governance (for example Jones and MacLeod 1999; Pierre and Peters 2000; Webb and Collis 2000) and the ‘new possibilities of recombination’ (Delanty 1999: 52) that accompany the increased engagement of an amorphous array of actors in governance. This work includes writing by so-called new institutionalists (see for example Healey 1998; Scott 1991). Such writers seek to understand
cooperation within and between governments, the nature and forms of inter-organisational networks and partnerships and their role in shaping political life (Gooey 2005; Jessop 1997; Langford and Edwards 2002; Lowndes and Skelcher 1998). Much of this work emphasizes the state’s continuing role, with some suggesting it provides coherence, coordination and conflict resolution among the disparate players (Pierre and Peters 2000: 31), as shown for example by Szirom, Hyde, Lasater and Moore (2002) in their work on whole-of-government initiatives in Australia.

The defining characteristics of governance regimes identified by these writers include: multi-tiered and multi-sectoral collaboration through inter-organisational networks, organisations and partnerships (with these terms sometimes used interchangeably). While the negative effects of a period of over-emphasis on competition have been observed (Szirom et al. 2002: 14), most of these writers conclude that, in the empirical examples of boundary spanning, whole-of-government initiatives or joined-up government, existing governmental structures and institutions play an important role and create significant bureaucratic barriers to more diffused forms of governance.

There is also a second inflexion on the theme of an altered, rather than diminished, role for the state. This provides descriptions of a transformation to a catalytic government, ‘steering, rather than rowing’ (Osborne and Gaebler 1992: 28); in other words a minimalist and ‘enabling’ role for the state (for example Campbell 1994; Goodwin 1998; Lockie 1999; Martin 1997). The enabling state has also been identified in many public administration studies, especially in terms of so-called ‘new public management’ reforms. They observe that governments employ measures such as separating service delivery and policy formulation functions; devolving greater responsibilities to managers; introducing competition into service-provision; and focusing on short-term, discrete outputs for performance measurement, accountability and budgeting (Petris 2005: 3). In doing so, the state is interpreted as ‘stepping back’ and allowing a greater role to the market and to a variety of autonomous actors within and beyond the state. Many government programs, including regional planning processes, have been described as providing an opportunity for the state to step back in this way and for regional communities to
engage in efficient, ‘self-help’ by active, entrepreneurial citizens, businesses and civil society organisations. But a range of writers detect, in such programs, the state ‘acting at a distance’: aligning, co-opting and manipulating these actors, their everyday interactions and interests to make them amenable to the political aims of government thereby constructing a convergence of the interests of citizens and the state (Herbert-Cheshire 2000; MacKinnon 2002). These writers regard the apparently self-organising networks associated with governance as involving considerably more state intervention than is superficially apparent. Where many groups are recognized as legitimate participants in the policy process, the state can govern through the groups of non-state actors, rather than these groups actually constituting an alternative to state institutions (Pierre and Peters 2000: 35).

This research, highlighting new techniques and capacities of the state, supports interpretations of a transformation and redirection, rather than an erosion, of state capacity (Castles 2004: 45, 71; Hunter 1998). Some writers cite evidence to support this view such as expansion of government spending as a proportion of gross domestic product, expanding tax income and increased state activity in a number of fields including social spending – indeed a slight overall shift towards state service provision in the past two decades (Pierre and Peters 2000; Weiss 1998). These writers include Lindert (2004) whose Growing Public: Social Spending and Economic Growth Since the Eighteenth Century demonstrates an inexorable increase in government spending that belies notions of ‘small government’ and a minimalist state. Likewise, Hirst (2000) argues that so-called minimalist government actually increased some dimensions of central state control and public sector spending. Majone (1996) and Brenner and Theodore (2002) similarly argue that the embrace of neo-liberal strategies, new public management and privatisation from the 1980s required, and was accompanied by, an increase in government regulation and intervention albeit in new and more diverse institutional forms. These studies have found that the state is less involved in direct service delivery, but is spending more on it, and is continuing to shape it by such mechanisms as regulation and contractual requirements and its facilitation processes.
Collaboration between state and non-state actors

Many writers identify regulations, contracts and various enabling processes employed by the state as ways of coordinating society without relying on hierarchical state structures of legislation and administration where experts in the bureaucracy and elected representatives play the dominant role. To some extent, this interpretation reflects a debate in the literature about the relative importance of markets and states in governing society. One argument is that the greater responsiveness and efficiency demanded of government is better delivered through market mechanisms and the private sector (for example Keating 2001). This work cites instances of the state deferring to non-state actors acting either autonomously in a competitive market environment or in particular forms of relationships with the state – including tenders, contracts and case-management. Often these non-state actors are private enterprises, but there is also evidence of an increased role for non-profit, or community organisations over recent decades (Kernaghan 1993: 58). This links to documentation of the rise of civil society (Deakin 2001; Edwards 2004). Hillier notes that recent manifestations of citizen involvement have evolved from decades of consultation and confrontational action:

Since the late 1960s in the western world, waves of interest-focused citizen activism have led to what has been termed the rise of civil society. Interests have been represented through relatively formal processes of public participation in planning, such as making written submissions or attending public meetings, through advocative processes such as lobbying (Hillier 2002b: 222).

Optimists look to this sector of voluntary, community association to provide a counterbalance to state and market sectors and open up a new political space (Taylor 2003: 14, 44).

In the new arrangements, both private sector and civil society organisations are characterized as ‘partners’ of the state (Kernaghan 1993). It is often to these non-state organisations or to such partnerships that the outward diffusion of state power (referred to earlier) is seen to occur. Prevailing political, economic and social realities are seen to demand increased efforts to build political coalitions to allow
effective governance of a range of matters (Yaffee and Wondolleck 1997). One example of this is that voluntary collaboration between autonomous, but interdependent institutions in informal networks or more formal partnerships are identified as the institutional form of governance of economic development under what has been called, ‘new regionalism’ (see Norris 2001; Savitch and Vogel 2000; Wheeler 2002). There has also been recent academic and practical interest in the potential of similar institutional forms to deliver other governance objectives such as environmental management (Hoverman et al. 2003). In various functional areas, therefore, there has been a movement from national government and interventionist policymaking towards reflexive structures of governance involving partnerships between, and networks of, state, private sector, and civil society stakeholders. Much of the literature that has emerged about such structures and relationships as public-private partnerships and policy networks depicts arrangements where non-state actors coordinate amongst themselves without state intervention (see for example Cloke et al. 2000; Leat et al. 2002; McClelland 2002; Petris 2005).

There is clearly a substantial body of recent literature that has begun to question assumptions about the state’s monopoly to make decisions or take action. As well, many of these writers address the related issue of the means the state uses to take action. They document a decreased reliance on coercive policy instruments in favour of more subtle techniques of imposing the state will through diverse institutional forms and processes. These include block grants to sub-national governments; deregulation of some private sector operations, establishment of quangos, and purchaser-provider contracts for service delivery (see Pierre and Peters 2000: 196). More recently, deliberative visioning, consensus conferences and multi-stakeholder advisory bodies have been observed (Morse 2002). Commentators conclude that these changed processes are a further indicator of new forms of governance involving cross-sectoral interactions (Sorensen and Torfing 2005: 198).

In discussing governance trends in Australia, Davis and Rhodes (2000) refer to three formulations: the hierarchic state, the contract state and the network state. They are

---

6 Quasi non-government organisations (quangos) are not fully government, fully private, nor strictly non-profit, community sector organisation, but some sort of hybrid (Wettenhall 2003: 64).
not alone in suggesting three broad forms of governance (see also Amin and Hausner 1997; Deakin 2001) and presenting networks as the emerging alternative to both hierarchies and markets. They portray networks as a coordinating mechanism, drawing together the fragmented and inconsistent institutions of governance, and they stress the need for new skills such as communication, diplomacy, negotiation, cooperation and engendering trust (Morgan and Henderson 2002; Rhodes 1997). Others suggest that network relationships between groups and individuals enhance the capacity of markets to consider non-economic criteria while enabling hierarchies to permit more participation (Pierre and Peters 2000: 201-02). In this writing, it is evident that the new approaches to governing not only raise questions about the extent, nature and effectiveness of state action, they also draw attention to the greater degree of influence and involvement of non-state actors from both civil society and the private sector and to various changes in the state-society relationship (Pierre and Peters 2000: 29).

The literature on the coordinating and enabling state, including the new institutionalist, new public management and new regionalist writing, contains similar rhetoric about benefits of broader participation, partnerships and networks. It has provided a significant body of empirical case studies and some detailed analysis of the nature of institutions, relationships and processes that constitute alternative governance models being experimented with in situations as diverse as devolution in the UK (Cooke and Clifton 2005; Deas and Ward 2000), economic development in Wales (Morgan and Henderson 2002), welfare reform in Australia (Szirom et al. 2002) and municipal governance in North America (Norris 2001).

These studies offer considerable insight into the changing role of the state sector in governance. However, when considered together, some ambiguities and conceptual inconsistencies emerge, not least because of the application of key terms such as empowerment, partnership, participation and network to what are significantly divergent phenomena. For example there is frequent use of the word ‘network’ to encapsulate the idea of interactions in institutional webs of relationships both formal and informal. But as Amin and Hausner’s spectrum of networks suggests, there is considerable variety in the governance rationale and practices of networks (Amin and Hausner 1997: 10). The plurality and diversity of network forms (see for example
Rhodes (1997) compound the confusion from different uses of the term network, and the way different properties of networks are highlighted by different writers. This has been identified as distorting understanding of the new arrangements and their potential (Moulaert and Cabaret 2006: 57-58). The emergence of many variants of the network model requires differentiation between relationships such as ‘communities’, ‘coalitions and alliances’ and ‘networks’ (Pierre and Peters 2000: 36). In brief, communities are relatively uniform with informal relationships; networks are more diverse with formalised interactions and potentially include state actors; and coalitions and alliances tend to be a less enduring relationship than either of those, formed to strategically address common interests (Pierre and Peters 2000). However, there is a tendency not to distinguish between these various relationships. As well, each of these terms has been invested with varied meaning to the point of becoming empty signifiers, as Somerville (2005: 130) argues about the term ‘community’. A third term, partnership, similarly is used to refer to a confusing mix of cronyism, market, consultative and collaborative arrangements and takes a variety of organisational forms operating in different modes of governance based on hierarchies, markets or networks (Considine 2001; Kernaghan 1993; Langford 2002; Lowndes and Skelcher 1998). In addition, some writers delineate a continuum of processes that provide some coordination of governance activities including partnership, collaboration, coordination, cooperation, and networking (Szirom et al. 2002: 18). However, again the terms are often used interchangeably in the literature, mainly to suggest a contrast with competition and with the isolated functional differentiation associated with a ‘silo mentality’ in bureaucracies (6 1997; Wanna and Keating 2000).

**Increased levels of citizen participation**

An important sub-theme of the concerns about the failure of both state and market centred forms of governance, and the involvement of civil society actors in new forms of governance, relates to the perceived remoteness from citizens of governing authorities which has resulted in a renewed interest in democracy (Meredyth 1998). This perception of democratic deficiencies and of failure by state and market has been accompanied by a popular loss of faith in ‘expert’ planners and comprehensive planning that reinforces the desire to involve citizens in planning (Macionis and Parrillo 2001). This exploration, in practice and in the literature, of more participatory
forms is not new. Thirty years ago there was considerable agitation for democratic participation (O’Brien 1977; Sandercock 1975b). However by the 1990s people were lamenting the decline in civic engagement and the passivity of citizens (Putnam 1993; Putnam 1995; Wuthnow 1999). Subsequently, studies have confirmed broad disenchantment in the electorate with the perceived remoteness and lack of responsiveness of government (Cox 2002; Davis and Stimson 1998; Gibson and Cameron 2001). Some writers differentiate among different tiers of government in terms of their democratic credentials and exempt local government as the most democratic, responsive, participatory and efficient level of government (Dahl 1967; Sharpe 1988), although this is contested (see for example Goldsmith 1992; Jones 1989: 11). In general though, the literature on citizen participation in political life reveals one of the many contradictions evident in recent trends. On the one hand, research reveals a declining trust in government and disillusionment with the working of parliamentary democracy (Cox 2002; Inglehart 1999; Langford 2002) leading to oft-bemoaned citizen apathy. On the other hand, a more optimistic body of work records that, despite the disillusionment with traditional politics and political parties, the close of the twentieth century witnessed an upsurge of citizen activity and engagement plus renewed calls for popular action and involvement in all levels, and scales, of government (Bogason and Musso 2006: 4). This has been identified as one of the drivers of contemporary governance changes:

[T]he 1990s have been a period in which the reform of the public sector, as well as being driven by market ideas, has been directed towards opening government to greater participation by the public (Pierre and Peters 2000: 49).

One of the forms of participation strongly advocated is widespread deliberation of matters of public policy to overcome the problems of remoteness, lack of responsiveness and excessive adversarialism associated with elected politicians and bureaucracies in representative democracies. In this vein, a number of recent studies highlight that a corollary of the new styles of governance involving diverse actors in networks, partnerships and deliberative forums, is a transformation in democratic practice (Hirst 2000). The burgeoning literature on civic engagement or citizen participation, for instance, is significantly influencing the theory and practice of
governance and public administration (Morse 2002). As a result of this ‘participatory turn’, the research on governance has overlapped with developments in democratic theory.

This work establishes a number of grounds for disillusionment with representative democracies including the absence of transparent institutional norms and trustworthy politicians (Hirst 2000: 13; Sawer 2003). As well, there is dissatisfaction with the way democratic processes are constrained by arrangements of a non-democratic kind in practice (Hindess 1997a; 2002). For instance, through parliamentary elections, citizens’ approval and preferences are measured by votes and exercised through representatives, rather than the whole populace making decisions about optimal strategies (Habermas 1996b: 20-23). This has led to concern about ‘elective despotism’. Some (for example Richardson 2001; Sawer 2002) argue that, in such a system, the rights of minorities are threatened by powerful vested interests or the populist majority. Research substantiates these various critiques. One example is the claim that elected representatives and the bureaucracy – and indeed some of the more recent ‘arm’s length’ bodies formed through contractual partnerships – have been vulnerable to partisan manipulation by commercial interests and other narrow elites and been responsive to only a narrow range of interests (Gleeson and Low 2000; Langford 2002; Sandercock 1975a). Many studies have found undue influence exerted on planning decisions by developers and other, usually commercial, interests. One example is Flyvbjerg’s (1998b) study of a planning project in the Danish town of Aalborg which revealed that a tiny elite of top-level politicians, high-ranking civil servants, and business community leaders were the primary decision-makers about Aalborg’s development and constituted an informal, but influential, council.

A similar argument has been made about regional planning in Queensland where the vested interests of cohesive and powerful State government departments and individual local authorities (acting effectively as agents of a developer rather than the broader public) distorted regional projects (Moon 1995). Such studies have prompted rejection of the idea of planning as an objective, value-free exercise and highlight instead how governance serves particular power interests (Hillier 2002: 7). These concerns for democracy underpin recent trends in planning practice (see Gleeson 1998), which, like other government activities, has consequently emphasized local
participation, collaboration and giving voice to a range of stakeholders (Hillier 2002: 7).

This issue of how to include the full breath of citizens in democratic participation has been explored by, among others, Saward (2000), Young (2000), Dryzek (1996) and Warren (2002). They highlight the democratic imperative to be inclusive of all citizens and the complexity of various notions of representation and legitimacy. Recent work also documents the expanding range of forms of participation open to citizens through alternative ways of representing citizen interests including e-democracy, citizens’ juries and consultation strategies for governments (Carson 2001; Cuthill 2001; Gammack and Barker 2005). Some of this research has demonstrated challenges with more participatory practices, since there are often irreconcilable differences between groups of stakeholders (Laclau 2002). The specific differences between the community, specialist advisors from the professions and academic disciplines, and government are an example (Brown 2004). There are also stark contrasts between these groups in terms of the kinds of knowledge and other resources, sources of power and authority, and timescales that each of them uses (Brown 2004).

Participation, like some of the other terms used here (see the discussion of networks above), has been applied in several different contexts and with various meanings. There is a body of work that analyses the capacity of different types of participation to influence planning and policy decisions. Classic works distinguish between ‘substantive participation’ and ‘mere administrative involvement’ (Selznick 1949: 220). Arnstein (1969) has eight rungs on her ladder of participation ranging from degrees of non-participation (therapy and manipulation) at the bottom; through forms of tokenism (consultation and placation) in the middle; to degrees of citizen influence (partnership, delegated power and citizen control) at the top. These distinctions have considerable practical relevance and have been widely applied for decades in assessing and comparing a range of participatory strategies from public meetings, surveys and focus groups to consultative committees, and policy roundtables and to consensus conferences, citizen’s juries and deliberative polls (Carson 2001; Sandercock 1975b). They have also informed recent research leading to nuanced insights about the paradox that many practices of consultation involve no
devolution of power (Stevenson 1998: 132). Further, even those programs that empower local individuals and are called participatory have questionable democratic credentials since they involve limited public participation and are not deliberative (Thomas 2003: 210). The manipulation and control of participation has also led to cynical conclusions that ‘glass ceilings’ exist in most such programs (Jenkins and Hague 2004: 209) or that consultation is used mainly to ‘reinforce the legitimacy of representative government’ (Bishop 1999: 12).

**Variants of participatory governance.**

In more conceptual terms, four broad variants of enhanced participation are evident in this literature: communitarian participation, direct democracy, associative democracy and deliberative democracy. These imply, in turn: more input from citizens in the local community; universal citizen input (through direct referenda for instance) though not necessarily any extra deliberation (in the sense of exchanges of a wide range of reasoned arguments); more input from voluntary, democratic associations of citizens; and more citizen and association input plus more deliberation (Hirst 1994; Pierre and Peters 2000: 139-140). All four therefore concentrate on the role of civil society actors in governance and the relations between state and citizens.

First, the communitarian forms of participatory governance (Adams and Hess 2001; Etzioni 1993; Sandel 1996) are linked in the literature with ‘conservative populism’ and with attempts to ‘revive volunteerism as an alternative to social and educational services provided by government’ (for a similar argument see Cohen 1999; Peters 2000: 59). These forms favour localized self-management within a restricted and generally homogenous community having little dialogue and interaction with a broader range of actors. The appreciation of the value of strong civil society is reflected in programs to strengthen the self-governing capacities of segments of society (Pierre and Peters 2000: 33). There are associated notions of individual self-reliance and responsibility – often labelled active citizenship (Kearns 1995; Marinetto 2003; Miller and Rose 1990). This term implies people acting

…as active and free citizens, as informed and responsible consumers, as members of self-managing communities and organisations, as actors in
Some recent studies are quite skeptical about such forms of participation. They identify them as neo-liberal techniques to foster economically rational practices among local actors as a way to address social and environmental imperatives (Higgins and Lockie 2002; Mowbray 2005), or as a veiled attempt at promoting market-based economies (Chaichian 2003: 19). As well, these forms foster only limited democratic participation since they identify social diversity as social fragmentation and regard social harmony and plurality as mutually exclusive (Cohen 1999: 276).

Direct democracy is the second and least institutionalised variant of participatory governance. It retains an embrace of majoritarian principles with no means of encompassing the minority views in society. The wishes of the majority are determined by universal plebescites, with citizens being asked to decide all policy issues by direct vote (Peters 1996: 54). Related literature has examined citizen initiated referenda, electronic polls and opinion polls (Catt 1999; Gammack and Barker 2005). This form of participation is very unwieldy for large populations and does not necessarily provide processes for opinion-formation or modification. This is particularly so since it contains no concept of civil society as constituted by groups having collective interests. These two forms of democracy may involve more participation, but, paradoxically, they are not inherently inclusive (Catt 1999).

A third variant is associative democracy, which argues for a more pluralist politics with the institutions of representative democracy supplemented with greater reliance on self-governing associations (Hirst 1994: 19). With its emphasis on dialogic processes, negotiation and consensus among diverse civil society actors (Amin 1996), associative democracy is arguably closer to the fourth variant, deliberative democracy, than communitarian participation. In a more conceptual vein, Fung (2003) has elaborated the various contributions associations make to democracy while also identifying aspects of associational forms that are inimical to democratic values and practice. This recognition of both democratic potential and constraints is
particularly relevant to increasingly popular multi-stakeholder processes involving civil society groups in governance.

Forester (1999) and Dryzek (2000a) are among an increasing number of writers who argue that more reflection and a broader range of citizen’s views can be included through the fourth variant – more deliberative forms of participatory processes. Studies of many industrialized democracies document attempts to construct patterns of policy-making that address the requirements for dialogue and communication and that involve some form of public participation (Peters 1996: 56). Many of the institutions and processes identified above – such as ‘issue networks’, ‘advocacy coalitions’ and ‘policy communities’ – are deemed suitable for these purposes (Rhodes 1997; Sabatier 1988). The basic idea underlying these frameworks is that there are many groups – often in civil society – including professional associations, researchers, activists, advocacy bodies, community organisations and so on, all of whom have an interest in any particular policy area (Dryzek 2000a; Peters 1996: 57). These are sometimes referred to as stakeholders. At least some of them hold a concern for the collective good, and a broader agenda than special-interest and identity-politics groups (Deakin 2001: 60).

The interest in public participation follows a long tradition of work, in public administration and other fields, on ways of involving clients in decisions affecting them. This included research into human services, urban renewal programs and model cities of the 1970s (Rogers and Mulford 1982). But the recent studies note new dimensions, notably notions of deliberation – as distinct from consultation (Lowndes and Sullivan 2004). These give a new slant to examination of multi-stakeholder processes. Deliberative democracy relies on conceptions of diversity and contestation of discourses within civil society (Stevenson 1998: 141) and structures discussion to permit maximum dialogue among a broad range of stakeholders. This form of participatory governance will be further elaborated in Chapter Three.

These studies of participatory governance focus on a revitalization of democracy with a greater role for citizens and civil society (Evans 1996; Fung 2003; Hirst 2000; Putnam 2002). They converge with other work on governance to suggest there is a role for diverse views from state, market and civil society rather than reliance on a
single dominant sector (Adams and Hess 2001; Morgan and Henderson 2002). The concept of less state-centred governance involving the interaction of state, market and civil society authorities instead (see for example Amin and Hausner 1997; Murdoch 2000; Reddel 2002; Schofield 2002) is regarded as providing some answers to the dissatisfaction with aspects of representative democracy. Along with the broad trends to collaboration and coordination among professionals, including administrators and planners, and the transition from government to governance, these democratic aspirations create conditions favourable to new forms of involvement of citizens and civil society actors in governance.

**Networks of state, market and civil society actors**

From both the diverse literatures on the new roles of each sector, and that on increased citizen participation, there is a common theme that the new structures of governance take the form of multiple and diverse networks. The networks link differently positioned and differently resourced actors from all three sectors of society. They are characterized by greater cooperation between various governments, levels of government and government departments as well as between government and non-government players – the latter including civil society organisations and private sector firms (Papadopoulos 2003: 473). The multi-level, multi-sector and cross-territorial relationships in these networks are cooperative rather than hierarchical or contractual in nature (Lynn et al. 2001: 23). Morgan and Henderson’s (2002) study of regional governance is one that highlights contrasting forms of relations in hierarchical and networked governance situations. Significantly, these writers alert us to the fact that networks exist in various regimes, and they profile different types – not all of which are necessarily democratic. Vertical, asymmetrical networks are associated with high dependence on state or corporate hierarchies and hence are found where the state or market is the leading actor in governance. These are distinguished from associational relations that result in ‘the more dynamic, horizontal networks which tend to form around agents of broadly equivalent status and power’ (Morgan and Henderson 2002: 3). Such horizontal networks are associated with networked governance regimes. They require building
…a relational infrastructure for collective action which requires trust, voice, reciprocity and a disposition to collaborate for mutually beneficial ends (Morgan and Henderson 2002: 2).

Rather than being located with the market or state, ‘rule’ becomes a consensus-based, interactive process of ‘collective social learning’ within and between public and private sectors (Morgan and Henderson 2002: 9). These emerging cooperative forms of governance replace (or supplement) elected representatives ‘with a combination of group representation and influence tied to sectoral or local expertise’ (Papadopoulos 2003: 479).

Writers use labels such as synoptic collaboration (Brown 2004: 43), boundary-spanning (Langford and Edwards 2002), multi-stakeholder processes (Hemmati 2002), collaborative planning (Healey 1997), networked governance (Petris 2005), interactive governance (Jessop 1997) and participatory governance (Lovan et al. 2004) to contrast these new ways of operating with more traditional, bureaucratic, state-centred forms of governance and also with the market-dominated approaches of new public management and neo-liberalism. Larner and Walters refer to a ‘multiple and networked polity’ (2002: 411) and there is an increasing tendency among other writers to adopt the metaphor of interdependent networks to describe the institutional manifestation of rule (for example Blatter 2003; Cooke and Morgan 1993; Morgan and Henderson 2002; Murdoch 2000; Rhodes 1996). Sorensen and Torfing (2005: 197-198) identify three axes of difference between governance networks, state-rule and market-based regulation: the relationships between the actors differ, as do the decision-making practices and the means of ensuring compliance. However, the details of the network form vary from one treatment to another. This new language reflects recent changes in the techniques of governing and represents an institutional transition to interdependent networks of state, market and civil society organisations as characteristic of new governance models (Jones 2001). There are some contrary voices in the literature arguing that networks and cooperative processes have been idealized. They suggest that more confrontational processes of direct action and civil disobedience remain appropriate techniques, and that networks need to be recognised as arenas for the exchange of different views,
conflict, contest, and negotiation, albeit rarely in adversarial, competitive and confrontational ways (Hillier 2002b: 221; Lowndes and Skelcher 1998).

Each of these literatures shares a tendency to see governance as being conducted across a more or less disaggregated field of organisations linked together in a loosely coupled form of collective negotiation and collaboration. However, because of their specific focus, each of these literatures tends to illuminate only certain aspects of the networked polity. For example, the literature on new public administration and intergovernmental links for policy formulation and implementation notes the ‘joined-up’ character of state organisation and concentrates on networking as a style of management largely internal to state institutions (March and Olsen 1984; Scott 1991; Szirom et al. 2002; Wanna and Keating 2000). The literature on new institutionalism and new regionalism is primarily concerned with the role played by institutions and networks in the market sector or linkages between the state and the private sector, and the structure and function of successful economies (Ansell 2000: 3; Goodwin et al. 2005; Wheeler 2002). And the literature on increased citizen participation focuses on civil society involvement, the linkages between state and society (or within society) and the effectiveness (or inadequacies) of consultation practices and forms of representation (Bishop and Davis 2002; Gramberger 2001; Papadopoulos 2003). All of these issues need to be considered when looking at empirical instances of governance and considering the rationales for regarding specific actors as having a governance responsibility.

There are challenges involved in linking these various literatures related to the actors, structures and processes of contemporary forms of governance. For instance the relationship between participatory governance work and other academic developments and debates reviewed above is not often addressed. As well, there are quite contradictory interpretations of the emerging structures and processes as, on the one hand, facilitating exploitative, economic rationalist agendas, and, on the other hand empowering communities to break the neo-liberal shackles. Beyond such challenges, the changing roles of various sectors outlined above have implications for other, related, transformations evident in current governance arrangements.
The new scope of governance

Changing conceptions of the significant problems confronting governing authorities, or the scope of governing, are as much a part of the transformations of governance as are the transformations in the governing institutions and actors (Wanna and Weller 2003: 63). Changes are evident in the activities of the state, and other governing actors, and in what they are deemed responsible for – in other words, the issues regarded as within the scope of government. As early as the 1970s the literature was identifying concerns that western democracies, were becoming ‘ungovernable’ because of three challenges they confronted: fiscal crisis in the public sector; widespread loss of popular support; and social, institutional and policy complexity (Crozier et al. 1975; House and McGrath 2004; Papadopoulos 2003: 476). More recently, globalisation is said to have led to a crisis of governability by creating ‘ungovernable’ issues, increasing exposure to forces beyond domestic control, and demanding greater capacity from states (Castles 2004; Merrien 1998). A significant common emphasis in these accounts of reduced governability is that policy complexities and new policy challenges have expanded the scope of governance, and stretched the capacities of governments. This matter of policy and program goals or issues will be reviewed in this section. It should be noted though, that some writers give less credence to notions of more complex problems. Pierre and Peters (2000: 63), for instance, agree that governments have proven unable to resolve a number of enduring problems. Their interpretation is that – rather than this indicating society has become ungovernable – it indicates both a loss of public confidence in government and also a loss of self-confidence on the part of governments (in their capacity to govern) (Pierre and Peters 2000: 45). This notion of loss of confidence underpins many of the participatory overtures and consultation practices discussed earlier in this chapter.

Whatever the reasons, new policy challenges are recognised, but the state’s capacity to directly address this broad range of social, environmental and economic problems is being questioned (Savitch and Vogel 2000), and practitioners and researchers remark that state bureaucracies lack the requisite resources – finances, institutions and expertise – to respond effectively to policy problems (Papadopoulos 2003: 474). To some extent, this is linked to re-conceptualisations of the state’s role as outlined earlier in this chapter. For instance, an enabling state is regarded as responsible for
ensuring the conditions necessary for private sector profitability – possibly by fostering the development of human capital and business partnerships (Keating 1998) – rather than providing concrete infrastructure assets and delivering services. But there is also a shift in priorities, objectives and diagnosis of collective problems from a predominantly economic focus. Some of the new priorities are persistent challenges that government has, to some extent, proven unable to resolve. They include the maintenance of law and order, caring for the sick and elderly and educating the young. Other governmental goals address new or burgeoning problems, only recently assumed to be matters of public interest and to warrant collective intervention. They include environmental degradation, cultural diversity and widening social, cultural and economic cleavages (Gray and Lawrence 2001; Merrien 1998).

In considering an expanded scope of governance, the literature touches on three significant impulses: the new, globalised economy (Jenkins and Hague 2004; Storper 1997), the new environmental consciousness (Jenkins and Hague 2004; Troy 1995), and new challenges of social justice and inclusion in increasingly diverse societies (Jenkins and Hague 2004; Miller and Ahmad 2000; Wuthnow 1999). This neatly captures one of the major debates in the literature that poses economic development as incompatible with goals of environmental protection and social justice (Stilwell 2000). In each of these policy sectors, the challenges confronting governments are sometimes referred to as ‘wicked’ problems’ to highlight their complexity (Petris 2005: 16).

*Changing demands for governing the economy*

Research shows that historically, economic objectives were the priority of governments (Sandercock 1975a; Stilwell 1980). This preoccupation lead to ‘one-sided development’ (Castells 2000: 694). The specific nature of economic goals has changed dramatically though. In the post-war decades, exploiting resources for comparative advantage was assumed to require protectionism and considerable pump-priming by government (Garlick 1999; Wilson 1989). From the 1980s the emphasis was on government exerting fiscal control, and facilitating competitive advantage in indirect ways. The economic goals of entrepreneurship and economic competitiveness (Osborne and Gaebler 1992) were perceived as resulting not from
state-driven policies, or a narrow set of economic factors but from a range of non-state and non-economic factors. These included sub-national social, cultural and institutional forms and ‘soft’ infrastructure (such as social capital and educational levels) (see Amin and Thrift 1995; Cooke and Morgan 1993; Putnam 1993; Rainnie 2002). Over the last decade or so there has been considerable research effort linking the emergence of new patterns of economic development with governance changes. Much of it implies that the right mix of governance institutions can have a significant impact on the competitiveness of local and regional economies within the new, globalised economy (Cooke and Morgan 1993; Lovering 1999; Norris 2001; Rainnie 2002). Researchers have defined a model of development policy and practice in Europe and North America that has been called ‘new regionalism’ (for example, Keating 1998; Lovering 1999; Storper 1997). The institutional and governance changes labelled new regionalism have particularly been documented as harnessing local knowledge and resources to enhance competitiveness of manufacturing industries and the administration of large metropolitan regions (Lovering 1999). More recently the emergence of global consumer and knowledge economies is causing further revision of notions of the economic problems that should be tackled collectively.

A new goal: environmental sustainability

Given concerns that economic and environmental goals are incompatible (Trainer 1996), it is paradoxical that stewardship of the environment is now equally regarded as a matter of public policy and a responsibility of those governing society. This resulted from broad public questioning of the industrial era paradigm of market-driven technological development (Bennett 2001) and of the assumption that continued economic development and environmental conservation could proceed in tandem (Dryzek 2000a: 122, 123). McCormick (1995: 85-6) provides a succinct overview of the cumulative evolution of this contrary consciousness that originated in the 1960s. He characterizes it as both growing concern about environmental degradation and growing acceptance that some curtailment of industrial and resource management activities and some remedial action is necessary. As early as 1972, the Stockholm Conference declared ‘protection and improvement of the environment [to be] the duty of all governments’ (Bennett 2001: 29). However it was only in the early 1990s that nations conceded that a balance between environmental and
developmental priorities was needed and that governments had a key role to play in achieving this. *Our Common Future*, the so-called Brundtland Report, popularized the concept of sustainability and placed it on the political agenda (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987). This embrace of the notion of sustainable development is an even more fundamental change in understandings of the scope of governance than revised economic responsibilities. Sustainable development implies that not only economic goals, but also social and environmental ones receive prominence in the quest for so-called ‘triple-bottom-line’ outcomes.

The responsibility of non-state actors for sustainable development has also been recognised in terms of corporate triple-bottom-line performance (Elkington 1997). Hoffman’s succinctly titled *From Heresy to Dogma* (2001) stresses not just a growing constituency supporting sustainable development, but the fact that no sector of society acts in a vacuum when it comes to environmental issues. One influence of such works has been to foster an appreciation of the significance of governance arrangements to the achievement of effective natural resource management. For instance, research about natural resource management has highlighted the achievements and shortcomings of various experiments with institutional arrangements. These include community self-help approaches (Lockie 1998; Lockie and Vanclay 1997; Martin 1997); reliance on market pricing and corporate environmental responsibility (Elkington 1997); and also national policy and legislative measures (Dore and Woodhill 1999; Slack 1999).

**A social justice imperative**

A second critique of the precedence given to economic development goals and market processes has come from political economists and planning and welfare professionals who argue that the pursuit of profit produced inequalities, neglected social needs and abrogated government responsibilities to ensure social equity and redistribution (Ife 2002; Stilwell 2000). They argue that public policy needs to counter the concentration of wealth and power that results from the patterning of social activity associated with market exchange economies and with social stratification (Harvey 1973: 239). This perspective advocates direct action by the state to prevent or rectify social and spatial injustice and inequality (Stilwell 2000; Troy 1987). While such priorities were sidelined during the 1980s and 1990s, recent
studies note that social inclusion and well-being have resurfaced as significant public policy issues (Miller and Ahmad 2000: 5). As well, the social changes that have wrought new forms of social polarization and diversity are argued to pose as great a challenge for governing authorities as the economic transformations of the late twentieth century (Cohen 1999; Kymlicka 1995). A new facet of this quest for social harmony is that cultural difference is regarded as a fundamental societal condition to cope with (Sorensen and Torfing 2004: 23). The challenge of inclusive governance raises considerations of many axes of difference in Australian society such as those between rural and urban communities, and for women, indigenous Australians and various cultural and linguistic minorities. The literature documents the need to embrace such spatial and social diversity through appropriate governance action (Fincher 1999: 59; Miller and Ahmad 2000: 5). This is particularly the case since the transformation of institutional arrangements for service delivery associated with market governance exacerbated the divide between the ‘haves’ and ‘have nots’ in society (Adams and Hess 2001: 17; Fincher 1999). The literature cautions that, although recent emphases on community engagement and diversity appear to have a social justice agenda, they may serve a neo-liberal agenda so that economic and policy utility ultimately take precedence (Adams and Hess 2001: 16, 17; Castles 1997: 20; de Carvalho 1998). As well, it suggests that community engagement policy designed to be universal in its application, and to heal social divisions, has inherent contradictions and may explain the disaffection of communities or groups confronting structural barriers to their social inclusion (Adams and Hess 2001).

**Integrating goals**

As well as these complex challenges in specific policy areas such as the economy or environment causing an evolution in thinking about the tasks of government, there have been some more fundamental demands for an expanded capacity to deal with any governmental task. One of the most pressing demands relates to dissatisfaction with the way Australian public policy in the second half of the twentieth century was dominated by ‘disjointed incrementalism’ rather than ‘comprehensive rationalism’ (Logan et al. 1975). That is to say, instead of acting to realise broad goals and principles, decision-makers responded in a utilitarian and ad-hoc way to problems that were in their immediate sphere of influence. While some studies have identified a practical, problem-solving focus as a component of effective governance (Fung and
Wright 2003b), others highlight that specific, marginal improvements are not necessarily pervasive and systemic and that the strategy is not effective where societal problems are ill-defined (Logan et al. 1975: 98).

After increasing segregation of the handling of social, economic and environmental policy issues, by the late 1990s there were calls for greater integration and a ‘major shift in public decision-making, towards looking at issues as a whole in a society long organized around separate contributions from a range of specializations’ (Brown 2004: 42). The response, sometimes labelled inter-professional, or inter-disciplinary collaboration (Miller and Ahmad 2000: 9), acknowledges that issues are intertwined and that varied skills and knowledge must be integrated to address complex issues. Recently, some researchers have detected a holistic and integrated approach that seeks to balance and interconnect economic development, environmental stewardship and social justice (6 1997; Gleeson and Low 2000; Szirom et al. 2002). This is evidenced in the increasing use of ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable’ in government programs and policies. This pursuit of three-fold goals of ecological sustainability, social amenity and economic growth has been reflected in urban and regional planning practices which are no longer contained forms of land-use plans drafted by professional planners, but more ambitious documents in that they provide whole-of-government policy frameworks for economic development, social well-being and natural resource management. This trend is not universally welcomed. For instance, Powell (2003: 114-115) argues such broad planning has become prevalent in Australia and has the semblance of planning without the substance because it is not sufficiently focused on tangible land-use guidelines. Because of the assumption in these governance practices with broader goals that ‘many of the most important problems facing society can only be solved collectively’ (Peters 1996: 107), these issues of scope relate to other changes, noted above, about involving actors from various sectors and the citizenry at large. They also suggest the need to examine the literature on the scale of collective action. The research about this dimension – the scale of governance – is dealt with in the next section.
New scales of governance

As mentioned above, globalisation is portrayed as diminishing the autonomy of nation states in favour of supra-national, global, bodies including intergovernmental organisations and transnational institutions which usurp state power (Held et al. 1999; Hirst and Thompson 1995; Strachan 1998). Yet, other studies have highlighted the increasing role of sub-national, community or local government level bodies in governance (for example Herbert-Cheshire 2000; Jones et al. 2002). The contradictory pressures of globalisation and devolution, as well as the changes in actors and institutions noted previously, have been associated with changes in the scale of governance with a number of writers advancing a thesis of state re-scaling (see for example Swyngedouw 2000). The scale of governance differs from the scope of governance discussed above in that scope refers to the range of functions regarded as tasks of governing, while scale refers to the reach of governance especially in a spatial or territorial sense.

A link has been made though between re-scaling and changing scope and policy priorities. For instance, Deas and Ward (2000), in examining changes of scale, such as devolution by the national government and concession ‘upwards’ by local governments in Britain, associate them with a shift of emphasis from redistribution and equity (which targeted ever smaller units to focus on the most deprived communities) to growth and opportunity through partnerships across community and local government boundaries. In other words they suggest that social equity priorities predispose to local action whereas economic competitiveness needs a regional scale of action. Indeed, many of the significant challenges facing society – poverty, industrial decline, environmental degradation – are not only inherently multi-organisational and multi-disciplinary, but also have ramifications from the global to local scale. Hence, they cannot be tackled unilaterally or at only one scale (Huxham and Vangen 2005: 7). Besides being related to expanded scope and to globalisation, changes in scale are connected to the other forces of change identified earlier, and to the institutional transition and changing priorities outlined in previous sections. For instance, the active participation across economy, state and civil society characterising the institutional transition profiled above, is difficult to achieve at a national scale (Amin and Thrift 1995: 60).
Localism: self-reliant, community governance

A significant body of research in the 1990s found a shift from a national approach to a more bottom-up approach of local, community development and self-help (Brenner and Theodore 2002; Cheers and Luloff 2001; Gibson and Cameron 2001; Taylor and Garlick 1989). This involved action in a localised unit – such as a single neighbourhood, town or local government area – with local citizens expected to join forces and foster their own solutions to the problems they faced, using local resources (Ray 1998). Much of the literature about this shift noted that the local scale was adopted as the territory for the governance of economic development in the post-Fordist era and for urban and regional development more generally (MacLeod 2001; Webb and Collis 2000). Environmental action was another example initially regarded as a local issue with specific problems tackled by a local company, municipal authority, community group or even individual landholders (Cary and Webb 2000). The developing concern with environmental sustainability, for instance, was addressed in part by locating responsibility for sustainable development with the level of government with the most extensive role in planning – namely local government (Bajracharya and Khan 2004). This stimulated enthusiasm for Integrated Planning – initially at the local scale (Sansom 1993; Sansom 1994). To some extent such strategies countered criticisms that have been especially prevalent since the 1980s, that planning and other aspects of both top-down governance and marketised strategies were unresponsive to local needs, overly technical-rational in orientation and ignored the differing needs of various social groups (Huxley 2002).

The literature is divided, though, over the degree of success of this so-called ‘new localism’ in empowering communities and boosting local economies. Some writers suggest it is no more than a spatial manifestation of the neo-liberal agenda to foster self-regulating, entrepreneurial citizens (Brenner and Theodore 2002; Higgins and Lockie 2002). During the 1990s, there was growing recognition of the limitations inherent in localised programs that relied upon local community action. Despite success in facilitating incremental change in individual communities, local projects were frequently small scale, poorly co-ordinated and potentially undermined by contrary activities in neighbouring localities (Davis and Rhodes 2000). There is also scepticism from researchers who suggest that the devolution strategies that accompanied the more local emphasis during the 1980s and into the 1990s served to
shift responsibilities for intractable problems or for funding between levels of
government without improving outcomes (Schorr 1997). Other critical observers
found that localist approaches encouraged neighbouring localities to compete against
each other for scarce markets and government grants, so that positive outcomes for
some communities occurred at the expense of others (Stilwell 2000; Tonts 2000;
Tonts and Jones 1996).

A seminal study of grass roots involvement in planning was Selznick’s *TVA and the
Grass Roots* (1949) which actually related to a much earlier process of devolution
and local empowerment. For the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), the desired
‘vitality drawn from below’ required the TVA to be ‘shaped by intimate association
with long-established institutions’ (Selznick 1949: 37) echoing some of the notions
of stakeholder involvement and participatory democracy outlined above. Selznick’s
research documents the challenges of local involvement in resource management and
development planning, including the effects of cooption and accommodation as
different sectors of society work together. The study also focused on an early
example of action at a regional scale with a decentralized administrative agency
responsible for coordinating the work of State, local and federal programs in its area
of operation; and for dealing with the resources of the region as a unified whole
(Selznick 1949: 28-29).

*A regional renaissance*

The general trend towards greater stakeholder participation may have fostered action
at a local, community scale during the 1980s and early 1990s, but recently the
regional scale, adopted by the TVA half a century ago, has again been emphasized.
Such shifts from a ‘new localism’ to a ‘new regionalism’ have been observed in the
United Kingdom (Deas and Ward 2000; Jones and MacLeod 1999). Elsewhere too,
scholars have observed, ‘increased attention to the regional scale and consequent
regional initiatives …often resulting in partnerships between the community,
industry and government’ (Dore and Woodhill 1999: 6). Throughout the western
world, there has been devolution of functions not only to localities, but also to
regions, with associated changes in the relationship between different tiers of
government. As Pierre and Peters (2000: 119) say:
Much of the early devolution was from the [nation-]state to local government and more recent reforms have aimed at strengthening the regional level of government. These latter reforms have included both some devolution of state functions and the creation of institutions to increase coherence, coordination and, in some cases, political representation at the regional level.

The regional scale is becoming more prominent in Europe and North America where new regionalism literature links successful economic development to spatial scale with the region seen as the most viable unit in terms of economic development (Jones and MacLeod 1999; Keating 1998; Morgan and Henderson 2002; Rainnie 2002). This literature shows that innovation and competitive advantage are geographically concentrated in specific regions, with a resurgence of entrepreneurial cities and regions (Jessop 2002). The region is portrayed as the optimal space for the knowledge creation, learning, innovation and networking deemed essential for economic competitiveness (Amin and Thrift 1995; Cooke and Morgan 1993; Lovering 1999; Storper 1997). For these reasons, which all relate to global economic restructuring and technological change, regions are seen as the crucible of economic development (Keating 1998; Savitch and Vogel 2000; Webb and Collis 2000). These shifts in scale that were first evident in economic governance of urban and industrial regions have extended to areas outside the metropoles, with the economic prosperity of marginal communities being linked to coordinated regional action (Morgan 2005). The region is prominent in a post-national order characterized as multi-scalar, with overlapping scales (Counsell and Haughton 2003; Deas and Ward 2000; Jessop 2002; MacLeod and Goodwin 1999). This shift in scale leads to new institutions at the regional level (Goodwin et al. 2005) and is as characteristic of new governance as changed institutional forms such as partnerships and networks.

The increased salience of the regional scale has also been noted for planning functions of governance (Heywood et al. 2004; Spiller 1999), and for environmental stewardship and responsible natural resource management (see Brunckhorst 2000; Dore and Woodhill 1999; Gray and Lawrence 2001; Hardy and Lloyd 1994; Tane 1994). This is because bio-regions or eco-regions are units that allow integrated approaches and the incorporation of larger geographic scales and longer temporal scales into decision making as is required by ecosystem science (Brunckhorst 2000;
Hardy and Lloyd 1994; Tane 1994; Yaffee and Wondolleck 1997). Although many regions lack a formal level of government, they offer a level of decentralisation where practices like cross-boundary cooperation, conflict resolution and problem-solving can occur in planning and natural resource management (Dryzek 2000a: 116). These practices, like learning and innovation, are increasingly regarded as integral to good governance and contribute to the emerging consensus that the regional scale is both ecologically and politically appropriate for addressing various policy challenges that transcend community and political boundaries.

This literature about economic and environmental governance and urban and regional planning highlights the complex rescaling of governance that is currently occurring involving trends towards multi-level governance and to associated spatial divisions (Sullivan and Skelcher 2002). These trends compound with changes in institutions, actors and processes being implemented for governing various complex policy issues in a broadened scope of governance as outlined in previous sections. Consequently, the resultant mode of governance has a triple agenda of new actors, scale and scope.

**The frontier of governance research**

This chapter has reviewed the diverse literature relating to dimensions of new modes of governance. It showed that interest in specific aspects of governance has originated in different places – for example joined-up government has been focused on in the UK (6 1997) and new regionalism in Europe and North America (Keating 1998; Lovering 1999). As well, different disciplinary emphases are evident in the literature: planners, for instance explore new possibilities for citizen input (Allmendinger 2002), while public administrators concentrate on new forms of inter-agency cooperation (Lowndes and Skelcher 1998). Recent manifestations of this new mode of governance have been variously labelled, with planners adopting ‘deliberative planning’ in the US (Forester 1999) and ‘collaborative planning’ in the UK (Allmendinger 2002; Healey 1997). It has overlapped with notions of a ‘third way’ (Giddens 1998); ‘new institutionalism’ (Amin and Hausner 1997; Amin and Thrift 1995); and ‘new regionalism’ (Gleeson 2003; Keating 1998; Lynn 2005). Public administrators refer to ‘joined-up government’ (Herrschel and Newman 2004)
and ‘engaged government’ (Reddel 2000); while ‘integrated catchment management’
(Dale 1998a) and ‘regional sustainability strategies’ (Dale 1998b) are favoured by
those with an environment and natural resources focus; and democracy scholars
conceptualize it as ‘empowered participatory governance’ (Fung and Wright 2003b)
or ‘deliberative democracy’ (Dryzek 2000a). This lexicon of contemporary
governance was shown to converge, conceptually, around four themes that establish
the current state of governance research and suggest challenges for further
exploration.

First, there is the theme of responsibility for governance that examines the actors
involved in governing and their various relationships. The literature deals with the
involvement of new actors through the largely voluntary, but institutionalized,
collaboration between government, civil society and the private sector. In addition to
this linking of the three sectors in networks, it notes changed relationships among
state actors with the ‘joining up’ of the three levels of government and the separate
government departments at each level. Another change in actors involves the
participation of local citizens and communities. The second theme focuses on altered
processes. The literature characterises contemporary governance as employing
processes that are cooperative rather than adversarial or competitive and that involve
decision-making based on deliberation, negotiation and consensus rather than
bargaining and contracts, or voting and arbitration. A third theme relates to the scale
of governance and the increased prominence of the regional scale in a multi-scalar
sphere of governmental action. The fourth theme documents new objectives of
government in the form of interrelated environmental, social and economic goals.
This functional orientation is expressed in terms of sustainable, triple-bottom-line
development. The trends in terms of changes in actors, processes, scope and scale are
concurrent.

Despite the recurrence of these themes, the review of the literature showed that
scholars have not reached consensus on the conceptualisations of governance. Some
writers adopt the label ‘new’ indicating their attempt to explain phenomena using
prior conceptual tools, but others have introduced propositions or interpretations of
these themes that diverge from previous conceptualisations. One such proposition is
that there is a crowded regional governance landscape, another is that a crisis of
governability is evident in changing conceptions of the objectives of governing. The merit of these propositions is that they direct attention to the value of analysing how the tasks of governing are problematised. Hence one challenge posed by these themes and propositions is that of understanding how those adopting new techniques and practices of governance think about governing (that is, what their mentality is, as briefly outlined in Chapter One).

While raising this challenge, the literature reviewed concentrates on interactive forms of policy making and policy implementation in the ‘formalistic and state-centred’ way that has been called ‘the first generation of governance network research’ (Sorensen and Torfing 2004). The work exhibits both divergent understandings and some common themes that have advanced appreciation of the dimensions and nature of emerging governance practices. However, it does not adequately conceptualise the multiple dimensions of contemporary examples of regional governance in a way that links all the themes and associated propositions identified in this review. As well, research to date has not involved extensive case study analysis of the implicit conceptions and thinking, in various forms and practices of governance, about the themes of who bears responsibilities, for what problems and at what scale. Where such analysis has been done, it is usually the practices of state actors (elected politicians or public servants) at one level of government that have been studied. For instance, at the national level, Pusey (1991) has indicated the influence of economic rationalist thinking among bureaucrats. At the regional level, Albrechts (2003), and, at the local level, Flyvbjerg (1998b), have documented the strategies of politicians and professional planners.

The current study considers the thinking about government embodied in the aggregate of the various concurrent developments identified above. It builds on the debates, assumptions and questions embedded in the literature to unpack the assertion that governance by networks has replaced top-down government. To establish the mentality of this governance by networks, this thesis must bring pieces of the puzzle together (see Figure 2.1) and provide a sense of how the many dimensions of the new mode of governance are interrelated and imply particular rationales. It does this by examining one of the more recent attempts at collaborative planning that involves not only experts in the bureaucracy and elected
representatives, but also non-state actors, and actors from multiple levels of government. This case study is distinguished from other studies and extends areas covered by previous research because it relates to all dimensions of contemporary governance identified above and adopts a distinct focus. The focus is on the regional scale (rather than the local or national) in the specific political context of Australia, and on the thought that animates the practices in this case.

This study of regional governance serves both to corroborate many facets of the material outlined above and to extend understanding of previously unarticulated aspects of such governance processes, bringing into consideration three important aspects insufficiently examined in the literature to date. The first of these additional aspects involves analysis of the differing rationales and justifications associated with various institutional arrangements, that are called the rationalities of governing (Rose and Miller 1992). Second, this study gives an account of the power effects associated with different forms of governance. Third, it examines key concepts like networks and participation and illuminates areas of debate that rest on un-stated differences in the use of such terms. More generally, the existing documentation of the changing dynamic of regional governance does not present a single analytical approach for interpreting the various jigsaw puzzle elements identified. The next chapter outlines three main conceptual approaches that have been adopted and develops a synthetic analytical framework to explore these themes and additional aspects in a way that moves beyond description and gives expression and definition to the concept of networked governance and its inherent rationalities.
Chapter 3: A Conceptual Framework for Examining Regional Governance

The Central Queensland regional planning process provides an example of regional governance in which the theme of good governance and the multiple dimensions of contemporary governance can be interrogated. This chapter introduces key concepts and outlines a conceptual framework that extends traditional approaches to the study of these themes and the way the task of governing is accomplished in contemporary Australia. Chapter One outlined three potentially contradictory influences during the 1990s on the predominantly neo-liberal activities of national and State governments: desire for greater democracy; desire for environmental protection; and desire for greater administrative efficiency and productivity. These contradictions arose because on the one hand, the competition and efficiency imperatives of neo-liberalism were served by reducing or privatising the service activities of governments, and modifying the nature of government activity to emphasise direction-setting and regulation over service delivery. On the other hand, this market driven influence was accompanied by the challenge of environmentally sustainable development and demands for new kinds of democracy and social inclusion (Gleeson 1998; Gleeson and Low 2000). Governance arrangements at the time responded to the tensions between these various drivers of change.

To have utility for this thesis, the conceptual framework must be able to address the multiple dimensions of change; examine aspects of governing like planning as a structures (or sets of arrangements) and as processes (or series of activities or practices); and identify both the visible elements of these structural and procedural dimensions, and also their more or less implicit values and rationales. A number of aspects of contemporary governance, identified in the review of the literature in the previous chapter, pose problems for traditional theoretical approaches. For instance Kulynych (1997: 315) has suggested emerging practices of political participation define the purpose of participation in very limited ways as providing opportunities to influence political choices, protect sectional interests and legitimise the political system. This, she claims, gives little understanding of the range of political actors
and the variety and effectiveness of forms of political action and power in the contemporary world (Kulynych 1997: 316). The array of non-state political actors poses a further challenge. Although some theorists argue that a state-centric approach to examining ways of governing is still relevant (Peters 2002), others suggest conventional ways of analysing politics using the nation state as the frame of the political system are inadequate to explain not only current practices of political participation but also many other facets of contemporary political developments (Rose 1999: 1).

Given this complexity and these explanatory challenges, no comprehensive general theory fully explains the contours of regional governance as exemplified in the Central Queensland regional planning process. Indeed, Jessop (1997: 105) has warned against applying general theory to forms of governance. So, in developing a conceptual framework for this thesis, key concepts, themes and perspectives emerging from recent scholarly interest in the phenomenon of governance are chosen for their relevance to dimensions of the current transformations in governance and their relationship to themes explored in more detail later. To apply these different concepts, an adaptive theory methodology (Layder 1998) (outlined in Chapter Four) will allow maximum ‘dialogue’ between diverse perspectives. The resultant conceptual framework provides the basis for a coherent analysis of the phenomenon of contemporary governance. It maintains continuity with past analysis by using elements of prior theory as a departure point for further elaboration and exploration (Layder 1998: 125), but the framework itself does not constitute a theory of governance.

There have been calls to draw together, in this way, various sociological perspectives in the analysis of contemporary governance (Sibeon 2003: 1). Relevant concepts of three such theoretical traditions are outlined below because they address areas specifically identified as unexplored in the recent work on governance. The first of these is analytical-descriptive writings on governance. Both Papadopoulos (2002) and Sibeon (2003) suggest this work should be articulated with the writings on deliberative democracy that form the second approach outlined. In addition, the relation of those approaches to a third body of writing – the Foucauldian work on ‘governmentality’ – is unexamined (Sibeon 2003: 13). While there has been a lively
debate over the incompatibility of the deliberative democracy work and Foucault’s writing (Chambers 1996; Gunder 2003; Stahl 2004), there is a counter-argument about the value of viewing forms and practices that resonate with one tradition through the lens of the other. This counter-argument suggests that Foucault’s approach to power and government can help make intelligible the unacknowledged conditions for the normalising of specific democratic practices associated with deliberative democracy (Dean 1999b: 168). As advocated by writers who have rejected an either-or approach (Kelly 1994; Kulynych 1997; McCarthy 1990), this thesis adopts a loose, empirical and adaptive relation to these different approaches and will show later how the selected concepts can be seen to interlock without inconsistency. Rose (1999: 9) has suggested that concepts are valuable to the extent that ‘they are able to provide a purchase for critical thought upon particular problems in the present’. This reflects Layder’s (1998: 35) notion of ‘sensitising concepts’.

Three main approaches to producing accounts of governance, and of core dimensions of it such as planning, have been recognised. These approaches have been labelled: analytical-descriptive, normative (Sibeon 2003: 12) and the ‘analytics of government’ approaches (Dean 1999a: 27-39). Within all three approaches, aspects of both structure and process are explored. They also address the implications of the associated activities of the state and non-state actors (as key players in such tasks). Selected elements of each of these three traditions will be outlined in turn in this chapter, as it reviews conceptual approaches to studies of governance. As a first step, the chapter sets out recent directions in traditional analytical-descriptive approaches that profile state restructuring and particularly introduce the concept of networked governance. A second tradition, of normative theorising, has also yielded a number of models. The chapter surveys three of these, all with an emphasis on communicative processes – deliberative democracy, empowered participatory governance and collaborative planning. A third tradition, based on the Foucauldian concept of governmentality, is also reviewed. It is shown to be a rich source of analytical concepts relevant to the study of regional governance.

From this consideration of the three main approaches, the final section of the chapter outlines a conceptual framework that will be used as a heuristic device for systematic analysis of governance practices – identifying and analysing structures, processes
and their inherent rationalities. It will enable a detailed exploration of the research question and provide the key frame of reference for the analysis of Central Queensland a New Millennium in Chapters Six and Seven.

**Analytical-descriptive approaches: a focus on networks**

Much of the literature reviewed in the previous chapter presents the project of regional governance in the context of a multi-dimensional process of re-structuring and re-scaling of the state, which involves new forms of organising and allocating state functions (Jessop 2002; MacLeod and Goodwin 1999; Rhodes 1997; Swyngedouw 2000). Issues given close attention by these theorists include legitimacy and accountability (Considine 2002; Lynn 2005; Rhodes 1997; Sullivan and Skelcher 2002). It has been argued that recent decades have witnessed a turn in the field of governance studies towards documenting historical trends (Beilharz et al. 1992: 9). This has included work examining the evolution of institutions in specific functional areas. Much of that work attends to economic institutions like clusters of firms (Porter 1998; Rainnie 2002) but other writers have focused, for example, on institutions for natural resource management and ecologically sustainable development (Dovers 2003b). These studies have yielded diverse insights into the forms of political power exercised by the network of institutions known as the ‘state’ or ‘the government’, and into recent trends towards ‘patterns of reciprocal interdependence across multiple boundaries’ (Jessop 1997: 101). It has been argued that the questions asked actually construct understandings of governance (Rhodes 2000: 67). This tradition of theorising focuses on questions such as (i) Who governs? (ii) What are contemporary challenges for the state? (iii) What changes are we witnessing to state form and function? (iv) What is the structure and operation of the economy, the administration or the polity more generally? (v) Who benefits from the institutional arrangements?

Significantly, this writing identifies a transition, since about 1980, from centralised and hierarchical systems of government (with planning and regulation exercised through administrative processes) to systems emphasising efficiency through competition and incorporating market mechanisms and practices of corporate management (see, for example, Pierre 2000). In this vein, Gleeson and Low (2000:}
profile the specific impact on urban and regional governance of the transition
from ‘the project of social democracy’ to ‘corporate liberalism.’ Other writers note
the multiple dimensions of this transition such as marketisation, corporate forms of
management, regulation, privatisation and decentralisation (Considine 2001: 149-
153; Davis and Rhodes 2000; Peters 1996). Implicit in all of these descriptions is the
idea that the hierarchical governance of large public bureaucracies, publicly owned
enterprises and a comprehensive welfare system changed to suit an environment of
globalisation, competition and privatisation. Following these writers, in this thesis
the concept of market governance is used to refer to such monetarist, managerial,
novel entrepreneurial, regulatory and contractual arrangements often involving cross-
boundary partnerships between state and non-state actors. Elsewhere, these are
variously designated as, for instance, the ‘contract state’ (Sawer 2003), the
‘enterprising state’ (Considine 2001), the ‘enabling state’ (Latham 2001), ‘new
public management’ (Gerritsen 2000) or ‘corporate liberalism’ (Gleeson and Low
2000). The general term, ‘market governance’, is adopted in this thesis, to cover
these variations while recognising the use of this term by some writers to imply the
more limited practice of corporate self-governance with minimal state intervention
(Rhodes 2000).

One aspect of the process of state re-structuring that has occupied theorists has been
the blurring of the state-society dichotomy (Amin and Thrift 1995; Ansell 2000;
Evans 1997). Investigators of this phenomenon have identified the significance of
inter-organisational networks as institutions for expressing, and ultimately achieving,
the common, public interest. Chapter Two provided examples of writers who suggest
there is a spectrum of forms of inter-organisational relationships often labelled
These included policy networks, public-private partnerships, coalitions and alliances.
Some of these networks are an informal series of bilateral relationships. In such
forms – for instance cross-membership of company boards – the existence of
traceable links or interactions, no matter how invisible, indirect or coincidental, is
taken to constitute a network without a need for each actor to feel connected to all of
the others and for people’s multiple connections to be transparent and public. The
literature lacks consistency in defining the features of networks and pays little
attention to the specific form and nature of relationships between various actors in
networks. Despite this, the network concept has become increasingly popular with social scientists, as Amin and Hausner (1997: 10) remark:

The idea of society as a web of interlocking networks of affiliation and interaction which are structured around a multiplicity of institutions, formal and informal, is a powerful metaphor.

Hence a key theme of recent analytical-descriptive works is the networked polity or network governance (Amin and Thrift 1995; Cooke and Morgan 1993; Moulaert and Cabaret 2006; Peters 1996; Rhodes 1997). This also has other names such as collaborative governance (Phelps and Tewdwr-Jones 2004). As a key contributor to this writing, Rhodes (1997: 53) describes the characteristics of networks of governance. They span the boundaries of public, private and voluntary sectors; they are self-organising, with significant autonomy from the state; and they involve ongoing interactions rooted in trust and mutually agreed norms. These three characteristics mean that ways of coordinating action in networks are regarded as informal (Lynn et al. 2001: 23). Nevertheless such network forms are an institutionalised framework (Sorensen and Torfing 2005: 197) and, as Rhodes (1997: 52) stresses, are ‘an alternative to, not a hybrid of, markets and hierarchies’. He has therefore adopted a useful threefold typology of governance as exercised by hierarchies, markets or networks. These are similar to Kooiman’s (2000: 146) three modes of governing: hierarchical governing, self-governing and co-governing. Rhodes’ analysis characterizes actors as both individual and organisational and explicitly considers the implication of the distribution of resources in the networks. In this conceptualization, state and non-state actors are in relationships of ‘asymmetric interdependence’ (Rhodes 1997: 15) in the networks – with the state having ‘more’ power while non-state actors have ‘less’. In that respect, he addresses the issue of power – although as a resource that actors can possess. Rhodes identifies different kinds of networks but tends to focus on government policy networks. Like market governance, the term network governance is widely used but in ways that are diverse and often nebulous (Moulaert and Cabaret 2006: 52). These efforts to distinguish state rule, market regulation and network governance have been grouped as first generation governance research by Sorensen and Torfing (2004: 11).
Much of this analytical-descriptive writing remains state-centric with the networks largely conceived of as a tool for state steering or for a kind of meta-governance role for the state (Jessop 1997: 112). As well, there is a tendency to idealise network relationships. However, Amin and Hausner (1997: 12) remind us that, ‘not all networks are non-hierarchical, mutually beneficial or discursive’. The treatment of power in this writing remains largely structural, located in a single centre (the state) and exercised in just one direction (top-down). This neglects the two-way operation of power in all social relations (Foucault 1986). In the specific case of planning, for instance, Forester (1989) provides an excellent analysis of the role of information, communication and knowledge in power. However his work has been criticised for focusing on institutional forms of power and underestimating the impact of exploitative relations (Moulaert and Cabaret 2006: 66).

Descriptive institutional analyses provide rich bodies of data as well as insights into trends in governance, and into contextual conditions for the emergence of the networked regimes, notably increasing social complexity (Amin and Hausner 1997; Jessop 1997; Kooiman 2000). These approaches have been criticised as limited since even a sophisticated conceptualization of the empirical forms of regional governance does not help us understand how it has been thought (Dean 1999a: 27; Rose 1999: 21), nor the characteristic discourses of systems so identified (Dean 1999a: 27). Before outlining the alternative approach presented by these critics, features of normative approaches will be examined in the next section.

**Normative approaches: a focus on participatory democracy**

A second body of theory expresses strong values about what makes better government. This normative strand of theorising is rooted not only in an agenda of reform to address the ‘failure’ of both hierarchical and market governance (Amin and Hausner 1997: 2), but also in an increasing dissatisfaction with representative democracy (Hindess 1997a; Mouffe 1992; Saward 2000). However, often no link is made between the two bodies of work. As Papadopoulos (2002: 3) says, ‘There have indeed been few exchanges between these two research traditions in spite of some significant overlapping in the issues they deal with’. Particularly, the issue of the democratic quality of various forms of governance has not been adequately
addressed (Sorensen and Torfing 2005). This question of democracy is an important aspect of the normative approaches.

There is no single, comprehensive theory of democracy and writers acknowledge a multiplicity of democracies. Despite widespread acceptance of Abraham Lincoln’s famous description of democracy as ‘government of the people, for the people, by the same people’ (Nevins 1962: 5), there are many manifestations in practice of this government ‘by the people’, most of which exclude the majority of people from any active participation (Hindess 1997a). They rely, instead, on systems with parliamentary representatives overseeing institutions that are beyond the reach of democratic control (Dryzek 1996: 37; Hindess 2002: 32). The distinction between two different forms of western representative democracies is particularly relevant to this thesis. While terminology varies, this thesis calls the first of these social democracy (Dow 1999; Giddens 1998; Gleeson and Low 2000). Others have called this ‘social liberalism’ (Richardson 2001; Sawer 2003) or ‘representation-cum-administration’ (Fung 2003). Social democrats emphasise collective provision (Dean 2002: 125) and state intervention in the interests of fairness and equal opportunity (Giddens 1998). They believe that the market economy should be subordinated to a democratic state which puts ‘the welfare of its citizens before the sanctity of contract and the rights of property’ (Sawer 2003: 4). Parliamentary political parties are regarded as key avenues for citizen participation. The political process of opinion formation and determining the public interest is undertaken by adversarial debate resolved by the strength of numbers. Social democracy is characteristic of the welfare state which Dryzek (2000a: 173) has judged effective in solving problems of social justice, redistribution, economic stability and environmental quality, but not being very democratic in terms of being decentralised and involving the public.

Social democracy contrasts, in many respects, with the second form – liberal democracy (Habermas 1996b; Uhr 1998). Gleeson and Low (2000) call this ‘corporate liberalism’ and Fung refers to it as ‘liberal minimalism’ (2003). Liberal democrats regard society as essentially an aggregation of individuals and emphasise classic liberal principles of individualism and autonomy which they regard as compromised by state intervention (Sawer 2003: 16). The political process of opinion formation is determined by the competition of strategically acting citizens.
trying to further their own interests (Habermas 1996b). Liberal democracy shares with social democracy an acceptance of parliamentary representation and the determination of the public interest by an elected elite (albeit an elite that cultivates the market virtues of self-interested bargaining) (Uhr 1998: 15). In addition, extra-parliamentary interest groups and lobby groups are seen as important avenues for political influence. It has been argued that this results in arbitrary and unstable democratic procedures and decision-making (Dryzek 2000a: 173).

It is dissatisfaction with aspects of both social and liberal democracy, and a desire for some form of alternative to both majority collectivism and individual freedom that has caused the recent interest in forms of democracy that provide for more civic participation (Barnett 2004; Mouffe 1992). These include, for example, ‘associative democracy’ (Hirst 1994), ‘participatory democracy’ (Fung 2003), ‘strong democracy’ (Barber 1984), ‘dialogic democracy’ (Giddens 1994), ‘agonistic democracy’ (Hillier 2002a) and ‘communicative or inclusive democracy’ (Young 2000).

Four broad variants of participatory democracy were discussed in Chapter Two: communitarian participation, direct democracy, associative democracy and deliberative democracy. From such examples it is evident that the permutations of democratic innovation are many and complex (Saward 2000: 214). In sum they provide a rich lode of concepts for thinking about emerging forms of governance. The alternatives they present for reforming democratic systems are, however, judged less coherent and compelling than their critique of the existing systems (Pierre and Peters 2000: 159), since in practice these diverse alternatives also possess deficiencies, some similar to the more established forms of democracy, some more specific. While it is not possible to amalgamate all of these strands of thought, some of the most influential recent theorists in the participatory democracy vein deal specifically with deliberative democracy. Therefore, the discussion below elaborates deliberative democracy and focuses on details of two related models of governance employing deliberative practices that have been called ‘empowered participatory governance’ (Fung and Wright 2003b) and ‘collaborative planning’ (Healey 1997).
Deliberative Democracy

Writers on deliberative democracy have adopted Habermasian notions of collaboration, enhanced democracy through citizen participation, and the value of a particular form of deliberation or reasoned argument which Habermas (1984; 1990) called ‘communicative action’. Communicative action is public dialogue and exchange of ideas between affected actors according to certain principles. These principles include listening to and respecting all viewpoints; all participants having equal power to speak, to challenge others and to access information; speaking sincerely and accurately without using coercive tactics; and reaching consensus through the force of reason (Habermas 1984). This implies a form of democracy that differs from both social and liberal democracy as outlined above. The political process of opinion formation in parliament and the public sphere does not obey the norms of competitive and strategic bargaining associated with liberal democracy, nor the adversarial and majoritarian norms of social democratic processes, but norms of public communication oriented to mutual understanding. The paradigm is not the market, or the ballot box, but dialogue (Habermas 1996b: 20-23).

Recent proponents of this tradition of democratic theory include Cohen (1989), Gutmann and Thompson (2004), Dahlberg (2004), Dryzek (2000a), Uhr (1998) and Bohman and Rehg (1997). They have outlined various conceptions of a more participatory politics based on dialogue, as an alternative to majoritarian representative democracy with its aggregation of individual interests through adversarial means and the equally adversarial forms of interest-group lobbying that tend to advantage already privileged interests (Hillier 2002a: 115). For convenience, in this thesis, these innovative forms of democracy are referred to collectively as ‘deliberative democracy’ (Lovan et al. 2004). While there are significant differences between variants within this extensive body of work, some common characteristics are relevant for this thesis. In deliberative democracy, political decision-making is based on public processes of dialogue, negotiation and persuasion in which disciplined exchanges of reasoned argument lead to a consensus in the collective interest (Gutmann and Thompson 2004: 9). This description can be elaborated as three core characteristics.
First, the dialogue in deliberation is not simply a confrontation of parochialisms, a
discussion or the exchange of information and opinions. Rather, the open exchange
of arguments over the merits of contending policy and program options is often
described as rational. This has fuelled debate about the potential for objective,
impartial and value-free arguments. However, a broader interpretation suggests it
involves many competing interests presenting their often partial or value-laden
arguments, but also clearly providing their reasons. As well, in assessing the reasons
for various suggestions, people need to be open to fair consideration of others’
reasons (Gutmann and Thompson 2004: 40). Such argument is distinguished from
bargaining as less self-serving and more likely to encourage consideration of the
wider public good (Hirschman 1994: 212). Consequently, this form of democracy
promotes mutual learning based on a mix of rational argument, technical
information, experiential knowledge and local needs (Chambers 1996; Habermas
1976). Cohen and Rogers (2003: 241) give a simple definition of the specific nature
of deliberation:

[T]o deliberate means to debate alternatives on the basis of considerations
that all take to be relevant; it is a matter of offering reasons for alternatives,
rather than merely stating a preference for one or another, with such
preferences then subject to some rule of aggregation or submitted to
bargaining.

Second, people conform to a disciplined set of practices for presenting their
arguments. These include reflexivity, mutual respect and empathy, equal
consideration for all, and the minimization of coercion and manipulation (Gutmann
and Thompson 2004: 40). This set of practices has been criticised. Since tactics like
rhetoric and bargaining are sometimes regarded as manipulative and hence not a
valid form of reasoned argument, it is argued that deliberation is too narrow and
exclusionary (Sanders 1997). More sympathetic critics have suggested that
communicative rationality can accommodate rhetoric and more subjective modes of
communication such as aesthetic and affective (or emotional) reasons (see for
example Chambers 1996; Dahlberg 2005; Young 2000). For instance, Dryzek
(2000a: 167) has said that all forms of communication should be admitted so long as
they are non-coercive and have some application to public issues by connecting the
particular to the general. Another criticism suggests it is unrealistic to expect argument to conform to such disciplined practices since various participants are likely to hold strong, partisan and often conflicting views (Hendriks 2002). Deliberative democrats concede that the practices are more likely to be realised under certain conditions. Deliberative democratic processes should therefore provide for on-going interaction rather than a one-off opportunity to express opinions; minimal exclusions and maximum breadth of participation; absence of prior constraints on the range of options available to participants; and empowerment of the deliberators to make decisions rather than having only an advisory role (Pierre and Peters 2000: 151). Given these characteristics, many forms of public participation and consultation used in representative democracies – such as hearings, opinion polls, meetings, letter-writing – while allowing some participation by citizens, are not really deliberative and constitute a shallow form of mass democracy (Uhr 1998: 11).

Third, resolutions should have general (if not universal) acceptance as fair and rational. This is what is understood by many as ‘consensus’. The understandings of ‘consensus’ are contested. Habermas distinguished rationally-motivated and uncoerced consensus from pragmatic compromises (Uhr 1998: 8). That distinction is dismissed as utopian by critics who argue the ‘impossibility of finding rational, impartial solutions to political issues’ (Mouffe 2002: 95). While many of the prevailing forms of deliberative democracy hold an ideal of rational consensus, there is disagreement among deliberative democrats about whether consensus is desirable or feasible in pluralist societies. One school of thought criticises consensus – understood as unanimity – for ignoring the deep-seated differences in society which mean there is no singular, comprehensive common good (Chambers 1996: 157; Hendriks 2002: 68; see also Mouffe 1996). This argument notes that no amount of deliberation can make incompatible values compatible. Others argue that it is a narrow, even inaccurate, interpretation of consensus to assume it requires unanimity, and that it is possible for conflicting interests to reach ‘workable agreement for diverse reasons’ (Dryzek 2000a: 170).

Processes with these three characteristics are not restricted to formal political arenas but occur in a de-centred society, with many competing interests engaging in open
exchange, and all interests given equal consideration (Habermas 1996a: 119, 169-176). The concept of the ‘public sphere’ (Habermas 1989) as the arena for deliberation has been influential in deliberative democracy debates, but there are many different conceptualisations of it. Some have drawn the distinction between forums where people work together in concert, and those where conflict and confrontation prevail (Hillier 2002b: 221). There have been criticisms that deliberative democracy gives inadequate recognition to social diversity and difference (Mouffe 1996; Young 2000). However most proponents have inclusive, pluralist conceptions of the ‘public sphere’ in which deliberations occur (Habermas 1989: 27). The diversity usually envisaged, and the parallels between the public sphere and conceptions of civil society are typified by the following explanation:

When talking of the public sphere, Habermas is not talking about a homogenous, specific public, but the whole array of complex networks of multiple and overlapping publics constituted through critical communication of individuals, groups, associations, social movements, journalistic enterprises and other civic institutions (Dahlberg 2005: 112).

From this discussion, it is evident that each of the characteristics and conditions of deliberative democracy is the subject of contestation. A further example of this debate concerns ways of including the full diversity of competing interests. A common way to achieve breadth of participation is by involving multi-party ‘stakeholders’ though there is considerable variety and vagueness about how to do that. For instance, stakeholders can be state-appointed, elected or self-nominated in open forums (Smith et al. 1997). Consequently, the multi-stakeholder processes raise questions of competing legitimacy which have been the focus of work by Thomas and Healy (1991) for instance.

Despite such debates, the work of Habermas and allied democracy theorists has been introduced into planning with the aim of enhancing the democratic credentials of public policymaking by increasing public participation (Phelps and Tewdwr-Jones 2004: 96). Forrester is one who argues for a radical alteration of existing power structures and power relations by such democratic innovation. He highlights the extent of transformation implied by deliberative democracy:
In the context of a technocratic or bureaucratic state, indeed, the call for democratization, for creating the conditions of open political discourse, for rational argument and criticism – this becomes a call for subversion of anti-democratic structures of investment and control.... Planners and analysts who seek to democratize planning and policy processes will necessarily at times be in conflict with the everyday routine, precedents, and structure of those planning and policy processes (Forester 1993: 58, 61).

The deliberative versions of more participatory democracy, then, rely on a communicative, rather than an instrumental rationality (Dryzek 1990: 9) and on a form of politics that is ‘increasingly discursive, educational, oriented to truly public motives, and needful of active citizenry’ (Dryzek 1990: 13).

Dryzek, prefers the term ‘discursive democracy’ (Dryzek 2000a; Dryzek 2000b), and provides insights that sharpen the theoretical consideration of deliberative democracy. He makes a distinction between deliberative decision-making and the top-down decisions (by either a handful of politicians or an economic elite) that characterise social and liberal democracy:

Discursive designs involve collective decision making through authentic democratic discussion, open to all interests, under which political power, money and strategizing do not determine outcomes. (Dryzek 1997: 199).

Dryzek has elaborated his understanding of ‘authentic democratic discussion’ as involving ‘communication that induces reflection on preferences in a non-coercive manner’ (Dryzek 2000a: 2). He stresses the difference between this and the manipulation and threats employed in bargaining situations. Deliberation is not confined to the institutional structures of liberal democracy (Dryzek 2000a: 3) and citizens have a role in public decisions, especially through the politicised aspect of civil society (Dryzek 2000a: 115, 130). This contributes to three dimensions of democratisation, by providing ‘authenticity’, by involving people excluded from conventional politics, and by raising novel issues for political scrutiny (Dryzek 1996: 52). Like other scholars referred to above, Dryzek has suggested that horizontal
networks may be the most appropriate organisational form to provide the opportunity for citizens to be democratically involved in collective decisions (Dryzek 1997: 201). In networks, individuals and groups develop norms of openness, respect and reciprocity that he regards as essential for deliberation (Dryzek 2000a: 134). The networks can link aggrieved communities, sympathetic activists, service delivery, information, research and advocacy organisations and a wide variety of local interpretations and viewpoints. In this way, the conceptions of deliberative democracy link to one of the notions of associative democracy – that groups within civil society can act as a source of countervailing power against state authority or other concentrated interests (Fung 2003: 522).

Besides linking with observations about networks and an enhanced role for civil society, Dryzek’s work is pertinent to this thesis because he introduces considerations of scope and scale that have also been highlighted in descriptions of contemporary forms of governances. Specifically, he claims one virtue of deliberation is its relevance at various scales – from community, through regional and national, to international – particularly for issues that transcend boundaries (whether geographic, political, institutional, sectoral or functional) (Dryzek 1996: 146; Dryzek 2000a: 175). A second advantage he claims for discursive or deliberative democracy is its ability to cope with highly complex social problems because it can effectively integrate diverse information and perspectives (Dryzek 1996: 146).

Dryzek’s conception of democracy is ‘the construction of public opinion through the contestation of discourses and its transmission to the state via communicative means’ (Dryzek 2000a: 4). This draws attention to discourse as a central concept and it will be considered further below. Although sometimes used interchangeably with dialogue, a discourse is a systematically-organised way of speaking about something that contains, reinforces and constructs a set of normative expectations about social behaviours and relationships (Wooffitt 2005: 149). In Wooffitt’s words, ‘discourses facilitate and enable, limit and constrain how we participate in social life’ (2005: 148). Hence discourses are more than just language and can be understood as:
Multiple and competing sets of ideas and concepts which are produced, reproduced and transformed in everyday practices, and through which the material and social world is given meaning. … discourses frame the possibilities of thought, communication and action (Richardson 2002: 354).

**Empowered Participatory Governance**

The interface of such theoretical directions with empirical instances led Fung and Wright (2003b) to propose a model of empowered participatory governance (EPG). Their model of EPG has three institutional design properties (Fung and Wright 2003b: 20-23):

- devolution of public decision authority to empowered local units;
- centralised supervision and coordination through creation of formal linkages of responsibility, resource-distribution and communication with central authorities; and
- new state institutions to support and guide governance processes.

As well, three distinctive operational principles are associated with practical examples of the model (Fung and Wright 2003: 16-19). First, they operate with grass-roots involvement of a range of citizens and officials within a sub-national space, such as a locality or region. Second, they take a practical, problem-solving focus to the challenges and options for the locality’s future. Third, they employ deliberative decision-making processes. What this model highlights is the importance of institutional factors in creating a normative environment for collaboration with new opportunities for agency beyond the state and market. In this conception of democratic governance, state institutions are ‘harnessed’ to civic organisations, and popular participation is institutionalised in a reconstituted model of governance (Fung and Wright 2003b). The concept of EPG provides a convenient analytical tool, highlighting some key dimensions for distinguishing the diverse ‘relational geometries of the state, market and associational sectors’ (Lovan et al. 2004: 3). It also directly addresses the issue of power by proposing that fairly balanced power relations are a background enabling condition for EPG and for deliberation (Fung and Wright 2003b: 23). This balance, they suggest, can be achieved in a number of ways including through institutional design and through collaborative countervailing
power\textsuperscript{7}. This concept of the need for robust countervailing power (Fung and Wright 2003b: 266) and the distinction between adversarial forms and sources of such power and what they call ‘collaborative countervailing power’ (Fung and Wright 2003b: 280), are particularly relevant to this research. Their recognition that the EPG model is vulnerable to problems of power and domination acknowledges common criticisms of deliberative democracy (Fung and Wright 2003b: 33). Through many empirical examples they suggest the challenge for EPG is not a naïve ideal of neutralizing power, but rather how to ensure countervailing power suitable for collaborative governance is exercised (Fung and Wright 2003b: 266-7).

**Collaborative Planning**

The theoretical propositions of deliberative democracy, and related debates about the influence of institutions and processes on democracy and people’s empowerment, have been applied in studies of specific tasks of governance such as urban and regional planning. An early pluralist theory of planning emerged from political economy theorists seeking to address distributional inequities (examples include Gans 1968; Sandercock 1975b). They emphasized the importance of consultation and participation in urban and regional planning. More recently, the widely recognized ‘collaborative turn’ (Allmendinger 2002; Fainstein 2003; Harris 2002) in the field of planning theory echoes many of the features of deliberative democracy. This is evident in collaborative planners’ focus on strategies for inclusions and argumentation and in their attention to institutional design as approached by new institutionalists (Healey 1997: 35). Healey (1997), Forester (1999), Innes (1995), and, in Australia, Yiftachel (1995) and Gleeson and Low (2000), have made significant contributions to the development and application of planning models that are inclusive and sensitive to social and ecological imperatives and are based on dialogue, deliberation, collaboration and the reciprocal sharing of different kinds of knowledge. Yiftachel (1995: 254) characterizes the transition in planning that parallels the disillusionment with social and liberal democracy as shifting emphasis from ‘planning for control, containment, exclusion and deprivation onto planning for emancipation, inclusion, empowerment and equity’.

\textsuperscript{7} This form of power is exercised through collaborative relationships and practices. It challenges actors with privileged access to decision-making resources (Fung and Wright 2003: 282).
Patsy Healey’s *Collaborative Planning* (1997) is the quintessential account of this model. It rejects modernist notions of planning – as espoused, most recently, by Powell (2003) – as a professional, objective and technical activity. Instead, it emphasizes the importance of dialogue between diverse actors in a network to reach a collective consensus at a decentralised scale. Her vision involves collaborative relationships between stakeholders in a territory, such as a region, and advocates a central role for planning bodies that adopt communicative, consensus-building processes and foster a collaborative governance culture. She uses the term ‘collaborative planning’ to describe a process of collective learning by which stakeholders agree on action to manage their co-existence in shared spaces that expresses their mutual interests. Conceptualising this process relies on an understanding of ‘the relational webs or networks in which we live our lives’ (Healey 1997: 57 emphasis in original). These networks and relationships are embedded in past experience, culture, and social structures. In this endorsement of networks and emphasis on learning, collaborative planning resonates with the analytical-descriptive body of work discussed above. Another relevant feature of this model is that it suggests a ‘vast range of knowledge’ (Gleeson and Low 2000: 189) is relied on in making planning decisions. The alternative sources of knowledge include professional, bureaucratic and ‘lay’ knowledge – the credibility of all of them needing to be justified through inclusive argumentation in the characteristic deliberative processes (Gleeson and Low 2000: 188).

In discussing collaborative approaches to public administration more generally, Kernaghan (1993) identified various factors that predispose to successful collaboration. He suggests there need to be clear and limited objectives; suitable formal structures and processes; the inclusion of all significant stakeholders; mutual dependence among the partners; and empowering and synergistic effects of collaboration. These prerequisites are consistent with both the EPG model and collaborative planning.

*Communicative traditions: common ground*

Theories of deliberative democracy, EPG and collaborative planning all reinforce a focus on trust and norms, as well as recognition of associations as key governance
actors, and networks as the institutional form of governance. These represent some of the areas of overlap with analytical-descriptive governance studies outlined above (Papadopoulos 2002). These features also indicate that studies of governance need not be state-centric and can address both structure and process. Key questions addressed by the normative approaches considered in preceding sections include: (i) Who should have a voice in governance? (ii) What procedures represent best practice for planning and governance? (iii) What are the democratic problems and potentials of different modes of governance? (iv) What are the sources of governance failure and conditions of governance success? This research focus is similar to what Sorensen and Torfing (2004: 11) call a second generation of governance research.

Normative models of governance like collaborative planning are criticized on a number of counts. The time-consuming nature of the participatory processes and the uncritical celebratory tendencies are said to result in a gap between rhetoric and action (Fainstein 2003: 180; Jessop 1997: 96). As well, they are regarded as over-emphasising procedures and neglecting content during deliberations. To some extent these criticisms rely on contested understandings of Habermas’s propositions and those of subsequent theorists in this tradition. For example the ‘proceduralist’ accusation results from the emphasis on process and disciplined practices in deliberations (Gutmann and Thompson 2004: 9). This implies they rely too much on rigidly defined democratic processes and communicative conditions – but Habermas, himself, specified that deliberative politics ‘cannot rely solely on the channels of procedurally regulated deliberation and decision-making’ (Habermas 1996a: 308). The disciplined set of practices emphasized in deliberative democracy is not regarded as an end in itself but is judged more effective than majoritarian votes, or other alternatives, for arriving at just and rational decisions (Gutmann and Thompson 2004). Critics of deliberative processes also suggest that they unnecessarily encourage divisive debate and extremist views, although paradoxically, deliberative processes are also charged with ignoring the inevitability of conflict (Gutmann and Thompson 2004: 53). Likewise, the possibility of minimizing coercion and
manipulation is disputed. Hillier’s conception of agonistic planning\(^8\) (Hillier 2002a: 111) is one example of attempts to reconcile the communicative practices of deliberation and the strategic exercise of power. In addition, Chambers (1996: 157) has noted that poststructuralists, for instance, see the privileging of agreement over disagreement as a type of disciplinary action to erase difference. Some, for example Gutmann and Thompson (2004), regard it as possible to cultivate respect, reciprocity and trust under certain conditions even between people with conflicting interests and viewpoints. Others, however, feel that mutual distrust and suspicion are unlikely to mellow where pluralism, entrenched differences and incompatibilities exist, so that it is simplistic to believe in resolution of conflict (Mouffe 1996; Young 2000). They reject as equally illusory the idea of unanimous decisions based only on reason, arguing that there is always more involved (for example emotion and power plays). This thesis follows van Stokkom (2005: 388) in assuming that emotions and power dynamics cannot be excluded from interactive deliberation and that it is fruitful to understand how they operate. These debates draw attention to the major criticism of deliberative democracy – that, in claiming to minimise coercion, resolve conflict and reach consensus it gives an inadequate account of power (Fainstein 2003: 190; Flyvbjerg 1998a; Flyvbjerg 1998b; Harris 2002; Hillier 2002b).

Although collaborative planning, EPG and deliberative democracy have roots in critical theory traditions and associated idealistic desires ‘to ameliorate oppressive social structures’ (Harris 2002: 28), these theories are charged in such terms with tending to erase power asymmetries, conflict and difference, largely because they embody values of equality and consensus. This is particularly argued in the case of Habermas’s foundational work:

Habermas’s utopian world is oriented towards an ideal speech situation where validity claims are based on consensus amongst equal participants, and the negative, distorting effects of power are removed (Flyvbjerg and Richardson 2002: 46).

---

\(^8\) Agonistic argument allows the full expression of conflicting views but in ways that utilise conflict resolution strategies and limit the use of abusively confrontational antagonistic behaviour (Hillier 2002a: 122).
This criticism can best be explained by recognizing the different ways of conceiving of power. On the one hand, power is viewed as a deterministic entity. On the other, it is not a finite property, but rather a strategy, operating through social relationships with both positive and negative potential (Foucault 1980a: 159). The specific conceptions of power applied in this thesis are elaborated in the next section. Habermas (1996a) reappraised the model of deliberative democracy, and subsequent re-workings by other theorists have further refined it. Proponents acknowledge the grounds for many criticisms of deliberation but assert that the reflexivity and iteration inherent in deliberative processes at least problematises these issues (Gutmann and Thompson 2004: 43).

Despite these limitations, many of the elements of deliberative democracy, EPG and collaborative planning provide valuable sensitizing concepts for this thesis. It adopts a ‘tolerant’ interpretation of deliberative democracy, closest to that of Dryzek (2000a: 1) and the broad points of difference between this and social and liberal democracy are the most salient features. This adds to the typology of three forms of governance provided by the conventional descriptive analyses outlined earlier in the chapter. The shortcomings of both of these approaches and the lack of relationship between them in terms of recognizing the democratic character of various forms of governance (Papadopoulos 2002; Sorensen and Torfing 2004) can be addressed by considering the third approach that also allows us to address the exercise of power beyond the state.

The ‘analytics of government’ approach: a focus on mentalities

The third approach to theorizing governance seeks to dissect and interrogate both the appearances (that are the focus of the descriptive approach) and the shaping ambitions and conceptions of good governance (that are the substance of normative scholars’ works). Inspired by some of the later work of Foucault, a number of studies have extended conventional understanding of the practices of governing, such as planning, by highlighting the rationalities, techniques and styles of government involved and how these embody specific governmental goals. Foucault’s legacy is not so much a theory of government, as a productive way of approaching the study of
governance based on his reflections about the art of government which he termed ‘governmentality’ (Dean 1997: 385). Foucault’s term ‘governmentality’ combines the notions ‘govern’ and ‘mentality’ and he wrote of it as, ‘the ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this…complex form of power’ (Foucault 1991a: 102). This approach encourages us to examine the kind of power used to control and manage the conduct of citizens in spheres of activity that were not traditionally subjected to direct state intervention. In this respect the governmentality work built on Foucault’s earlier analyses of power – for example in Discipline and Punish (1979) – which introduced some basic understandings of power. Notable among these was the notion that power is not a possession or entity, but a dynamic force inherent in the relationships through which it is exercised. The governmentality work extends the examination of the exercise of power over the individual to examine the exercise of political power over the whole population or citizenry and how self-government and government of others became bound up in political forms of power exercised under liberalism (Cheshire 2006). As well, Foucault addressed government itself as practices and regarded these practices as enabled and justified by specific rationalities (Gordon 2000: xxiii). These practices are not limited to those of the state. They are diverse and refer to:

[T]he deliberations, strategies, tactics and devices employed by authorities for making up and acting upon a population and its constituents to ensure good and avert ill (Rose 1996a: 328).

In other words, this third approach draws attention to the ways of thinking that are embodied in specific attempts to govern, rather than offering a new theory of the state. This is particularly so since it treats government, not in the conventional sense as the preserve of state institutions, but as the conduct of conduct, or shaping of conduct by a myriad of agents and practices throughout society (Burchell 1996: 19; Marinetto 2003: 103). Because of the use of ‘power’ and ‘government’ almost interchangeably – with both operating to shape or influence the behaviour of others (Gordon 1991: 2) – this work allows an examination of the exercise of political power by everyone who seeks to conduct the conduct of others, not just state actors. Embedded in, and forged by, the various organised practices and techniques they
employ for governing is their thinking about government. It is this collective thinking about ways of governing that is the primary concern of this approach, which is known as ‘an analytics of government’. An ‘analytics of government’ or governmentality approach (Dean 1999a: 10; Rose 1999; Rose and Miller 1992) allows an evaluation of the ways entities, such as institutions and networks, are imbued with authority and power, the ways in which various actors exercise power, and how the regional domain is ‘constituted as governable and administrable’ (Dean, 1999: 29). The rationalities, or justifications the state and others employ to promote particular forms and practices of governance, are also a focus of study. The object of an analytics of government is not to describe institutions, structures, functions and routines but rather to diagnose ‘an array of lines of thought, of will, of invention, of programmes and failure, of acts and counter-acts’ (Rose 1999: 21). This concentration on how governing structures and processes are thought about, draws attention to ideas about how to govern that are the central concern of an analytics of government (Dean 1999a: 23).

The collective thinking about how to govern has also been called a ‘mentality’ of government (Dean 1999a: 16). It involves, in turn, conceptualisations of the art of government that include ideas about who and what to govern, and what techniques and practices should be used to govern well or to improve government (Dean 1997; Gordon 1991). It is evident from the discussion above that such an approach examines the process of governing and considers a number of dimensions such as networks of rule; the exercise of power; discourses of government; technologies (including administrative practices) employed to shape conduct; the rationalities or logic or justifications for these, and, finally, the mentality of government (governmentality) which is the sum of all these dimensions. In so far as such a mentality offers a conception of the project or problem of government – how to govern effectively, to govern better – it relates to concepts illuminated by normative models. As well, a mentality of rule is evident primarily from the appearances and empirical manifestations highlighted by descriptive scholars.

This focus on mentalities has a number of implications. First, it has been claimed that ‘mentalities of government contain a strangely utopian element’ (Dean 1999a: 33). In this respect there is, as previously stated, a connection with the normative theories
since both profess values about improved government. Governmentality studies scrutinize these values as part of the rhetorical practice of government in the same way as different forms of knowledge and different tactics are examined. That is to say, an analytics of government seeks to enhance understanding of how the values function, and the consequences they have, rather than evaluate them in the manner of normative approaches.

A second implication is the attention that must be paid to discourses of government which are regarded as an integral part of the workings of government (Dean 1999a: 26). Rather than a state-centric analysis, Foucault (1980b: 194) advocates examining the

… thoroughly heterogenous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulative decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions … the system of relations that can be established between these elements.

Discourses, or shared ways of apprehending the world (Dryzek 1997: 8), rest on assumptions and judgements and are embedded in social practices, social relations and also in language. Key rhetorical terms do not just represent, or describe, social relations but actually allow particular practices to operate (Richardson 2002). Ananalytics of government approach is not primarily concerned with language as a field of meaning, but with how language functions, what it makes possible, and what it mobilizes (Rose 1999: 29). Discourse is not just about language, it is also about practice and social action since it does not just define what we can say, but what we know and do as well. Foucault therefore introduces the idea of discursive practices to convey that, through discourse, power becomes embodied in various techniques, institutions and social practices (Foucault 1986: 223). Such institutionalised social conventions (both formal and informal; structural and procedural) are produced by (and embedded in) discourses and provide the context that shapes social action. Examining political behaviour involves recognising interrelations and articulations between and among various discourses existing at particular sites. These multiple discourses have dynamic relations with each other (Deetz 1992: 265). While it is hard for people who subscribe to different discourses to comprehend each other,
‘interchange across discourse boundaries can occur’ (Dryzek 1997: 8). In circumstances where reflexivity is encouraged, questioning of ‘previously taken-for-granted forces of social control such as discourses’ is more likely (Dryzek 2000a: 163).

A third implication of the analytics of government is that the operation of political power is a core concern of this approach to conceptualising government (Miller and Rose 1995: 591). Because there is interplay of power and knowledge within and between discourses, this links to the previous point about a focus on discourse. It also flows from the understanding of governmentality as associated with a complex form of power as mentioned above (Dean 1999a). Foucault (1990) argues that communication is always permeated by power and highlights the role of power, knowledge and language in affecting decisions and outcomes. This particular perspective views power as inextricably linked to the production of truth and knowledge within discourse (Foucault 2000b: 112). It also recognises knowledge, truth, rationality and validity as qualities attributed to, or bestowed upon, statements and arguments rather than inherent to them (Richardson 1996: 282). This is because the ‘truth’ of any particular social situation is discursively constructed in the very process of articulating ‘knowledge’ about it (Foucault 1986: 229). Consequently, the truth-claims made by various actors and authorities are significant discursive strategies. As well, accumulation of knowledge about a particular object or subject enhances the ability to govern it or exert power over it. This knowledge-truth-power nexus is a significant element of Foucault’s work.

This distinctive treatment of power is a defining feature of the analytics of government approach. Power operates in two directions (not just from rulers to ruled); is regarded as a capacity to influence, operating dynamically through social interactions rather than as a finite property held by one actor, including the state; and is the outcome of relationships and actions rather than the cause. It takes many forms, operates in multiple directions, and is exercised from innumerable points (Foucault 1990: 93-94; Foucault 2003b: 265-66). Modern forms of power are about managing and regulating people in their aggregate form – as a population – and about this population being seen as both docile and economically useful (Foucault 1979: 138). This can, however, involve harnessing the self-management and self-
regulation of individuals to achieve the desired social behaviours. As well, Foucauldian scholars characterise contemporary patterns of rule as dispersed, with political power exercised through a profusion of shifting alliances between diverse authorities, rather than centralised (Rose and Miller 1992: 174). Foucault’s (1979) notion of power as pervasive with mechanisms of power extending beyond the confines of particular institutions contrasts with the notions of power applied in other traditions. This understanding of power is said to provide both an alternative and a complement to collaborative planning theories (Harris 2002: 30). As mentioned above, the normative theories of democracy have been criticised for underestimating or ignoring power, conflict and partisanship or conceiving of it in a ‘have or have-not’ fashion as stable, negative, one-dimensional and top-down (Richardson 1996: 285). Authors like Yiftachel (1995), Richardson (1996), Flyvbjerg (1998b) and Hillier (2002b), have attempted to overcome this by importing Foucauldian concepts into planning theory.

Jean Hillier (2002b) and Bent Flyvbjerg (1998a; 1998b) for example, have assessed the similarities, complementarities and theoretical disjunctions between approaches derived from Habermas and those derived from Foucault. They conclude that, despite some inadequacies in the normative theory of deliberative democracy with respect to analysis of power relations, it is useful to retain some elements of deliberative democratic models and supplement them with a Foucauldian-informed understanding of power and discourse (Hillier 2002b: 67). This is intended to recognize the role of both communicative practices and power-plays in governance activities like planning. This is not to suggest an easy assimilation of these ideas since most analysts suggest this poses challenges and Richardson (1996) argues that many attempts to link such contradictory positions as those of Foucault and Habermas are inadequate. While these theorists have incorporated Foucauldian notions of power and made the distinction between ‘power-as-entity’ and ‘power-as-strategies-and-tactics’ (Flyvbjerg 1998b: 6), they have not focused directly on the mentalities of rule and asked ‘What “governmental rationalities” are at work when those who govern govern?’ (Flyvbjerg 2001: 131). They have recognized the operation of the kinds of power implied by governmentality, but not that broader issue of the framing mentalities.
Nikolas Rose and Mitchell Dean for example, examine this issue of the framing mentalities. Their work, alone or with others, is a development of Foucault’s concept of ‘governmentality’ (Foucault 1991a). These theorists analyse political power in terms of the ‘problematics of government’ (Rose and Miller 1992). The characterization of their conceptual analysis as a problematics of government underlines their concern with the ways actors and authorities have asked themselves questions about how to conduct government, govern conduct and govern better (Dean 1999a; Rose 1993). It identifies political discourse and discursive practices as the vehicles for expressing the answers to these problems and rendering the task of government thinkable (O'Malley 1998: 157). These writers focus mainly on the ‘multifarious forms’ (Dean 1999b: 174) of, specifically, a liberal rationality of rule and especially what Rose (1996a) calls advanced liberalism. Advanced liberalism implies a method of government in the post-welfare era that embraces principles of both liberal democracy and neo-liberalism. A key difference between this and earlier forms of liberalism is that advanced liberalism requires some contrivance of people’s behaviour rather than relying on spontaneous, free action (Burchell 1996). Advanced liberal rule redefines liberalism so as to govern autonomous, free individuals indirectly in the context of their social allegiances (Rose 1996b). There is a redefinition of free citizens as people who can be active in their own regulation and whose social affiliations and obligations can be ‘celebrated, encouraged, nurtured, shaped and instrumentalised’ (Rose 1996a: 335) so that they behave responsibly in accordance with governmental objectives. So government is simultaneously curtailed and extended into ‘private’ areas (Hunter 1998). In their analysis, these theorists depict advanced liberalism as a form of political practice where power operates through a range of relationships and indirect mechanisms that harness individual autonomy to political objectives of efficiency, competition and entrepreneurship. This exercise of power indirectly aligns individual conduct with state will and has been referred to as ‘action at a distance’ (Miller and Rose 1990: 9; Rose 1993: 292; Rose and Miller 1992: 180).

Much of the empirical application of the concept of governmentality has focused on the way authorities and agencies (often, but not always, state ones) shape and direct the conduct of individuals and groups such as welfare recipients or the gay community (Dean 1998; Dowsett 1998; Henman 1997). Governmentality approaches
have also been applied to studies of regional governance (Ward and McNicholas 1998), local economic governance (MacKinnon 2000), regional development agencies in the UK (Painter 2002), self-help community development in rural towns (Cheshire 2006), natural resource management (Higgins and Lockie 2002) and to planning as a practice of social regulation and control (Gunder 2003; Huxley 2002). The latter application accords to planning the status Foucault (2000a: 350) gave to urban planning as an integral part of the art of government. He said,

[T]he cities, with the problems they raised, and the particular forms that they took, served as the models for the governmental rationality that was to apply to the whole of the territory (Foucault 2000a: 351).

This body of work attends to political rationalities and technologies. It basically portrays governance as a system of economic and social management that is ‘a pervasive and heterogeneous activity undertaken at a multiplicity of sites’ (Dean and Hindess 1998: 12). The state is simply one element in multiple power relations connecting diverse authorities and actors (Rose 1999: 5). This notion, of power operating at a multiplicity of sites and in multiple directions, connects to the conception of society as a network of autonomous institutions and organisations both within and beyond the domain of formal political authority. These political and other spheres are nevertheless conceived as acting in dynamic alliances to govern all aspects of economic and social life without direct regulation by the state. Hence, Rose and Miller (1992: 176) observe:

To the extent that the modern state ‘rules’, it does so on the basis of an elaborate network of relations formed amongst the complex of institutions, organizations and apparatuses that make it up, and between state and non-state institutions.

In assessing the strength of governmentality analyses, Dean (2002: 132) highlights the focus on key conceptual elements, notably, ‘the actual rationalities and techniques through which the contemporary liberal government of the state is accomplished.’ As a framework for analysis, the analytics of government, outlined above, studies more than rationalities and techniques. It examines:
…mutations along four axes of government: its objects, its subjects, its explanatory regimes (rationalities), [and] its techniques and technologies (Rose 2000: 1408).

In other words it provides a means to inspect ideas – and possible changes in them – about who and what is governed, as well as the justifying reasons and institutional and other mechanisms employed in governing. In brief, the closely interrelated elements associated with an analytics of government include the general, framing, problematics of government as well as rationalities and technologies. Taken together, these three interrelated elements profile a mentality of government (or governing, or rule). As the mentality of government constituted by CQANM is the focus of this thesis, these concepts warrant brief elaboration.

The problematics of government direct attention to particular problematisations, or questions that actors and authorities ask, concerning how to conduct government and govern conduct (Dean 1999a: 27). To analyse the way government is reflexively thought about and practiced, it is necessary to examine the discursive construction of the problems confronted in this questioning process. They include conceptions of the field to be governed (both the territory and the objects of rule), the intentions (or objectives) of government, and the actors and agencies through whom government is accomplished. This element of the mentality involves examining how the world is construed as a set of problems to which specific patterns of collective action will provide the answers. These problematics of government are evident in the discourses that specify the areas of social and political life that are taken to be problematic and within the scope of government, just as they shape conceptions of the proper ways of addressing the problems, and also of the distribution of the tasks among diverse actors and authorities. That is to say, discursive practices embody answers to questions about what governing is such as:
  
  - What or who should be governed and to what end? (objectives of governing)
  - What is within the competence of governing authorities and what is not? (scope of government)
  - What should be the territorial or spatial focus? (scale of government)
Who should govern? (institutional forms and key actors)
What means are to be used? (technologies of rule)
How is each of these justified? (rationalities of rule)

The many ways of posing and answering these questions provide a set of normative reflections about the art of government and about good governance (Gordon 1991: 3).

Just as the nature of the reality that government has to address is questioned, so are the appropriate methods of government. This directs our attention to a second element – governmental technologies. These are the ‘procedures through which authorities seek to embody and give effect to governmental ambitions’ (Rose and Miller 1992: 175). These practices, mechanisms, instruments and tactics, implement the system of thought encompassed in political rationalities (Dean 1999a: 31). They can include programs, administrative practices, and the range of techniques – such as workshops, consultation processes and funding schemes – employed to exercise power and bring about a particular vision of society. Indeed they encompass all the activities through which political authorities seek to shape the conduct and aspirations of others to achieve the outcomes they regard as desirable (Miller and Rose 1990: 8). In studying the organised practices and characteristic routines through which people and places are governed, the aim is not simply an empirical description of them, but an understanding of how they operate to form knowledge, produce discourses, constitute relations of power and build institutions (Albrechts 2003: 264; Dean 1999a: 18).

Finally, any mentality is an attempt to rationalise the nature, aims and limits for exercising power; the specific styles of governing adopted, as well as the instruments, techniques and practices to which they are linked (Rose 1999: 28). These ways authorities reason about governing are called rationalities and they provide a third valuable analytical tool given the fact that the focus is on mentalities, and that both problematics and technologies direct attention to how they are justified. Political rationalities are the discourses of particular ways of ruling and the relatively systematic logic that is embodied in the practices adopted to govern. Rationalities form part of the ways in which we think about and act upon our own conduct and the conduct of others (Barry et al. 1996: 7) as they express justifications for particular
ways of governing and exercising power (Rose and Miller 1992: 175). They are also articulated in relation to a particular understanding of the spaces, persons, problems and objects to be governed (that is, the problematics of government). Furthermore, rationalities are characterized by regularities and have a distinctive idiom or language (Rose 1999: 26). This last characteristic explains the imperative to focus on discourse and hence to explore the way power and knowledge operate to imbue these justifications with truth.

A mentality of government is a cluster of discourses about good governance expressed in shared way of speaking about, practising and communicating ideas of governing. That is why it was argued earlier that the context of discourse and discursive practices provides a focus of the analysis. The next section will assess how, in examining the discursive practices of CQANM, the specific elements profiled here will be used as a framework for analyzing mentalities and their constituent elements – problematics, technologies and rationalities – in later chapters.

The value of examining mentalities of government for this research

There are a number of advantages of the analytics of government approach, with its focus on mentalities. It has resulted in powerful and richly textured analyses of the rationalities of government associated with liberalism and it constitutes a significant advance on the more conventional treatment of liberalism as political ideology (Burchell 1997: 374; Hindess 1997b: 269). This is partly because analyses of liberalism as an ideology assume a consistency and mutual coherence of ideas, whereas analysing the mentality reveals contradictions between elements (Gordon 1991: 18). These studies have extended understanding of liberal and neo-liberal rationalities and the exercise of state power by focusing on the state’s discourses and techniques for governing the conduct of its citizens (Dean 2002: 132; O'Malley 1998: 158, 162). Theorists using governmentality as an analytical framework are not satisfied with rich, descriptive interpretations, nor with filling explanatory gaps left by more idealised models. They seek to provide insights about complex interrelationships and the ideas and practices that frame programs of government. A focus on mentalities is particularly valuable in dynamic situations, for detecting ‘the changing shape of the thinkable’ (Gordon 1991: 8). Dean (1999a) has argued that an
analytics of government is well suited to developing an understanding of empirical governance situations since the other approaches have little to say about the interplay of discourse, power and knowledge. As well, the analytics of government approach builds on the other perspectives since, on the one hand, its empirical grounding ensures a connection to the appearances that dominate the descriptive perspective. On the other hand, by interrogating these, and considering the mentalities of government, the ambitions and ideals of actors (that normative scholars focus on) – and additionally their impact – are not overlooked. Hence, for instance, this approaches extends understanding of the distinctions between state, market and network governance by drawing attention to the way these various sites of authority are discursively constructed and justified. Advanced liberalism constitutes society or community as an alternative mode of governing to hierarchies or markets. Rose’s (2000: 1400) analysis, for example, shows that:

[I]ncreasingly, it is the language of community that is used to identify a territory between the authority of the state, the free and amoral exchange of the market, and the liberty of the autonomous, rights-bearing individual.

Using an analytics of government framework to give an account of planning and governance appeals for a number of reasons. First, because it recognizes the ubiquity of power relations and directs attention to the ways power is exercised in social relationships. A second attraction is that the approach facilitates scrutiny of several of the old oppositions and dichotomies in the field such as those between state and civil society or powerful and powerless. It sees these as discursive constructions of a particular mentality of government (Burchell 1991). Finally, it provides the opportunity to look beyond the state and examine practices, techniques and justifications (and the logic inherent in them) that are likely to be overlooked in a study that focuses on political institutions alone (Dean 1994: 176). Because of these advantages, this thesis will apply the concepts outlined above in relation to the specific problems and practices of regional planning and governance.

By analysing an example of regional governance in terms of the concepts of governmentality, this thesis explores a theoretical answer to the research question posed in Chapter One: How can we understand the mentalities of rule – or clusters of
discourses about good governance – embodied in a recent example of regional governance in Queensland? Figure 3.1 summarises the components of the analytics of government framework adopted for later analysis and suggests how they link to the research question.

Figure 3.1 Conceptual framework to examine mentalities of rule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual element</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Link to research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problematics</td>
<td>Reflections about the problems of governing including:</td>
<td>What understandings are inherent in the mentality about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>What is the task and intention of governing?</td>
<td>What are the goals of governing some conduct?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>What territory needs governing?</td>
<td>What is the spatial focus of government?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects of rule (scope)</td>
<td>Who or what needs governing?</td>
<td>What functions should be governed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors/ Players</td>
<td>Who has a role in governing?</td>
<td>Who should govern?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologies</td>
<td>What are the routines, practices and techniques used for governing and how do they operate?</td>
<td>What means are to be used to govern?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalities</td>
<td>The logic and justifications inherent in particular ways of governing (both discourses and practices).</td>
<td>How are answers to each of the questions above justified?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theorising and analysing mentalities as clusters of discourses makes new insights about planning and governance possible. Caution is necessary though, since confusion has resulted from failure to distinguish between different meanings of the term discourse within the various theoretical traditions outlined here. In particular, the views of Habermas and Foucault have been contrasted though they have similarities in that both are concerned with analysis of systematically distorted communication and language, and with unmasking and challenging power in political and social relations (Forester 1989: 238 note 9). Both Habermasian and Foucauldian scholars view language as an integral component of social practices.
(including ways of governing), and both recognise that dialogue and persuasion can be a form of force and coercion (Dahlberg 2005: 121-125; Foucault 1981: 67).

However, there are significant differences. For Foucault and his followers, discourse is the form of social power in language and action – it conditions, enables and limits the way people think, act and communicate (Richardson 2002). In the theory of Habermas, discourse has a contrasting connotation. It is communication that provides the means of transcending or resisting control by raising and challenging arguments (Dryzek 2000a: vi; Fainstein 2003; Pusey 1991: 285; Stahl 2004). The point of difference is really over the different ways in which power operates through discourse and the extent to which people are prisoners of the discourses that have shaped them. This thesis does not propose to engage in the polarised philosophical debate that has been explored at length elsewhere (see for example Dean 1999b; Kelly 1994; Kulynych 1997; McCarthy 1990). It will examine the discursive field in a Foucauldian sense – that is the language and practices that provide the parameters of thought and action. In doing so, it anticipates finding how discourses about the problems of governing became inscribed in a particular mode of governance (Dryzek 2000a). Both perspectives contribute to an understanding of the politics in Central Queensland as a struggle between multiple agents, mobilising often conflicting discursive resources to shape their regional planning program (Dean 1999a: 66).

The work of governmentality scholars therefore provides a substantial basis for the theoretical perspective of this thesis, and explains the focus on ‘mentalities’ as the primary heuristic tool for capturing various dimensions of the rhetoric and practice of regional governance. However, there are some silences in such studies, and some ways in which they discount features identified in the current research, that suggest an adaptation or extension of this exploratory device with other conceptual tools. Governmentality, for all its emphasis on the dispersal of power beyond the state is not particularly explicit about democracy (Dean 1999b: 166), so it is valuable to extend the analysis to address concepts from democratic theorists.

There is also a reason to extend the analysis in terms of governmentality to explicitly address some of the empirical appearances highlighted in analytical-descriptive approaches such as the involvement of non-state actors. This directs attention beyond
the state apparatus of government to the full range of social and power relations (Delanty 1999: 104). While there are currents in all three traditions to recognise non-state actors, the state remains their main concern as Dryzek (1996: 35) has argued about democracy theory. In addition, Dean (2002: 132) says many governmentality studies focus on state actions and mentalities. As a consequence he argues they replicate normative and descriptive findings and also focus on one kind of power – the top-down, indirect, ‘action at a distance’ by state authorities – rather than considering ‘multiple zones of power’ (Dean 2002: 134). Instead of considering only relations between society and the state (Gordon 1991: 4) this analysis will examine the diverse relations established among and between political and other authorities. It will consider the various alliances, struggles and competitions between groups and the various forms of knowledge inscribed in institutions, practices and relations.

The conceptual framework for the thesis is therefore based on determining the mentality of rule according to the elements identified in Figure 3.1. However it takes a second cue from democracy scholars in recognising the distinct discursive practices associated with various forms of democracy – social, liberal or deliberative. It will aim to understand how these can be understood in terms of a mentality of governing. Thirdly, it uses some concepts from analytical-descriptive accounts that provide, as Dean (2002: 132) has observed, detailed accounts of current forms of governance where horizontal networks displace systems of hierarchy and command. These have not, however, examined the mentalities of the different modes of governance identified in, for example, Rhodes’s taxonomy. This thesis therefore employs concepts such as hierarchical, market and networked governance, but interprets them within the framework of an analytics of government. This allows a focus on the way different social groups and actors conceived of the problems of governing and how those conceptions shaped the practices and interrelationships in Central Queensland. It opens new ways of understanding both government as a political contest of discourses and also the forms of thought that shaped both democratic techniques and also relationships in networks of rule (Rabinow and Rose 2003: xxii). This research therefore engages with, and elaborates upon, previous studies with respect to the discourses, rationalities and technologies involved in a regional planning process. It also introduces a number of elements of other conceptual approaches that resonate with the data and with the research question. In doing so, it deepens understanding of
the broader governance arrangements within which the governmental role of the state is located in contemporary Australian society.

**A synthetic conceptual framework**

Rose (1999: 19) has warned that ‘the ethos of analytics of governmentality is very different from that of sociologies of governance’. However, other theorists, undaunted by apparent incompatibilities, see value in synthetic frameworks of analysis that make use of concepts drawn from the other two approaches. In general terms, Hirst (2000: 30) argues that ‘analysis and normative hypotheses need to go together in any worthwhile political theorizing’. More specifically, Colebatch (2002: 430) suggests that both governmentality and more traditional perspectives contribute to a sophisticated analysis and, as mentioned at the start of this chapter, Sibeon (2003: 13) specifically refers to the need to explore links between work on governance, deliberative democracy and governmentality. This thesis begins to address the theoretical omission he identifies, by adopting an analytics of government approach, but incorporating certain concepts and empirical treatments from other sociological approaches. By using an analytical lens that makes intelligible the mentality of an instance of regional governance, it retains the governmental concern to be:

[D]iagnostic rather than descriptive … seek an open and critical relation to strategies for governing, attentive to their presuppositions, their assumptions, their exclusions, their naiveties and their knaveries, their regimes of vision and their spots of blindness’ (Rose 1999: 19).

In addition, it aims to position that account in relation to others that are familiar from broad taxonomies of governance (as hierarchical, market or networked) and democracy (as social, liberal or deliberative). These classifications link with much of the language of politics – state and civil society, freedom and constraint, public and private, legitimacy and democracy. The descriptive and normative implications of the discourses will help identify the form of governance in practice. However those classifications are not adequate tools for analysing the mentality of a program of government, so the analysis will also identify the intrinsic problematic, rationalities
and technologies. Together, these concepts provide a frame of reference which is operationally relevant to examining changes in governance. The framework proposed here complements, rather than substitutes for, other valuable analyses and theorising. For example, it complements the recent work of Sorensen and Torfing (2004; 2005) that brings together concepts of network governance, democracy theory and governmentality analytics to evaluate the democratic potential and problems of governance networks. Rather than forming a composite theory, this thesis deploys various analytical concepts in relation to one another. It thereby adds a new dimension to our understanding of traditional typologies in diagnosing their inherent mentalities. At the same time, it extends understandings of forms of political rationality to reflect on the practices and institutional forms of contemporary representative democracy and on the thinking about democracy, in ways not explicitly undertaken by Foucault or his successors to date (see Dean 1999b).

It is clear from the discussion in this chapter, and the focus on mentalities – which are clusters of discourses – that there are strong theoretical impulses for a methodology designed for analysis of discursive practices. The next chapter deals with these methodological implications of the proposed analytical approach and other questions of method in outlining the research process.
Chapter 4: The Research Process

The purpose of this study is to increase understanding of regional governance by exploring the ‘collective and relatively taken-for-granted’ (Dean 1999a: 16) thinking inherent in recent governance practices. Earlier chapters have identified some of the emerging challenges these governance initiatives seek to address. Those challenges are complex and rely on conceptions of good governance for their resolution. Clarity about the process for studying these conceptions of good governance as embedded in recent governance practice will ensure the research results have credibility, relevance and utility. To provide such clarity, this chapter’s intent is twofold: first to argue a rationale for the approach taken, consistent with the research problem and theoretical framework identified in earlier chapters. Second, to show how this was implemented by presenting the specific research techniques used in the study. In both respects it indicates some of the major choices made in designing and implementing the research process. The chapter has five sections. It begins by outlining the types of insights sought in undertaking the research and their relation to the particular epistemological and ontological stance of the constructivist paradigm identified by Lincoln and Guba (2000: 165-166). The second section discusses the case study methodology adopted for this research. In the third section, aspects of data generation including sampling techniques and the specific methods of document selection and interviewing are discussed, along with related ethical and methodological considerations. The fourth section expands on that and details the approach to data processing and interpretation. The chapter concludes with a discussion of issues of generalisability, validity and reliability in the research.

Understanding research practices – a research paradigm

Geertz (1973: 5) has argued that people are suspended in ‘webs of significance’ that they spin for themselves. The current research is concerned with understanding such a web of significance of regional planning as constructed by social actors through their discourses and practices. That the planning process generates such shared and complex understandings is clear in the following claim:
[The] values and images of what a society wants to achieve are defined in the planning process. Values and images are not generated in isolation but are created, given meaning and validated by traditions of belief and practice, they are reviewed, reconstructed and invented through collective experience (Albrechts 2003: 251-252).

The study assumes we cannot adequately understand the phenomenon of contemporary governance by simply examining the legal status and composition of governance institutions or observing people’s actions, however comprehensively. Nor are collective subjective realities entirely contained within people’s utterances since, for example, there may be inconsistencies between people’s statements and actions. This problem of identifying the object of research is not uncommon in social research (Daly 1997: 353). As Foucault has warned, ‘We must not imagine that the world turns towards us a legible face which we would have only to decipher’ (1981: 67). The focus of the research is on analysing and understanding the social construction, organisation and operation of processes of planning and governance. To allow such insights it explores these social phenomena by focusing on discourse as ‘the material practice that constitutes representation and description’ (Schwandt 2000: 197). In speech, texts and action, people produce and reproduce a certain way of understanding the world and actually structure the world a certain way (Fairclough 2003: 129). In society, groups of people share and develop ideas and take many of the same ‘facts’ and values for granted. Those who participate in reproducing these shared ideas are all part of a discourse that is embedded in language and social behaviour. Consequently, the research regards observable structures, behaviours and interactions as all owing much to the discourses constituting the social organisation of regional planning. The data generation produced reconstructions of these diverse discourses in the participants’ voices. Reconstructing how people think about, speak about and enact, regional governance facilitates analysis of the strategies and social relations functioning in particular kinds of discourse rather than simply the various mental versions of the world people build (Schwandt 2000: 197). This sort of discourse analysis is not concerned with detailed analysis of texts. Instead, it identifies the implicit rules which frame bodies of texts and utterances, as well as social behaviour. As Richardson (2002: 354) says:
The essence of this approach is that it does not follow a linguistic focus on discourses as texts and communication, but is instead more interested in how social structures create conditions for thought, communication and action.

The orientation of the study towards constructed, subjective representations of good governance and their effects on social relations and behaviour, focuses on a particular planning process and examines it as a more or less stable and organised way of thinking about and practicing key tasks of government (Dean 1999a: 21). Planning is an essential dimension of governing or influencing the conduct of ourselves and others (Dean 1999a: 198; see also Jenkins and Hague 2004: 208). As Forester has argued, planning is a collaborative, interpretive, sense-making process (1989: 125). As will be shown later (in Chapter Five), the planning project was undertaken in a fragmented institutional environment and so can only be understood through the eyes of the several participants (Rhodes 2000: 68). For them, ‘reality’ is constructed through social interaction, language, practices and structures (Rose 1998: 168). The approach taken accepts these multiple socially-constructed ‘realities’ (Schwandt 2000: 197) and assumes each of the participants constructs ways of thinking and acting according to their social and cultural situation (Guba and Lincoln 1994). Of course, this context includes shared understandings and practices (Schwandt 2000: 197). This study does not provide one ‘true’ account of how CQANM governed the region, rather it interprets the conflicting but overlapping stories that actors constructed from their socio-political context and experiences (Rhodes 2000:85). These multiple constructions, and equally diverse and multiple attempts to govern (Dean 1999a: 199) constitute discourses of regional governance. By exploring competing representations of regional governance the study renders aspects of the discourse of regional planning more visible (Fairclough and Wodak 1997: 258) – aspects like underlying assumptions and the influence of various actors in defining problems and solutions concerning the future of the region. Examining the range of discourses about how coordination, planning and other key governance tasks can be achieved at a regional level, allows an analysis of the historically and socially specific sets of ideas, statements and actions that constitute the mentality of regional planning. As the previous chapter argued, the constituents of a mentality – problematics, technologies and rationalities of government – are all embedded in discourse.
To explore people’s discursively constructed knowledge and understandings of the phenomenon being studied (regional governance) requires a qualitative methodology. This is consistent with contemporary approaches to the study of planning and governance practice that endorse the use of qualitative research methods (Flyvbjerg 2001; Rhodes 1997). Understanding the range and pattern of representations of regional governance and providing an account of their effects on practices (both discursive and material) (Kendall and Wickham 1999: 41), also requires particular kinds of data about the ideas and practices underpinning and shaping such endeavours.

The discourses of regional governance are evident in documents and policies and pervade accounts of governance and planning. They are also inscribed in the relations and practices that operate, and in language. For instance, key rhetorical terms in the vocabularies of rule, such as ‘participation’, ‘community engagement’, ‘whole-of-government’ and ‘sustainability’ become inscribed in particular organised practices (Dean 1999a: 64). Hence, close attention to the discursive practices of democracy, development, planning and governance is necessary. In examining the discursive construction of the regional planning process, the previous chapter proposed an essentially Foucauldian framework considering the process as technologies of government, implementing a conception of the art of government and justified by particular rationalities. This analytical approach seeks evidence of various discourses and of their effects on political mentalities. Language is examined for the various ways it constructs territories, problems and people as governable, thereby highlighting the problematics of government as articulated in this example. As well, the technologies and rationalities can be inferred by examining the regularities and the idiom of the discourses and practices associated with governing.

The study aims to identify the more or less implicit logic of the practices adopted and people’s stated intentions. Dean (1999: 72) argues that there is such a ‘non-subjective yet intentional logic that can be discerned when one analyses a regime of governmental practices’. This indicates that not only the nature of the data is important, but also the data analysis process employed, which has been called a sociopolitical analysis of discourse (van Dijk 1993: 249). This form of analysis
examines ways of endorsing, representing, enacting, legitimating or resisting, jointly produced social relations and social practices through text and talk (van Dijk 1993: 250). It examines how discourse, and its constitutive socio-cultural ideas, practices and institutions, produce and reproduce – or challenge – the ways that regional governance operates and the social organisation of regional governance. Van Dijk has further argued that discourse should be studied as ‘complex structures and hierarchies of interaction and social practice and their functions in context, society and culture’ (1997: 6). Consequently the methodology pays particular attention to the social relations and power relations produced by the discourses.

The resulting account based on scrutiny of ‘appearances’ and of multiple representations serves as a conceptual version of the social phenomenon, providing intelligibility but not claiming to represent the objective ‘reality’ of regional governance (Daly 1997: 343). This is consistent with the social constructionist position that ‘we do not find or discover knowledge so much as we construct or make it’ (Schwandt 2000: 197). The understandings, concepts and models that emerge from the research do, however, provide an explanation of the socio-historically located processes and structures examined and facilitate an awareness of the values, knowledge, interpretations and regularities inherent in them.

An additional consideration is the proposition that research into new forms of governance should ‘interrogate existing traditions and narratives and meet established evidence and reason’ (Rhodes 1997: 192). This implies that the empirical manifestations should link with a theoretical framework which is an enduring goal of research (Geertz 1973: 313). To achieve this, the research adopts a methodology connected to both the data and to previous research and scholarship as embodied in Derek Layder’s adaptive theory (1998). Adaptive theory is characterised by dual sources of conceptual categories. On the one hand, the empirical data about behaviour and understanding of actors associated with grounded theory prompts some concepts. On the other hand, previous conceptual models and theorising provide further notions of possible relevance. This methodology provides strategies for research that are both guided by theory and generate data for forming (or modifying) theory (Layder 1998: 42). The process is dialectic in that it juxtaposes
existing ideas with new circumstances or contexts thus prompting their reconsideration.

**A case study**

Given the approach to the research outlined above, it was necessary to determine suitable ways of generating data about the phenomenon under examination. Rhodes (1997: 193) argues that the methodologies appropriate for researching contemporary sub-national planning and policy-making include case studies, semi-structured interviews and analyses of values and power relations. While critics suggest a narrow and inaccurate understanding has emerged from ‘analyses that rely on too few studies of unrepresentative regions’ (Webb and Collis 2000: 857), others (for example Gleeson 2003: 222) have argued the value of single case studies for highlighting diversity. As well, the intentions in this study to attend to specific ways of governing (Dean 1999a: 20) and to examine the particular context in which problems of governing have been called into question, suggests a case study methodology that moves well beyond description.

There are precedents for this approach. They include Selznick’s study (1949) of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Flyvbjerg’s study (1998b) of a planning project in the Danish Town of Aalborg, and Albrechts’ (2003) case study of the development of a broad strategic plan for a whole region in Flanders, Belgium. The various advocates and practitioners of case studies highlight a number of circumstances where this is the preferred strategy for investigation. These indicate why a case study is apt for the purposes of the current study. First, the holistic approach allows development of a contextualised understanding of social behaviours within the broader global and national processes of which they are an integral part (Flyvbjerg 2001: 70; Mason 2002: 166; Yin 1994: 3). Second, a case study is an effective way to explore subjectivities and the multiple meanings participants attach to their behaviours (Gerring 2004: 150; Yin 1994: 3). Third, this strategy has been favoured for exploring ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions about complex, contemporary phenomena (Punch 1998: 155; Yin 1994: 1). Fourth, a case study is appropriate for examining power relations. This is because, even though the foundations of these relationships
lie in the whole social network, they are best analysed as embodied in specific institutions since

…carefully defined institutions … constitute a privileged point of observation, diversified, concentrated, put in order, and carried through to the highest point of their efficacy (Foucault 2003c: 139).

Additionally, a case study is effective for generating practical knowledge (Flyvbjerg 2001: 70). Finally, case studies facilitate the positioning of empirical work within a social theoretical perspective as advocated above by Geertz and Layder. In fact, Yin claims theory development is an essential characteristic of a case study (1994: 27), though his injunction that it should precede collection of data is not consistent with the dialectic approach of adaptive theory. Rather, this study sought a rich ‘dialogue’ between empirical details and reflections about the rationalities and technologies of governance (Gibbs 2002: 3).

A suitable case needs to provide a holistic and empirically-dense example of the phenomenon of regional governance (Punch 1998: 153). Yin suggests it is common to adopt a particular program or organisation as the unit of analysis in a case study (1994: 22). As argued above, regional planning is a manifestation of governance and it was possible to identify a recently completed regional planning process in the Australian State of Queensland that was in fact both a program and an organisation. Central Queensland A New Millennium (CQANM) was the name given to the project of drafting a comprehensive regional plan, and the organisational arrangements for doing so, in a region in the centre of this State. Although it is superficially a geographically, temporally and institutionally bounded case, the appearance this gives of clear delineation of the case is deceptive as Yin warns (1994: 22). Nevertheless, CQANM provides an example of how we govern and are governed – how we think about and practice government.

This choice of CQANM as the case study is particularly appropriate because of the interest in what is unique or different about this particular approach to regional planning rather than what it has in common with other cases. This means there is no need to select a ‘representative’ case. A prime rationale for undertaking a single case
study is where it represents an extreme or unique case (Yin 1994: 39). CQANM was singled out as an exemplary regional planning process, just as the Aalborg case was for urban planning. Both received a prize for innovative planning, and both emphasised the involvement of citizens and interest groups (Flyvbjerg 1998b: 237). CQANM was selected for this study for a number of other reasons as well. For instance, as the most recent of the regional planning processes in Queensland, it embodies the most recent ideas. In fact, in a number of respects CQANM represents or signals a change or divergence in thinking about the problematics of government. This provides valuable historical specificity even though the shifts identified and reasons behind them cannot automatically be assumed to be trends. That means it is difficult to determine in advance whether CQANM is also a ‘paradigmatic case’ (Flyvbjerg 2001: 80) highlighting more general characteristics of contemporary governance in Australia. However from the information available about regional planning projects in Queensland during the 1990s, a strategic, information-oriented choice points to CQANM as a case worthy of scrutiny. Finally, and more pragmatically, the study was funded by an Australia Research Council Linkage grant with the Queensland State Department of Local Government and Planning (DLGP) as the industry partner. This partnership influenced the selection of the case study and provided permissions, access and contact details to facilitate the research.

None of this precludes broader applicability of many of the processes and discourses explored, though this is a long-standing concern with case studies. While certainly statistical generalisation is not possible, Flyvbjerg claimed the Aalborg case, ‘when closely examined, reveals itself to be pregnant with paradigms, metaphors and general significance’ (1998b: 4). The potential for this case to have similar significance is discussed in the final section of this chapter.

**Data generating**

A necessary, but not sufficient, requirement of using qualitative methods is gathering qualitative data (Pratt 2001: 7), or more accurately ‘generating’ such data – a usage Mason prefers to express the range of proactive relationships between researcher, social world, and data that are involved (Mason 2002: 52). Consistent with the case study strategy and adaptive theory methodology more generally, the use of multiple
sources of qualitative data is adopted (Eisenhardt 1989; Punch 1998; Yin 1994). The use of diverse sources and techniques of data generation is well suited to teasing out the multi-dimensional nature of complex issues like governance. As well, in those instances where there are two sources of data about the same event, there can be corroboration or cross-checking of any patterns detected in the data.

Common techniques within a case study are document analysis and interviewing (Denzin and Lincoln 2000: 22). Significant case studies including Flyvbjerg’s study in Denmark (1998b) and Hillier’s research in Western Australia (2002b) have utilised both documentary and interview data. Like those precedents, this study needed data not just on the practices employed, but also on the rationales or justifications for them and the power relations functioning in them. Given the importance of discourse to all of these, as argued earlier, it was important to interact with people, listen to (and read) their accounts and understand the nuance and complexity of varied situated accounts. Consequently, this research employed dual techniques of analysing both a number of relevant documents and also primary data from semi-structured interviews with selected participants. This does not mean that the structures and processes of regional governance are equated with the utterances of the research participants. Rather, it means that the interviews define, re-construct and ‘represent’ what happened. So, for example, what files and publications said about the regional planning process, when considered in conjunction with what was said by staff from a number of State government departments, local government councillors, people from different industry sectors and community organisations, generated discursive patterns from which to develop an understanding of the social phenomenon and discourses of good governance.

The participants were spread over the whole region under investigation covering a large area (141,963 sq kms). This made gathering a broad range of perspectives time-consuming and costly. However, the techniques adopted did not necessitate such extended periods in the field as many ethnographic studies require. As summarised in Table 4.1, I visited Central Queensland on five occasions and conducted personal interviews with 50 people in three rounds of interviews. The initial orientation trip, in late November 2002, was for the launch of the Regional Growth Management Framework (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002).
which was the culmination of almost four-years of the CQANM project. The intention of this trip was to familiarize myself with the stakeholders involved and develop a general understanding of the process. In subsequent field visits, a more focused approach was taken. Two intensive rounds of interviews were scheduled from mid March to early April 2003 and from late February to mid-March 2004. The other trips to Central Queensland were of shorter duration, scheduled to coincide with specific meetings and, in terms of data, used primarily to gather relevant documents from the project files.

Table 4.1: Summary of field trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Nature of trip</th>
<th>Data collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2002</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>General familiarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March - April 2003</td>
<td>Data gathering</td>
<td>1,500 kms traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 people interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2003</td>
<td>Data gathering</td>
<td>2 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February-March 2004</td>
<td>Data gathering</td>
<td>3,500 kms traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 people interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2005</td>
<td>Data gathering</td>
<td>Documentary data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The visits to Central Queensland were important not only for the interviews and for searching files, but also for learning about publications and other secondary sources of information that could not have been identified from afar or accessed through the Internet. An effort was made to seek out informal, unofficial sources of information as well as accounts on the public record; both insider and outsider accounts.

**Sampling method**

The major sampling decision for this research was made in identifying CQANM as the case to be studied. However, there were still decisions to be made about the people and documents to include. The ‘participatory’ elements of the planning process mean that potentially the whole population of Central Queensland could be regarded as stakeholders and participants in CQANM, though some people were clearly more engaged and influential than others. A purposive sample, selecting data-rich cases for in-depth study, was used to retain flexibility in terms of exact number of people interviewed and documents analysed. The intent was to generate data with
‘depth, diversity, subtlety and complexity’ (Seale et al. 2004: 8), from a sample with social significance rather than statistical representativeness (Gobo 2004: 436). This sampling method allowed me to recruit participants deemed significant and with a range and variety of perspectives all meaningful in the context of my research aim (Waitt 2005: 177). It also recognised the impossibility of securing a representative sample of all those involved in the regional planning project by random (probability) sampling means and the inadequacy of such an instrument for gathering data of the nature required (Gobo 2004: 439). The sorts of data desired were about people’s discursive constructions of good governance and their knowledge, views, understandings and interpretations of experiences and interactions during the regional planning process. All of these constitute meaningful properties of the social reality I wished to explore, namely the mentality of regional governance (Mason 2002: 63).

I therefore chose a subset of the population to contact. People and documents were progressively included in the sample on the basis of my growing understanding of the planning process and the Central Queensland context; relevance to theoretical issues identified; and relevance to lines of enquiry emerging from the empirical data. In other words, I selected for interview people who participated in critical events, decisions and routines as well as documents that revealed the contexts of such behaviours and incidents. The purposive sampling resulted in some exclusions. For example, there were a disproportionate number of male participants, reflecting that the composition of most of the CQANM operational groups sampled was male-dominated (approximately two-thirds men). As detailed below, most participants were involved with the CQANM process in a range of roles, but I also sought out some whose voices were not directly heard in the process, but who are impacted by the outcomes, and a spread to ensure counter-discourses were provided. In this way a cross-section of both those closely involved, and other regional citizens, were interviewed about their role in, and views of, the planning process.

For the interviews, potential participants were identified from lists of those involved in the process, other publicly available lists of civil society, business and state bodies in the region and from conversations, interviews and documents. I began with people who could be regarded as very knowledgeable, central actors, later recruiting the
‘unconverted’ (even dissident), or apparently weakly represented, perspectives. Those selected were initially contacted in writing with a participant information sheet (see Appendix A) that described the research, invited voluntary participation (in accordance with ethical guidelines) and gave the researcher’s contact details to allow potential informants to raise any queries. This general, written introduction to the research also indicated the endorsement of both The University of Queensland and the State DLGP. It was followed up with a phone call seeking participation, giving proposed times for field trips and arranging a suitable time and place for interviews. Written confirmation of arrangements was then provided (see sample in Appendix B). All those contacted were extremely helpful, and many were keenly interested in the research. No one contacted declined to participate though the logistics of arranging interviews precluded meeting some of those who had indicated their willingness to contribute to the research.

Access to documentary sources was easily negotiated with the DLGP, though an office move impacted on the timing of availability. This State government department, in a spirit of cooperative research, made available all of the project files as well as providing samples of publications and electronic copies of requested records.

**Documentary data**

The use of written documentation from the period as a data source is warranted given the importance attached to exploring context, and the search for coherent patterns of statements (discursive formations) (Waitt 2005: 176). During the life of the CQANM project, a number of reports, maps and other documents were produced, and the project office accumulated voluminous files and records. Therefore, a range of secondary sources was available including promotional materials (invitations, brochures, media releases), working documents (meeting minutes, issues papers, maps, reports and correspondence) and publications (discussion papers, and of course the final *Central Queensland Regional Growth Management Framework (CQRGMF)* itself). The latter was the most important document in that this published version of the regional plan was regarded as a key ‘deliverable’ of the regional planning process. Given that a component of this research was focussed on governmental rationalities, analysis of such ‘official’ documents provided a valuable way of examining the discourses surrounding CQANM and the planning process.
Considering the conventions under which it was prepared, the assumptions inherent in various drafts, and the conception of good governance it implies, increases understanding of the mentality of government embodied in CQANM. As well, my interest in the way power and authority were exercised was particularly served by noting aspects of the official record and comparing that to participants’ less formal accounts. Such documents were embedded in the social (and power) relations being examined in this study. Although they were not exhaustively examined, a purposive sampling of key documents added to the raw data. Like the interview material, these data were recognised as socially produced, with embedded meanings and therefore revealing the way events were construed at the time, by those who participated in, or observed, the actual process (May 1997). Wherever possible, matters of detail (such as the dates of specific events or membership of committees) were cross-checked with the written record and it was used to corroborate, augment – and sometimes contradict – interview data. It was also possible to make inferences directly from the documentary data and to gain from them insights into different aspects or different perspectives. For example distribution lists provided insights into the transparency and inclusiveness of operations; while differences between successive drafts of the CQRGMF provided insights into substantive developments.

The following is a list of the more significant documents, other than the CQRGMF considered in the research:

- *Who Has Studied What in the CQ A New Millennium Region - Summary Report*, June 1999
- *Notes from the Engaging Community Sectors Forum*, February 2000
- *Key Issues in Planning for Central Queensland’s Future*, August 2000
- *Summary of Key Messages from the Critical Friends*, February 2001
- *Community Consultations*, August 2001
- Newsletters, pamphlets and other promotional materials
- Newsclippings and other media file materials.

A substantial amount of unpublished file material was also accessed. It included copies of correspondence and memoranda; agendas and minutes of meetings;
progress reports; working papers and other administration records. Many of the in-
house materials were available electronically, with some relevant, externally
authored ones (for example letters to the project team from outsiders, media
clippings) only being available in hard copy. The most relevant of such items were
relatively short and could be retyped or scanned as editable text for inclusion in the
database. While I was given official and open access to the project office files, some
of these records necessarily were written by, refer to, or implicate others, in addition
to the keepers of the files, thereby raising questions about informed consent and
ethical practice. Hence the unpublished material has generally been accorded the
same anonymous status as the personal interview material so that sources are not
always identified and quotations are not always specifically attributed.

Unlike the interview data, the documentary sources were not reliant upon the
reconstruction of past events. They were accounts from the time and, for instance,
contained correct names, dates and details. This is not to suggest there is no bias or
selection inherent in the file record. These data were equally a partial account with
the potential of reporting bias and incomplete recording or collection. It was
therefore necessary to contextualise documents and regard them as embedded in, and
constitutive of, social relations (including power relations) rather than as an objective
record of ‘fact’. This required considering for each document: who prepared it, for
whom, under what conditions and according to what rules and conventions (Mason
documentary sources because they give a broad coverage of events and settings over
the whole time span of the period under study and provide a stable and unobtrusive
record – that is, not one created as a result of the study or influenced by researcher
attributes.

**Interviews**

The major form of primary data for this study was the detailed perceptions and
accounts of those interviewed. This choice was based on the view that interviews are
‘an economical means of getting access to issues that are not easily available for
analysis, to get people to “think out loud” about certain topics’ (Rapley 2004: 29).
While I expected documentary sources to yield valuable understandings, to fully
grasp how participants constructed their own understanding of the planning process it
was necessary to hear their accounts. Richards argues that without understanding such perception of the situation we cannot fully understand behaviour (2005: 68). Interviews can elicit descriptive details, opinions and insights into the process, give people the opportunity to reconstruct and reflect on their experiences and views and demonstrate that their interpretation of events is valued and respected (Dunn 2005: 80). The resultant interview data, *speaks to* and *emerges from* the contemporary ways of understanding, experiencing and talking about that specific interview topic* (Rapley 2004: 16, italics in original). From the data, I could make inferences about ideas, behaviours and events outside of the interview interaction itself (Mason 2002: 78) and about discourses inherent in them.

Such inferences are necessary given the partial and conflicting nature of accounts and the response bias and likelihood of discrepancies between words and deeds that Yin (1994: 80) has warned are weaknesses of interviews. As well, there can be times when people say what they think the interviewer wants to hear (Yin 1994: 80). A State government department supported this research and it was possible that perceptions of the research being closely identified with the DLGP would constrain or distort some of the responses. However my university affiliation and location remote from State government offices, as well as my independent negotiation of interviews, served to limit the potential. Although DLGP provided approval for the research, the gatekeeper’s letter also provided was not used in practice and there was no mediation of researcher contacts with participants in the field through the DLGP. As well, the Department had no control of the questions asked, or issues explored, and did not censor my access to files nor have access to the raw data I collected. These measures minimised any bias from this external funding.

Given such potential constraints, interviews are widely acknowledged as resulting in co-constructions. As Rapley (2004: 16) says:

> Interviews are, by their very nature, social encounters where speakers collaborate in producing retrospective (and prospective) *accounts or versions* of their past (or future) actions, experiences, feelings and thoughts (italics in original).
It was assumed that in these collaborative and constructive interactions, the interviewees’ words constituted ‘versions’ of reality constructed within the interview (Silverman 2001: 87).

There are some limitations with interviews. For instance, they rely on people’s capacities to articulate ideas in words and to remember (Mason 2002: 64). The potential inaccuracy due to poor recall is also remarked upon by Yin (1994: 80) and is relevant to this post-hoc reconstruction of the CQANM process which depended on the people involved constructing their accounts of the process in hindsight. More than one participant said, ‘You’re testing my memory now,’ especially when questioned about the origins and early stages of the process which required them to reflect upon events that occurred up to five years earlier. This limitation was countered by the availability of extensive documentation, the relative recency of completion of the project and the fact that many of those interviewed have on-going interaction with each other and with the resultant planning document in the current implementation phase.

The key interviewees were selected from project staff of CQANM and members of most of the seven other groups that were part of the CQANM process as shown in Figure 4.1. These were the Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC) and six other CQANM Committees: the Critical Friends; the Integration and Innovation Team; the Leisure and Lifestyle Working Action Group; the People and Work Working Action Group; the Sustainability, Conservation and Environment Working Action Group; and the Regional Community Identity and Development Working Advisory Group. These groups ranged in size from seven to 32 members with a degree of overlap of membership. Figure 4.1 shows the number interviewed and total membership in each group. Altogether there were some 200-250 people closely involved and, as well, the Regional Community Identity and Development Working Action Group conducted community consultations with over 150 people in more than 25 community meetings held in centres throughout the four sub-regions of Central Queensland. To encompass this range, a dozen community-based stakeholders in the relevant cities or shires who had no sustained role in the process were also interviewed. These peripheral observers included people who participated in community consultations or technical action groups (TAGs in Figure 4.1) as well as
councillors or council employees, representatives of unions and people involved in community based organisations active on social or environmental issues.

Figure 4.1: Groups of people involved in the CQANM planning process

The core of the material was based on 43 interviews of approximately 60 minutes duration involving 50 individuals that were conducted from March 2003 to March 2004 some four to 16 months after the completion of the planning exercise and into the implementation phase. The sample covered over 10 percent of those actively involved in the planning process and almost half of those interviewed had been members of the Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC) or of the Project team (that is, staff). The intention of those choices was to provide a body of material
that captured the various dimensions of the relationship between CQANM and its social context, both structural and ‘cultural’; to build a fairly comprehensive, but not exclusively, ‘insider’ perspective of the process; and to explore the multiplicity of discursive elements – or ‘polyphony of voices’ in Flyvbjerg’s terminology (2001: 139) – and the broader social and political processes they constituted. As argued in the previous chapter, this reconstruction of the discursive field provides insight into the rationalities and power relations embedded in particular technologies and social practices.

The categories of people interviewed included State public servants as well as elected representatives and senior staff of the 14 councils – whether involved in the RPAC and Working Action Groups or without such a close engagement. Table 4.2 shows details of the people interviewed indicating their sectoral affiliations and their roles in the regional planning process. This summary is deceptively simplified and static. Although it provides a sense of the diversity of views, it does not convey the full complexity of permutations and combinations included in the sample. For instance, RPAC members were always members of other CQANM committees. As well, many of those interviewed had additional roles in other regional organisations, in sub regional groupings or in local unions, industries, welfare groups and educational institutions. However, these multiple affiliations are not shown in Table 4.2, to avoid complexity and for reasons of confidentiality. Consequently the ‘employment’ category refers specifically to people’s capacity in CQANM with ‘professional’ indicating that their employment (outside of government) was the basis for involvement. For instance someone employed in industry or a paid staff member of an economic development organisation or catchment body is designated ‘professional’, whereas ‘bureaucrat’ is used to indicate someone whose job with State, local or federal government warranted their inclusion. Those who were involved because of unpaid involvement (usually, but not exclusively in civil society organisations) are categorized ‘volunteer’.

Interviews were conducted across the region – usually in the participant’s workplace or a location of their choice. In some cases people chose to meet me at the local

---

9 The nature of other regional organisations is explained in Chapter Five.
Council Chambers, DLGP offices, or a community building. The criterion for venue was simply that the interviewee was familiar with the place and comfortable there, so that I was ‘going to them’ rather than them ‘coming to me’. Two interviews, with people who have moved from Central Queensland to more distant areas of the State, were conducted by telephone. Four other people who now reside in or near Brisbane were interviewed in their current workplace or home, outside the Central Queensland region. A flexible approach was taken to interviews such that most were one-to-one conversations but some small group interviews (maximum three people) also took place at the suggestion of participants where time and location were convenient to multiple people and they preferred to share their reflections of the process.

**Stages of interviews**

Interviews were semi-structured to expose the diversity of participants’ constructions and minimize the impact of prior assumptions about what was relevant. They progressed through four stages. In the brief introductory stage of each interview I provided verbal and written information about the interview and research project and sought people’s written consent to participating in the research and having the interview recorded on audio-tape. Taping provided a more comprehensive and reliable record than field notes and allowed my attention to be directed to active listening and engaging in the conversation rather than attempting to take notes during the interview. The second stage of the interviews focused on obtaining some background information about the participant and their role in the regional planning process and the region generally. These questions were not probing and served to ‘tune’ people’s conversation and memories to the period and activities I sought to focus on and set people at ease, conveying, even to those perhaps socially distant from me, that they could ‘legitimately be themselves’ in an informal, engaged and inter-active format (Poland and Pederson 1998: 301).

The bulk of the interview constituted stage three. In it, there was no set sequence or wording of the pre-determined issues for participants to speak about, and most questions were open-ended. This flexibility allowed me to respond to varied accounts of dynamic social processes as they unfolded, while also allowing the participants to talk at length and provide comprehensive detail.
Table 4.2: Attributes of the 50 people interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>CQANM Role</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>Peripheral observer</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Project officer</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>RPAC (State Gov)</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Peripheral Observer</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Peripheral observer</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Peripheral observer</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>RPAC (environment)</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>RPAC (State Gov)</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Elected politician</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>RPAC (Industry)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Other CQANM Committee</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Peripheral observer</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Elected politician</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Peripheral observer</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Elected politician</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Project officer</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Peripheral observer</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Elected politician</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>RPAC (Local Government)</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Elected politician</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>RPAC (Local Government)</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Local politician</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</td>
<td>Project officer</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Project Team</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>RPAC (Local Government)</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>Peripheral Observer</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Professional Status</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Peripheral observer</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>RPAC (Mining)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>RPAC (Federal Government)</td>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Project officer</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Project officer</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Peripheral observer</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelda</td>
<td>RPAC (Social services)</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Project officer</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>RPAC (Local Government)</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Elected politician</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regan</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Project officer</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohan</td>
<td>RPAC (Local Government)</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Elected politician</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Peripheral observer</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Peripheral observer</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Elected politician</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Other CQANM committees</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Other CQANM Committee</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>RPAC (Local Government)</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Elected politician</td>
<td>Shire</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>RPAC (Business)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interview log

The minimal structure applied did, however, ensure that the data related to the research questions and to emerging and pre-existing theoretical concepts rather than being primarily descriptive. Although the questions were adapted to the specific person being interviewed, and also were refined over the life-cycle of the process, a number of the broad themes were covered in most interviews through questions such as:
• How did you become involved and why were you prepared to commit time (and maybe other resources) to the process?
• What opportunities were there for your council/ agency/ organisation/ community to engage with the CQANM process?
• What was different about the CQANM process compared to previous regional activities?
• What were the main issues discussed by the groups you were involved in? How were they identified and how relevant did you find them?
• What will be different as a result of the CQANM regional planning process?

However, even where the same question was repeated, it was not assumed that different respondents would understand it in the same way since particulars of delivery, context, order of questions and many other ambiguities precluded any likelihood of uniformity.

As a fourth and final stage, to close the interview, participants were invited to make further comments or clarify earlier answers and were advised that they would be sent a copy of the transcript of the interview and of any publications in which they were quoted (even if anonymously). Some challenges created by this undertaking are discussed below. At the end of the interview, in thanking them for their time and thoughtful responses, I took the opportunity to highlight some particular insight I had gained from them, thus reinforcing how much I valued their account and hopefully increasing their satisfaction with the experience.

Ethical issues: confidentiality, subjectivity and asymmetrical relationships
The interviews and data generation raised a number of practical and ethical issues. The first of these is the concern for confidentiality. The ethical and practical challenges of respecting the confidentiality of interview data have been cogently argued (Dunn 2005; Mason 2002) and had to be addressed in the research process. Most of the sample (as detailed above) was drawn from a small population of those involved with CQANM over a specific four-year period. Identifying particulars (such as a person’s sectoral affiliation) are significant in the analysis of the results so the related issue of anonymity is very pertinent. Particulars such as participants’
organisational affiliations are likely to prompt recognition – especially by anyone familiar with CQANM at the time. To protect privacy, information with personal particulars was kept confidential. Tapes, transcripts and documentary data were stored in a locked filing cabinet and a password protected computer file, and were only accessed by the researcher. As well, the use of open-ended questions throughout the interviews gave the participants a choice of whether to make disclosures in relation to any personal matters that influenced the planning process or their perception of it. As a final measure to establish confidentiality commitments, I asked participants to nominate, on the consent form (see Appendix C), the degree of disclosure they were comfortable with – ranging from total anonymity to full identification with an intermediary option of agreeing to reporting of ‘potentially identifying’ information. Almost half of those interviewed gave permission for their name to be used in attributing views, and only five people requested total anonymity and I intended to operate according to those expressed wishes. However as the research progressed a number of observations made me realize that issues of anonymity and confidentiality were more ambiguous than they first appeared (see Dunn 2005 for a discussion of this).

First, during the interviews, I became aware that those who had requested total anonymity were speaking very frankly and more critically than many who had said they were happy to go public with their views. While it may have been that people could judge in advance that they had opinions and perceptions they wanted to keep private, it increased my caution about exposing individual viewpoints. This was reinforced when some participants asked for parts of their reply to be ‘off the record’ both because this request was sometimes given after the comment rather than before, and because it was not always clear the amount of information people wanted off the record (I hesitated to interrupt the flow of dialogue by asking when I could switch the tape on again). Often such information was very useful in pointing me to issues to explore with others, additional people to speak to, or further documents to view. And sometimes the later source did not ‘quarantine’ the information.

Second, I only fully realized the practical challenges of protecting anyone’s identity as I began to write about the project. For instance there were many roles in the process that were only held by only one person, most obviously the chairs or
convenors of the RPAC and each of the Working Groups, and RPAC representatives
from non-government sectors. As well, to disguise some people’s identity while
referring to others by name would, in reality, allow identification of people by a
process of elimination. As Mason says, ‘data can usually be recognized by the
interviewee whether or not you attach the interviewee’s name to them, and also they
may be recognizable to other people’ (2002: 80). This makes it particularly hard to
ensure internal confidentiality (that is, to protect the identity of participants from
each other).

The issue of consent was further complicated because material revealed in interviews
sometimes related to third-parties not covered by consent – a circumstance identified
as not uncommon in interviews (Mason 2002: 81). For example, in seeking to
establish how inclusive the process was, I asked a question about ‘voices’ not heard
in the process. One person responded with the view that one of the groups actually at
the table was not well represented since their spokesperson was not conscientiously
engaged and often absent from the meetings and activities of that sub-group.

I concluded that, while people understood they were consenting to more than just the
interview, it was not possible to adequately convey the complexity of the interpretive
process I would undertake and the full range of forms in which the data and analysis
of it might be published or reproduced – and for how long it might be drawn upon.
Hence, in retrospect, I have endeavoured to protect the anonymity of all those in
Central Queensland, involved in the regional planning process or providing
observations on it, who have helped me to an understanding of their experiences. I
have done so by assigning pseudonyms to all participants and have tried to generalise
references wherever possible while providing single attributes as pointers to the
source of certain perceptions where that enhances analysis and understanding.

Besides issues of confidentiality, a second methodological challenge with interviews
is that some subjectivity inevitably enters into the relationship (Daly 1997).
Consequently, I did not seek to de-personalise myself as interviewer by positioning
myself unrealistically as ‘naïve’ and avoiding all statements of opinion. Rather, I
tried to consciously reflect on how the interaction during each interview produced a
particular trajectory of talk that was affected by characteristics of myself and the
participant such as age, status, gender and ‘social location’ (Rapley 2004). As well, the influences of contingencies on the day was considered. For example one mayor was distracted by the repercussions of a riot that occurred the night before our conversation (indeed the conversation was delayed by police and media interviews). In these ways, my understanding or interpretation of people’s words and actions related them to the wider context in which they were said (Gibbs 2002: 2). In addition to reflexively situating the interview data in context, this explicit acknowledgement of my subjectivity is consistent with regarding the interview as the joint construction of meaning. As Poland and Pederson stress, ‘Both parties to a conversation must work at producing meaningful talk and may struggle to understand the intent of the other speaker’ (1998: 294).

Throughout all stages of the interviews I was aware of a third ethical challenge associated with interviews. This is the inherent imbalances or asymmetries of many kinds in the relationship. Therefore, I aimed for what Glesne and Peshkin (1992: 92) have labelled ‘paradoxical bilateralism’ with neither the interviewer nor interviewee passively conforming to the other’s ‘mould’, but rather being active participants in an interaction and collaboratively producing the interview data (Mason 2002: 63; Rapley 2004). Scheurich (1997) warns of the likelihood of interviewer dominance in the relationship and also resistance by the person being interviewed. In reflecting on the trajectory of talk, I therefore tried to identify instances outside of those categories as well as welcoming evidence that interviewees challenged my understandings or assumptions, turned my questions into ones they wanted to talk about, or otherwise asserted their agency within the interview. Such instances suggested that power relationships within the interview were not entirely unidirectional. In the initial stage of the interview, I particularly ensured that participants were clear that I did not ‘belong’ with a State Government department or any other player. This was intended to allay concerns about any inherent bias as well as any ascription of power by association.

Providing transcripts also moderated an element of the power I wielded as researcher. However, since beyond that I had total control of the data, there was still considerable asymmetry and responsibility. As well, there were complications created by supplying participants with copies of the interview transcript and copies
of writings in which they were quoted. Some of these challenges were simply logistical. More significant though, were issues related to the implied transparency and control of this sighting given that even a verbatim transcript is but a partial record (Poland and Pederson 1998: 298) and the exercise in no way served to validate data. Participants could only check that the specific details in the record were accurate and that I adhered to undertakings (for example to treat some comments as ‘off-the-record’). They could not check or confirm my understanding of their utterances as Poland and Pederson attest:

Not only may one not hear what was intended to be heard, one may hear the reverse – that which was not intended. The very same words may have a radically different meaning that is not always readily apparent. In these cases, the speaker may feel misinterpreted (1998: 296).

The reassurance may, therefore, have been somewhat unfounded since, as will be discussed later, the raw interview data were supplemented by my subjective notes on non-verbal messages and the whole inevitably subjected to my interpretative reading of the data.

**Data processing, interpretation and analysis**

Having obtained a range of in-depth information about the case being studied, I then looked for patterns in people's various accounts in the context of the whole case. The accumulated tapes, documents and other data records needed to be systematically stored for easy access and then analysed to provide answers to the research questions. This section outlines the main processes of data management and data analysis involved in this phase of the research.

**Data management**

An important indicator of the quality of research is the accuracy of the data. However Mason (2002: 77) cautions against overestimating the representational or reflective qualities of interview transcripts. Many subtleties of the communicative interaction and meaning-generation in the interview were not captured on tape, for instance non-verbal communication. Other aspects were lost during transcription. For instance, I
faced problems with the technical quality of some recordings, especially those made in noisy venues like coffee shops, which contained some relatively inaudible passages. Beyond some simple indicators of emphasis, it was not possible to ‘transcribe’ the wealth of non-verbalised data including context, silences, evasions, emotional connotations (like a sarcastic or enthusiastic tone) in the interactions (Poland and Pederson 1998), so judgements and selections were made. To some extent, by doing my own transcriptions I made them ‘thick descriptions’ with notations to indicate vocal expression, laughter, hesitation and observations other than the actual verbal exchange. Including such observations in the transcript involves an inference, meaning that the body of data, while only partial, is certainly more than just the dialogue or written text. As well, people’s idiosyncratic use of gestures and tone of voice varies according to their ‘speech culture’ (Young 2000). For such reasons, Scheurich (1997: 61), has characterised interview data as an indeterminate intersection of language, meaning and communication. That nicely distinguishes different dimensions that are hard to record, but important to register, in analysing material that is assumed to represent the participants’ construction of ‘reality’.

The challenge was to draw meaning from this indeterminacy in pages of unstructured transcripts, documents and field notes in order to form coherent conclusions that interpret, relate and explain the complexity and richness of the multiple accounts recorded. Therefore the second step in data management was to re-read the transcripts and documentary material and record perceptions about passages in the data using codes such as legitimacy, devolution, relationships and sustainability. By assigning the one code to all passages relating to a specific concept, I gained a sense of the variety and patterns of experiences with respect to that concept. Some passages of text were quite densely coded having relevance to multiple concepts. This process made information, themes and topics not contained in the data in an orderly or sequential manner more readily accessible or visible. Though systematic, coding was not a mechanical process, and allocating codes was not decided ‘in a vacuum’ (Miles and Huberman 1994: 256). The reading of the data stimulated some codes (Richards 2005: 86), for example perceptions of a distinctive feature of the CQANM process as ‘participatory’. By the same token, it is inaccurate to suggest I began coding with no ideas at all. As well as ‘emic’ notions, suggested by the ideas
employed by participants, other codes were ‘theoretical or etic ideas, more abstract and derived from the literature.’ (Gibbs 2002: 223). Sensitising concepts from the literature such as ‘networks’ or ‘matters to be governed’ were considered potentially relevant codes that would link to a conceptual framework and the study’s research question (Miles and Huberman 1994: 256). However, they were not firm preconceptions and the data provided an opportunity to rethink, reconstruct and redefine such concepts (Daly 1997: 345).

The coding process provided an operational frame of reference but not an explanation: further thinking was required for that. Both processes employed computer aided qualitative data analysis software. While it cannot code or analyse itself, or substitute for thorough familiarity with the data (Gibbs 2002: 65), computer software facilitates more rapid, rigorous and thorough coding and analysis of interviews transcripts, field notes and documents, ‘without damaging their complexity or losing their context’ (Richards 2005: 55). To utilise these advantages, the QSR NVivo package assisted with the whole data management process. Basically, the software improved the efficiency of data processing and analysis by helping me to organise and access the data records, (and the ideas they prompted) in a flexible system that could be constantly refined. That, in turn, facilitated reflection on the research problem, and, therefore, application of the conceptual framework. NVivo allows for handling large volumes of data in text form and for systematic coding and categorisation (and readjustment of the coding framework during the course of the research and analysis). This enhanced efficiency is claimed to increase the credibility of the research (Richards 2005: 107).

Having a multifaceted database of diverse categories of material systematically available also increases the reliability of the case study (Yin 1994: 95). As well, because NVivo provides ways of storing the words and the associated observations or attributes of the person being interviewed in a separate but linked fashion, it facilitates maintaining an accurate ‘chain of evidence’ despite protections to provide anonymity.
Interpretation of the data began during the interviews and the document search, but was much more focussed in the data analysis phase. Data analysis has been characterised as ‘a creative interaction between the conscious/ unconscious researcher and the decontextualized data’ (Scheurich 1997: 63). This sort of creation required systematic analysis and exploration of the data for ‘…threads of meaning and patterns of responses’ (Richards 2005: 59), for relationships, and even beyond those for inherent functions and assumptions (Kendall and Wickham 1999: 29). So I was ‘unravelling’ how these individual accounts are woven within a social fabric of which discursive formations provide the warp (to use an image from Waitt 2005: 176). In this reflexive process, I needed to consider what ‘went without saying’ or was ‘taken for granted’ (Poland and Pederson 1998: 300), as well as the available texts, to develop my understanding of the discourse.

While the process I undertook could broadly be labelled ‘discourse analysis’, that can mean a range of things (Mason 2002: 57) including semiotic textual analysis and conversation analysis in the linguistic tradition. The socio-political approach I used explored social relations, power relations, actions, perceptions and opinions as discursively produced, and examined how discourses were constituted and circulated within (textual) representations. As well as identifying embedded values and themes, I assumed that inherent discursive structures restricted, or determined, the available ways of talking about, and acting within, the specific social context (Waitt 2005). Through a post-hoc analysis I sought to identify the pattern or ‘rules’ people followed in their reasoning, even though they might not have articulated these themselves. As Clegg (1997: 485) has noted, the rules both enable and constrain action and are implicit in what people say and do even if they do not express them as a coherent rationality.

Aided by the electronic exploration facility, I worked through all the data segments seeking connections and relationships between sets of statements that were significant. These allowed me to draw from individual, subjective accounts some regularities possibly unrecognised by the individuals but observable when considering the totality of the case. However, I needed to resist drawing inferences about apparently meaningful relationships or patterns of occurrence that
oversimplified as a result of my preconceptions (Coffey and Atkinson 1996: 181; Richards 2005: 135).

This thorough and systematic examination of the data allowed me to identify themes and concepts. According to Richards (2005: 130) these are, ‘threads [that] have to be woven into the fabric of an argument, an account that will make sense of the data’. In this context, Mason (2002: 148) distinguishes between literal, interpretive and reflexive readings of data. My analysis of the discourses was closest to an interpretive reading which she says, ‘will involve you in constructing or documenting a version of what you think the data mean or represent, or what you think you can infer from them’ (Mason 2002: 149). These writers are indicating that the researcher inscribes meaning on the data in this phase. But Scheurich (1997: 73) warns about the impositions involved since processes of organising, categorising and finding meaning in the data

…are overlaying indeterminacy with the determinacies of our meaning-making, replacing ambiguities with findings or constructions. When we proceed, then, as if we have ‘found’ or ‘constructed’ the best or the key or the most important interpretation, we are misportraying what has occurred.

This suggests that findings will reflect the researcher’s representational predispositions. With similar reservations, Foucauldian scholars also reject the assumption that we can uncover ‘hidden’ meanings and warn against ‘imposing second-order judgements’ (Kendall and Wickham 1999: 29).

While constructing an interpretive account of these clusters of discourses, later chapters quote liberally from the transcripts. This provides a window onto participants’ experiences and perceptions in their own voice and recognises that participants’ accounts have more than a representational function – they also create, re-create and embody interactions for the ‘listener’ (Wortham 2001). As well, the strategies of quoting at length; avoiding strongly interpretive comments; and allowing cited words and juxtapositions of them to carry the work and speak for themselves, are consistent with Foucault’s practice (McHoul and Grace 1993: 21). I did not seek to produce a definitive account, but did intend going beyond face-value and diverse – even
conflicting – interpretations to develop an understanding both experientially compelling and also politically and culturally articulated. This is not to suggest that any or all of the participants’ accounts are ‘wrong’ or that mine is ‘right’. Rather my account organises the first-order findings (the dominant themes of the informants) into a broader theoretical structure (Pratt 2001: 4). In respect of the agency of the researcher in producing such a ‘second-order’ account, Hillier has identified the ‘twofold truth’ involved in the researcher’s interpretation of the individual positions revealed by participants (2002b: 181). However, the use of the term ‘truth’ conjures the ‘objectivist viewpoint’ she disavows (180) and was certainly not my intention. The application of a particular conceptual framework will inevitably simplify a complex reality, however Stoker (1998: 26) argues the value of such simplification when it illuminates our understanding.

Consequently, the concepts and scheme I constructed to make sense of the data do not just reproduce participants’ ‘realities’ since, as Daly (1997: 350) suggests, this would provide ‘the singular voice of an echo’ or, what Geertz (1973: 312) describes as ‘perfected impressionism … a collection of anecdotes’. In exploring these subjective representations I also take into account the context of wider social settings that influence the production, understanding and interpretation of the ‘situated’ discourse of planning (van Dijk 1997: 11). Then, from the multiple accounts articulated by participants and consideration of the context, I construct a well-informed interpretation of the multi-dimensional, layered and textured nature of recent forms of regional governance.

My second-order account is an ‘interpretive commentary’ (Daly 1997: 349) on this case of regional governance. It provides a language by which to identify key features of a complex reality and pose significant questions about it, even though it is influenced by some of my ‘interpretive baggage’ (Schurich 1997: 74). Various writers have remarked on the fine balancing act involved. For instance, Gibbs warns against ‘interpretive omnipotence’ (2002: 228); and Mason suggests this is avoided by meaningful, justifiable and sensitive interpretation rather than imposition of preconceptions (2002: 77). On the other hand, overemphasizing the qualifications about how this is an individual and partial interpretation of a socio-historically located phenomenon can devalue the research findings. As Allmendinger has argued,
‘There is a danger if not inevitability that contextualising and relativising understanding can make judgements and theories merely ad hoc and localised’ (2002: 12). So the challenge is to manipulate and explore disparate data to produce a meaningful account without shaping it too much. This highlights potential threats to the quality of research when it comes to data analysis, particularly from analysis that artificially imposes order (Scheurich 1997). These include discounting some data, misinterpreting data, privileging data, focusing on the unusual, jumping to conclusions and unwarranted generalisation. All of these can result in partial and biased analyses (Gibbs 2002: 14, 231), and link to broader issues of quality such as generalisability as discussed below.

**Quality Issues – generalisability, validity and reliability**

Although I acknowledge that my second-order account is necessarily partial and itself an interpretation, there are still issues of quality in an interpretive account of research findings. Miles and Huberman (1994: 277) claim key quality considerations in qualitative research include the validity or credibility, reliability, bias and transferability or generalisability of results. Others regard these issues as a quantitative legacy (Gibbs 2002: 13). This section deals first with generalisability and then with dimensions of validity and reliability as they apply to this qualitative study.

Although I have found the case of CQANM theoretically revealing (Gobo 2004: 446), for the research to have value, some degree of generalisability or transferability is desirable. This is a challenge not only because of the researcher interpretations and influences acknowledged above, but also because of changing socio-historical contexts. As Stoker (1998: 26) has argued,

> One of the difficulties of identifying an organizing perspective that is devoted to understanding a changing system of governance is that no sooner is the perspective outlined than the object of study changes.

However, wider relevance need not be based on the pervasiveness of the phenomenon and certainly the aim of this study was not to enumerate the frequency
of behaviours but to provide an argument with strong plausibility across a range of planning settings (Forester 1989: 83).

This account provides more than a particularly rich and detailed description of this one, localised case. The experiences documented as relating specifically to Central Queensland encompass topics covering broader theoretical issues in regional planning. These include issues like discourses of good governance and the inherent rationalities of particular technologies such as community participation; networking existing organisations in the region; processes for achieving consensus, coordination and integration; and ways of constraining coercive forms of power.

Besides such ‘generalising to theoretical propositions’ (Yin 1994: 10), another way we can demonstrate more general application is through establishing the similarity between the case study context and others (Pratt 2001: 2), even though the choice of case will often be based on an extreme, atypical or novel example. Gobo (2004: 443) concurs with this, arguing that generalisability concerns findings and should not be equated to the representativeness of the case or sample. In the case of CQANM there are certainly similarities to other regional planning exercises in Qld and also parallels with the broader adoption of multi-stakeholder processes for other governance tasks. While unique in some ways, it provides a case of responding to some of the pervasive challenges of our times: how to govern democratically, sustainably and inclusively. In this way the lessons of CQANM may be applicable in more practical terms as a guide for principles and action both for the future of CQANM and its enduring role in the region and for other regional planning processes that might consider some or all of the practices CQANM adopted.

If the generalisability or transferability of the case study findings needs to be understood as complex, so do the other quality issues referred to earlier. Indeed, some qualitative researchers actively reject ideas of reliability and validity – suggesting that inherent indeterminacy and relativity characterise data and that accounts are situated and tentative (for example Scheurich 1997: 89). This rejection is partly based on different interpretations of terms like validity – some employing it in a positivist sense of suggesting the account represents ‘reality’ or ‘truth’ while others adopt the approach that, in qualitative research, it relates to ‘plausibility’ of
the interpretation – its ‘fit’ with the data – and suggest that, ‘the validity of qualitative research depends on information-richness and the analytical skills of the researcher’ (Waitt 2005: 178). Scheurich though, argues that the evolving understandings of ‘validity’ within different research paradigms merely change the criteria for declaring an interpretation as valid and ‘mask’ an effort to systematise knowledge of the world in an acceptable form (Scheurich 1997: 85-86). He proposed a reconstructed validity as ‘shifting’, multifaceted, and retaining complexity (Scheurich 1997: 88). This thesis rejects a criteria of ‘truth’, and adopts notions of quality related to analytical ‘fit’ with rich data.

Concerns about reliability (or confirmability) are also evolving, with less expectation now that results of qualitative research should be consistent across investigations, and that findings should be comprehensive and definitive. Rather, what must be achieved is internal consistency and rigour by the systematic and appropriate selection of trends, issues and themes for attention and by systematic (rather than haphazard) exploration of the data. Such assessments require the research process and its conceptual logic to be transparent (Miles and Huberman 1994: 200). The quality of the research determines whether an account is well-founded, substantiated and applicable (albeit not ‘true’). The details above have made my research methods transparent and demonstrated the systematic approach adopted to ensure wider theoretical and practical applicability while acknowledging the situated and multifaceted nature of social reality and researcher influence on the process.

A link to context
As a qualitative case study based on discourse analysis of interviews and documentary data, this research provided an empirical study of a particular context in which questions have been raised about governing. People’s conception of the tasks and intentions of good governance can be ascertained by examining both the objectives explicitly stated in official documentation of the regional planning process and also statements about problems that the process was designed to address. The latter are relevant because a common discursive strategy is to contrast positive self-representations with negative other-representations (van Dijk 1993: 264). Consequently, the enquiry was built on a core of material gathered from a number of
semi-structured interviews with key actors and a selection of related print material. The socio-political discourse analysis of data generated by these methods led me to an interpretation of the mentality of regional governance and also provided insight into discursive constructions of dimensions of it, such as what constitutes ‘participation’ and ‘sustainability’. The next chapter outlines the specific contextual details of CQANM as the selected case of regional governance and so situates the discourses identified in the data analysis.
Chapter 5: Introducing CQANM – Governing Through Planning Regionally

The previous chapter outlined a research strategy appropriate for investigating a mentality of governance. It emphasised that understanding the discursive construction of good governance requires recognition of the particular context in which questions have been raised about governing. Some of the broad contextual elements for this case study were mentioned in Chapter One, which described the convergence of a number of trends in western nations, including perceptions of the failure of both the welfare state and economic rationalism; an environmental crisis; the desirability of increased civil society participation; and the appropriateness of devolution to sub-national scales. In Australia, these trends, during the 1980s and 1990s, were situated in respect to several socio-political developments of significance for governance. This chapter focuses on these developments within Australia, and more specifically within the State of Queensland, since the fact that each State has its own political culture and administrative system means there is considerable variation between States. It also describes the origin and purpose of one regional planning process that grew out of this context and was chosen as the case study for this research, Central Queensland A New Millennium (hereafter CQANM).

The chapter has two main parts. In the first, CQANM is positioned in the context of these broad trends and specific developments in Queensland. Like any significant innovation, CQANM had its origins in a confluence of quite different agendas. Hence, the first part charts some of the key political, legislative and professional developments, particularly in the last fifteen years, that have shaped the practice of regional planning and the governance landscape of Central Queensland. The second part of the chapter describes the specific structures and processes that constituted CQANM.

Evolution of the governance context

*The three-tier system*

The situation with respect to governing regional spaces in Australia is complex. Despite being a vast country of considerable social, economic and physical diversity,
and a federation of autonomous States and Territories, Australia is governed in a
centralised and hierarchical fashion (Jones 1989: 59). National governments
monopolise important functions and use their control over finances (with
responsibility for some 80 percent of public spending) to encourage States to
implement federal policies and programs (Jones 1993: 228). The role of the middle
tier of government, the States, has been summed up in these words:

Powerful state governments, administratively centred on the dominating
capital cities, deliver health, education, housing, police, transport and cultural
services through large and often unwieldy bureaucracies (Jones 1989: 58).

The third tier of quite parochial local governments (Chapman 1997) are, in turn,
dominated by the State governments that created them (Gray and Lawrence 2001;
have much more limited bureaucracies to implement their varying, but historically
limited and localised, functions such as the provision of physical infrastructure,
community services and amenities (Gray and Lawrence 2001; Jones 1989).
Successive Queensland State governments established a record of making ‘heavy use
of local authorities as agents’ (Power et al. 1981: 22) despite claims about the
comparative strength and independence of local government in Queensland, as
compared to other States (Beer and Maude 1996).

The past decade has witnessed some contradictory impulses with respect to this
hierarchical and centralised structure. On the one hand, further centralisation is
evident in federal action to control areas previously regarded as State jurisdiction
such as industrial relations and school curricula. Similarly, some State governments,
including that in Queensland, have consolidated their authority over many functions
at the expense of local governments and of decentralised agencies of the State
Government itself. On the other hand, there are examples of a contrary trend by both
federal and State authorities to devolve responsibilities to local governments. This is
evidenced by the expansion of human services provision by councils and recently
delegated responsibilities for administration of specific programs on behalf of other
levels of government (House of Representatives Standing Committee on Economics
Finance and Public Administration 2003: 8-12). Councils in Queensland have a
significant governance responsibility in that they manage valuable public infrastructure and assets (Spiller 1996: 17). However, these local government responsibilities articulate with shifting State and national frameworks and priorities in a wide range of portfolio areas. Therefore, the system of economic, social and environmental planning of regional spaces should not be understood as determined by the policies and practices of any single level of government. The influence of State and federal governments, beyond their obviously significant role as funding providers, cannot be underestimated.

One result of this three-tier system of government with staggered three-year electoral cycles is frequent policy and program reversals or contradictions. Many initiatives and programs that are introduced lack continuity and consideration of the long-term (Beer and Maude 1996; Beer et al. 2003). Particularly relevant for the Queensland experience over the past fifteen years was the change at the national tier in December 1996 to a coalition\(^\text{10}\) government after thirteen years of Australian Labor Party (ALP) governments. At the State tier too, impetus for change in Queensland in the 1990s came with the election of a reforming Labor State (Goss) government in 1989 after thirty-two years of conservative rule (Stevens and Wanna 1993). These different regimes had distinct views about the appropriate role of each level of government and their functional priorities and goals. The government of premier Goss was elected in a climate of disenchantment with a populist and paternalistic, but also quite centralist, State government. A significant challenge for the new government was addressing concerns about a politicized, inefficient, non-transparent (even corrupt) public administration and a legacy of distrust of expertise (particularly that within the State bureaucracy) (Wanna 1992). Labor introduced measures attempting to engage more with citizens on the one hand, and to commercialise and contract out state activity on the other (Queensland Government 1990). Rather than being interpreted as empowering, and ameliorating people’s suspicions of a highly

---

\(^\text{10}\) Australian politics is generally conceived in two-party terms with conservative forces usually ruling as a coalition of the Liberal and National Parties. In Federal Parliament, the Liberal Party has been the majority partner in the coalition, but in Queensland the National Party had that position and hence chose the State’s premier. When the coalition holds government at either level the other major party, the Australian Labor Party, forms the opposition.
bureaucratized, interventionist state (see Stevenson 1998 for an account of such suspicions), many of the policies and programs of the time were regarded as centrally controlled and unresponsive to the public will (Wear 1993). The continuing disaffection of citizens was evident in subsequent State elections when there were a number of successful candidates who were not affiliated with the major parties (Davis and Stimson 1998).

A second result of the three-tier system with its sectorally differentiated bureaucracies (Sansom 1994: 7), is the absence of an integrated and holistic view of the overall situation. For instance, the many aspects of planning – social, resource-management, infrastructure needs, economic development, environmental protection – are allocated to diverse government departments and agencies with expertise in different disciplines (MacRae and Brown 1992: 214). Consequently, issues are dealt with in isolation without considering the interconnections between functions and their ramifications. Only a limited range of skills, knowledge and experience shape particular policies and programs (Miller and Ahmad 2000: 10). Integration is necessary to ensure more than a series of fragmented policies and programs, each rational in their own right but lacking coherence and causing confusion (Bellamy et al. 2002). This challenge of integration has also been called ‘holism’ (6 1997: 37). A key characteristic of a holistic approach is recognition that economic profitability, ecological sustainability and social justice are mutually interdependent and cannot be addressed in isolation from one another (Sustainable Regions Steering Committee 2000).

As well as the problem of linking functions in Australia’s bureaucratic and hierarchical political system, there is also a third, overlapping, challenge posed by the political system – that of linking administrative units or organisations. This is the problem of coordination of diverse departments, agencies and also statutory authorities, advisory committees, action groups, and quasi-autonomous non-government organisations (quangos) at all three levels to handle discrete policy areas. Writing in 1999, Garlick describes the result for regional policy at the national level in this way:
The situation has led to a proliferation of functionally specific but uncoordinated boards and committees operating with different regional boundaries and reporting arrangements at the regional level. There are now 24 different programs across a range of agencies at the Commonwealth level alone that claim to address regional issues (180).

Horizontal coordination between diverse state agencies and departments is vital to ensuring efficiency and avoiding duplication on the one hand or contradictory policies or regulations on the other. Just as important is vertical coordination between administrative units or organisations at various levels – national, regional, State and local (Kooiman 2000; Petris 2005). Historically, relationships between the three levels of governments in Australia have been competitive and antagonistic, with each level lacking trust in, and doubting the capacity of, other tiers (Jones 1989). The interplay between the three levels of government has been identified as making management of major issues, like sustainability, more complex (Head and Ryan 2004: 362). Recently, however there have been moves to improve mechanisms for inter-governmental relations in the three-tier system. In 1990, the Council of Australian Governments was initiated in an attempt to ensure greater vertical coordination between these three tiers of government. Its achievements include agreement on national frameworks for environmentally sustainable development, forests, biodiversity, water reform and responses to greenhouse gas emissions (Head and Ryan 2004: 368). The direct links between federal and local governments have also been strengthened by agreements such as the 1995 accord between the Keating Labor government and the Australian Local Government Association, and the Commonwealth-Local Government memorandum of understanding of the subsequent coalition government (Wensing 1997: 40). A number of sector-specific programs and partnerships likewise seek vertical coordination such as the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (NAPSWQ) in relation to natural resource management and the Roads Alliance with regard to transport.

A further consequence of the hierarchical three-tier system of government that is significant for this study is the suspicion that arrangements intermediate between State and local government would erode the power of both of these tiers of government (Flanagan 2003). Nevertheless, although in Australia there is no formal
tier of government at the regional level, both the Commonwealth and State
governments have long-established forms of regional structure for their bureaucracy
(Harris 1972), and at times, have fostered other bodies for regional administration as
well. Despite their reluctance to formalise and give long-term legitimacy to regional
bodies, and strong reservations about a fourth tier of government, all levels of
government now recognise that many governmental responsibilities require action at
a regional level.

The embrace of the reforms known collectively as ‘new public management’ by
Commonwealth and State bureaucracies around Australia had a major impact on all
levels of government (Tucker 1997: 74). These reforms involved the extensive
adoption within federal, State and local government bureaucracies of ‘managerialist’
structures and processes and an economic reform agenda requiring competition,
contractualism, commercialisation, corporatisation and purchaser-provider divisions
of labour (Queensland Government 1990). As Chapter Two indicated, new public
management entailed a changed perception of the role of governments as more
strategic and less ‘hands-on’. Consistent with this, local governments, for example,
are seen as moving beyond ‘roads, rates and rubbish’ and becoming ‘involved in
governing as well as managing’ (Chapman 1997: 2). The principles and practices of
this new style of public management were popularised in the early 1990s as
entrepreneurial government (Osborne and Gaebler 1992). Allied principles such as
decentralisation, competition and market-orientation (Osborne and Gaebler 1992)
were also embraced by all three levels of government in Australia.

The evolution of the hierarchical and centralised three-tier system of government was
shaped by electoral changes, concern over new governance challenges and new
public management. The effects included inconsistent programs and policies,
departments with discrete rather than integrated functions, and power manoeuvres
rather than cooperation and coordination within and between the formal tiers of
government. These transformations were reinforced by specific programs of
government and by legislative changes in recent decades (Tucker 1997).
New programs and legislation for local government and for planning

During the late 1980s and 1990s, Commonwealth and State governments introduced many new programs in the interest of achieving greater relevance to sub-national territories and greater effectiveness. Both national and State governments increasingly favoured community and local level action (Gibson and Cameron 2001) and strategies of development became more bottom-up and localised (Garlick 1997). To encourage this, the Commonwealth Department of Local Government and Administrative Services funded a wide range of community development projects and local economic development initiatives (Day 1987: 221). Federal government initiatives also sought to increase local government involvement in Commonwealth programs (Marshall 1997: 6) and to build the capacity of local government for independent action through the Local Government Development Program (Beer and Maude 1996). The parallel change in perceptions of State governments resulted in reviews of local government legislation in all Australian States (Spiller 1996; Wensing 1997). In Queensland, the legislation provided for significant changes including greater autonomy, greater flexibility, improved accountability, a whole-of-government approach to governing local communities, and a stronger corporate and strategic planning role of local authorities (Tucker 1997: 84). This change in focus expressed in programs and legislation brought about major changes in the role and operation of local government.

This inherent localist emphasis of government programs in the early 1990s was not directed only at local government, it also resulted in an increase in practices of local participation and consultation and more participation by local community organisations. The discontent about communities being excluded from decision-making processes that resulted in the electoral backlash of the late 1990s¹¹ pressured

---
¹¹ In 1996 a by-election resulted in a short-lived coalition government in Queensland. Then in 1998, the One Nation Party won eleven seats in the State election. The One Nation Party, or more accurately, Pauline Hanson’s One Nation Party was an ultra-conservative party that originated in Queensland in 1996. Its policies included protecting Australian jobs and industries from global free market competition and opposing foreign investment, immigration and foreign aid (Davis and Stimson 1998). The party’s electoral success both federally and in the State prompted a significant reconsideration of regional policies by mainstream parties and efforts to make government more responsive to citizens.
both State and Federal governments to give local communities an increased role in local planning and more ‘voice’ in their futures. However, the response also raised concerns about burdening community organisations with extra costs and responsibilities (Stevenson 1998) and about cost-shifting from federal and State governments to local government (House of Representatives Standing Committee on Economics Finance and Public Administration 2003). In addition, the fostering of local participation resulted in the formation of an array of organisations strongly attached to, and focused on, their communities but relatively weakly tied to their wider region or to state authorities other than local government bodies (Stevenson 1998: 143).

At the same time as local participation was being encouraged, renewed support was given to the formation of inter-council cooperative bodies. Notable among these were the Voluntary Regional Organisations of Councils (VROCs or just ROCs\(^{12}\)). The ROCs had received intermittent support from the Commonwealth government, for example by the Whitlam Labor government in the early 1970s. However, it was the Federal government’s Local Government Development Program in the 1980s that triggered substantial growth in the number of these groupings (Beer and Maude 1996). Even though Commonwealth funding was later cut, ROCs continued and have provided a means of regional cooperation among councils. They allow economies of scale where some expensive functions, facilities, plant and equipment – and even staff and expertise – can be shared by neighbouring shires. As well, they undertake joint lobbying where individual councils lack the clout to have their concerns addressed, and they improve access to grants and funding from other levels of government (for instance, through such programs as the Commonwealth’s Regional Economic Development Program in the early 1990s) (Bertelsen 2000). Despite such cooperation on administrative responsibilities, ROCs were not regarded as bodies with the capacity to coordinate the various local and sub-regional bodies (Sansom 1994: 5).

---

\(^{12}\) ROCs are known by various names. For instance, in WA the usage is Regional Organisations of Local Government and in the case study region, one grouping favoured the name Alliance of Councils. ROC is adopted here as a generic term for these diverse groupings all involving a degree of voluntary cooperation between neighbouring councils.
As well as responding to these federal initiatives, councils collectively, through the Australian Local Government Association (and related State associations), were proactive in a number of areas including the particularly pertinent one of promoting integrated local area planning (ILAP). The aim of ILAP was to achieve broad-based planning through cooperation between all three tiers of government, the community and the private sector. This was to be achieved through adopting, ‘a holistic view of local areas, linking related physical, environmental, economic, social and cultural issues, rather than treating them separately’ (Sansom 1994: 4). This emphasis on greater coordination between various actors and a more integrated, holistic, approach represented a shift from the British-based approaches to planning previously followed in Australia. For most of the twentieth century, planning focused on land use planning, development applications and a small number of targeted problems in a limited geographic area (Gleeson 1998: 3). The resultant plans were essentially regulatory and even regarded as ‘myopic’ (Jenkins and Hague 2004: 214). Hence, the embrace of ILAP provided momentum from the bottom tier of government for changes in planning practice – an area in which local government in Queensland had relatively high levels of responsibilities (Spiller 1996).

The developing assertiveness on the part of local government coincided with federal and State attempts to encourage local governments to be more cooperative and more involved in various governance tasks, notably strategic planning. This emphasis on planning, as opposed to administrative responsibilities, related to conceptions of the role of councils (and other levels of government) as ‘steering not rowing’ (Osborne and Gaebler 1992: 20). Although the notion of planning by the state counters aspects of the free-market philosophy of economic liberalism (see McKnight 2005: 118), one of the concomitants of entrenching neo-liberalism in Australia during the 1990s was a second group of legislative and program changes that fostered decentralised, strategic planning (Sansom 1994).

The Commonwealth’s Local Government Development Program (mentioned above) picked up the ILAP concept and funded initiatives to enhance capacity in strategic planning by councils (Sansom 1994: 4). Another Federal Government program provided funding through the short-lived, Regional Economic Development
Organisations (REDOs)\textsuperscript{13}, for development of strategies to boost local economies though generally for a geographic area slightly larger than a locality (Beer and Maude 1996; Northwood 1995). This planning focus was also felt in other areas. For example, individual businesses were encouraged to plan more systematically through State government programs such as an extensive training program in Property Management Planning run through the Department of Primary Industries and similar training programs directed at small business operators by the Department of State Development. Also, the Federal Government’s Rural Plan provided funding for local and community groups to conduct feasibility studies and develop action plans, usually for economic development rather than more holistic futures.

In the field of natural resource management, as well, first local and then regional planning was supported. The National Landcare program was federally funded from 1992 as part of the National Strategy for Environmentally Sustainable Development. This program involved about one-third of Australian farming families in devising and implementing projects to repair land degradation and to improve land management in their local districts (Cary and Webb 2000). Subsequently, the National Heritage Trust (NHT) program, introduced in 1997, advocated the formulation of ‘integrated environment and natural resource management strategies’ (Roberts 1998: 186), but in this case by regional groups. Many of these federal programs envisaged a role for local and State governments. For instance, the NHT dovetailed with the Integrated Catchment Management programs initiated by the Queensland Government in the 1990s. However it was argued that:

\begin{quote}
[T]he strategic management of ‘big issues’ like water allocation and vegetation clearing could not depend – for their effectivity [sic] – on informal arrangements built on landcare and voluntary groups (Head and Ryan 2004: 372).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13} These organisations were known elsewhere in Australia as Regional Development Organisations (RDOs) and established with federal funding in the early 1990s, though discontinued in 1996 when the Keating Labor government lost power. The Queensland terminology is used here to distinguish them from RDOs which are smaller, more numerous, community-based companies or incorporated bodies … a more grassroots phenomenon funded by memberships and local governments though receiving project money from State and federal government.
Consequently, the NHT’s successor program, NHT2, which commenced in 2002 was established as a joint Commonwealth-State initiative in Bilateral Agreements. These define the roles of two Commonwealth departments (Environment and Heritage; and Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) as well as of State or Territory governments and of the fifty-six designated natural resource management (NRM) regional bodies nationwide (Head and Ryan 2004: 369).

There were other statutory changes to planning as well, with reforms to planning legislation in all Australian States (paralleling changes in Local Government Acts). Queensland’s Integrated Planning Act (1997) introduced significant reforms and established important planning provisions beyond the various requirements of the Local Government Acts (Fogg et al. 2001). One such provision seeks ‘to achieve ecological sustainability by coordinating and integrating planning at the local, regional and state levels’ (section 1.2.1 cited in Fogg et al. 2001). This Queensland legislation, and similar initiatives in other States, addressed neo-liberal desires for efficiency by concentrating on reducing bureaucratic requirements (Spiller 1999). Such legislation also strengthened provisions for strategic planning and whole-of-government approaches at a regional scale (Sansom 1993). As well, it formalised the previous informal and limited practice in Queensland of voluntary, cooperative and flexible approaches to regional planning (Tucker 1997). Additionally, it paralleled international trends to broaden planning so that regional strategies became ‘a vision rather than a spatial plan’ (Jenkins and Hague 2004: 214).

Through this legislation, Queensland joined the Federal Government in endorsing the Australian Local Government Association’s concept of Integrated Local Area Planning. Such changes are evidence of attempts in Queensland, as in other States, to achieve economies of scale and coordination and to expand capacity. But Queensland sought to do so using alternatives to amalgamation of councils, as was done in other States (Chapman 1997). In Queensland, the State Government’s associated regulatory framework is defined in State Planning Policies that explicitly link social, environmental and economic considerations in a way that supplements environmental legislation. During the early 1990s, this triple-faceted understanding of sustainability became a dominant theme in much federal policy rhetoric of
regional development and planning as well (Reddel 2002). Such notions of sustainability were not an explicit component of planning practice in Australia until this era. The impetus came from the so-called Brundtland Commission report (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987) and subsequent Rio Earth Summit in 1992 where many national governments, including Australia, adopted the concept of local area sustainability management. This established the principle of subsidiarity (that is decentralization and devolution of decision-making to the lowest appropriate level) (Bajracharya and Khan 2004). This had significant bearing on governance in three respects. First, it reinforced the moves towards localism and enhanced citizen participation mentioned earlier by advocating that local authorities should take the lead in securing sustainability strategies for their local communities and that democratic participation is crucial to successful delivery of sustainability (Patterson and Theobald 1995). Second, it enshrined the responsibility of governments at all levels for integrating social, economic and environmental matters. Third, it laid the foundation for a revived interest in regions and new policies of regional development. The resultant policies and programs of national and State governments further shaped the context of developments in Queensland.  

**Historically fluctuating interest in regional planning**  
Some patterns are evident in shifting priorities of Commonwealth and State governments. Governments in Australia have traditionally exhibited a belief in state planning and the ‘social contract’ as a way to address challenging social, economic and environmental problems. A highly bureaucratized, centralist and interventionist state typified federal and State administrations for most of the second half of the Twentieth Century with only a few short-lived periods of interest in regions and more decentralised planning, regardless of the incumbent political party (Jones 1993). This was partly because planning and bureaucratic systems of governance are regarded as implicitly associated with ‘welfare-statism’ (Jenkins and Hague 2004: 208) and regional planning was regarded, in some Australian States at least, as ‘dangerously socialistic’ (Heywood 1992: 14). The association between social democracy and planned development has, in some brief periods in Australia, also accompanied the adoption of a regional scale. This is exemplified, federally, in the programs and policies of reconstruction after World War Two (Harris 1989). Programs of the Department of Urban and Regional Development and the Australian
Assistance Plan in the 1970s and the Working Nation program of the early 1990s likewise gave stronger priority to planning and to the regional scale than coalition government policies have historically done (Orchard 1999). Neo-liberal reforms during the 1980s, in contrast, dismantled many aspects of the extensive regulation, central planning and protectionism of earlier decades. This suggests that Labor governments in Australia (whether at national or State level), especially those with social democrat philosophies, have been more positively disposed towards planning and integrated approaches at a regional scale (MacRae and Brown 1992). The table in Appendix D records features of these approaches for selected periods. Of further interest is the fact that, at each of the periods with a focus on planning and a regional scale there were accompanying objectives of increasing social equity and improving public participation in decision-making – as Stevenson (1998: 130) highlights for the 1970s. However such decentralised initiatives, with social democrat goals like equity, created two problems for governability: coordination and ‘overload’ (Gleeson and Low 2000: 172).

For these and other reasons, experiences with regional planning, whether initiated by the Federal or the State Government, were not regarded positively (Spiller 1996: 17). As well:

{I}n some parts of Australia there has been little or no institutional experience or capacity in ‘regional’ governance. This is especially so in the state of Queensland, which has had virtually no history of institutional arrangements/forums for collaborative priority-setting, planning and delivery at the ‘regional’ level {Head, 2004 #682: 362}.

The lack of capacity and negative memories of rare regional experiments provided some barriers to revisiting the approach for the State Labor government in Queensland in the 1990s.

Throughout Australia, the interest in strategic planning in the 1990s was also linked to attempts to address late Twentieth Century development challenges – notably coping with the logistics of population growth and economic expansion. These challenges were often long-term consequences that were not considered when short-
term gains were the prime objective (Jones 1989). Most were first evident in metropolitan areas. State and local governments therefore responded to problems such as industrial pollution, traffic congestion and inadequate infrastructure by developing plans for metropolitan regions. These included *Cities for the 21st Century: Integrated Urban Management for Sydney, Newcastle, the Central Coast and Woolongong* (1995), which dealt with an area covering 53 local government authorities. A revised metropolitan plan for Perth, *Metroplan*, was likewise released in 1990 (MacRae and Brown 1992). In Queensland too, South East Queensland 2001 (SEQ 2001) was established in 1991 to devise a framework for planned growth rather than ad-hoc, reactive, development. It covered a region encompassing 18 coastal councils in the south east corner of the State including the State capital city, Brisbane (DLGPSR Queensland Government 2005). In this metropolitan region, demographic pressures were a major catalyst for change. Rapid urban and economic growth also fuelled infrastructure demands in major coastal centres beyond the metropolis. Consequently, the metropolitan southeast and the high growth region surrounding Cairns in the northeast led renewed interest in regional planning in Queensland. Development of the initial regional frameworks of SEQ 2001 and Far North Queensland 2010 (FNQ 2010), at the geographic extremities of the State, was undertaken to provide a means of coping with the ‘boom’ regions of the State.

In many regions of the State other than these boom areas, there were different imperatives. Queensland is relatively decentralised, being the only mainland State with more than 50 percent of its population outside of the State capital city. These regions needed to increase the viability of rural shires facing financial difficulties and declining populations, and to diversify their economies and reduce the impacts of restructuring (Beer and Maude 1996). It was also imperative for them to satisfactorily resolve conflicts between neighbouring councils over issues like the location of major infrastructure (such as airports, shopping centres, noxious industries). Another goal was better management of cross-boundary issues (like water catchments or weed control) (Kleve 1996). This linked to the increasing urgency to address issues beyond the capacity and domain of individual councils. In Queensland, these included the challenge of an adequate water infrastructure in a drought-prone State with expanding domestic, recreational, industrial and agricultural demand for supplies of good quality water (Head and Ryan 2004).
Figure 5.1: Queensland Regional Planning Projects (to 2000)

Key
CYPL S: Cape York Peninsula Land Use Strategy
GRDP: Gulf Regional Development Plan
FNQ 2010: Far North Queensland 2010
TTSP: Townsville Thuringowa Strategy Plan
WHAM 2015: Whitsunday Hinterland and Mackay 2015
CQ: Central Qld A New Millennium
WB 2020: Wide Bay 2020
SEQ2001: South East Queensland 2001
EDROC: Eastern Downs Regional Organisation of Councils

Table 5.1: Details of Queensland Regional Planning Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Year commenced</th>
<th>RPAC Model</th>
<th>Number of LGAs</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area (sq km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South East Queensland 2001 (Now SEQ 2021)</td>
<td>1990 (plans launched in 1995, 2000, 2005)</td>
<td>Local Gov (4 sub-ROCs) State Gov (6 ministers) Supplemented by interest and advisory groups</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,660,000</td>
<td>22,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville Thuringowa Strategy Plan (TTSP)</td>
<td>1996 (launched 2000)</td>
<td>RCC with Local Gov (2 mayors) and State Gov (2 ministers)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>3,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Regional Development Plan (GRDP)</td>
<td>1997 (released 2001)</td>
<td>Local Gov (10), Aboriginal Councils (4) State Gov (4), Federal Gov (2), Land councils (2), Others including industry (5)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitsunday Hinterland and Mackay 2015 (WHAM 2015)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Local Gov (7), State Gov (4), Federal Gov (1), Mining (1), Community (1), Tourism (1) Indigenous (1), Business (1), Environment (1), Primary producers (1).</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>90,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Queensland A New Millennium (CQANM)</td>
<td>1999 (CQRGMF launched 2002)</td>
<td>Local Gov (6), State Gov(4) Fed Gov (1), Mining (1), Industry (1), Business (1), Primary producers (1), Social Services (1) Indigenous (1), Tourism (1) Environment (1)</td>
<td>14 (includes 1 Aboriginal council)</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>141,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maranoa</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Local Gov (8), State Gov(3)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>107,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>n.a.</strong></td>
<td><strong>n.a.</strong></td>
<td>60% of State</td>
<td>93.9% of the State</td>
<td>35.9% of Qld</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


14 In mid 2006, work commenced on a two-year project of drafting a regional sustainability plan for this region.

15 With extensions in 2005 and 2006 to the coverage in some regions – e.g. Wide Bay and North Queensland – and the inauguration of three new planning projects for Western Queensland regions, 100 percent of the state will soon be covered by completed plans.
A central component of the State economy is the coal industry and related energy-intensive industries. This meant that climate change and national and State imperatives for controlling greenhouse gas emissions and land clearance were issues similarly requiring concerted attention (Head and Ryan 2004).

In response to such imperatives, regional planning expanded to other areas of the State with non-metropolitan issues becoming more significant in subsequent plans (McCauley 1998). For example, Wide Bay 2020 (for ten local government authorities) commenced in 1998, and the regional planning process in Central Queensland commenced early in 1999. The full sequence and location of these is provided in Figure 5.1 and Table 5.1. The total annual budget for regional planning outside southeast Queensland is $1.8-2.5 million and the typical budget for a three to four-year planning project is in vicinity of $1 million (personal communication, DLGP). CQANM’s budget, for example was $904,000 with an additional $100,000 in 1998 and $30,000 from Department of State Development. Whitsunday, Hinterland and Mackay (WHAM) and Wide Bay were, similarly, set up with $903,000 budgets each (Wypych 2000). With these projects, the notion of regional planning, introduced under the Goss Labor Government, was continued and extended to non-metropolitan regions by succeeding State governments of both sides of politics.

A crowded governance landscape?

This renewed interest in regional planning for both metropolitan and non-metropolitan regions in Queensland, during the early 1990s, reflected a national trend. It responded to adjustments in the three-tier system of government, new demands from above and below for sustainable development and for more local participation in decision-making. It also indicated a heightened appreciation of the value of strategic, integrated planning as a way of ‘steering’ or governing a region. Together these contingencies resulted in what was claimed to be:

[A] powerful resurgence of Commonwealth Government interest in urban and regional affairs, together with wide-ranging activity amongst the States in the areas of planning system and Local Government reform (Sansom 1994: 7).
A significant consequence of the changed approaches to regional development and planning adopted by State and federal governments during this time was the formation of diverse advisory and action groups, many of them in local communities but also a number at a regional level, including the ROCs, NRM regional bodies and REDOs whose origins are explained above. The Australian Local Government Association has expressed concern that this profusion of bodies unnecessarily complicates regional governance. Their chairperson said:

In Australia, a focus on regional development across government has led to a proliferation of regional structures and an ambiguity in the roles and responsibilities of different levels of government. The establishment of new policy frameworks and mechanisms, regulatory processes, regional task forces, advisory groups and planning strategies in many cases defers a real policy initiative in favour of another addition to an already crowded system of regional governance (Montgomery 2004: unpaged).

Sansom (1994: 3) echoes such criticisms and claims that these additional multi-layered decision-making arrangements lack effective mechanisms for cooperation and consultation between governments. As well, they result in complex and fragmented administrative systems with inadequate role definitions for various levels of government, and in inefficient use of resources. Other critics conclude that cases of overlapping or concurrent responsibilities of different levels of government or different departments are just as challenging as the fragmentation associated with discrete responsibilities in policy areas (Lane 1999). This complexity was seen to be further complicated by the variety of relationships between the many bodies.

The region focused on in this study, Central Queensland, with 185,000 residents, and covering an area of 141,617 square kilometers, had such a crowded system of groups with governance roles in the mid-1990s. It had two city councils, 12 shire councils (one of them an Aboriginal Deed of Grant in Trust Community\[16\]), whole or part of

\[16\] In the 1980s Queensland established community land trusts to own and administer fifteen former reserves in the State (all but two in the north of the State) under a form of title called a Deed of Grant
seven State government electorates and three federal government electorates. In terms of population, area, budget and staffing, the various local governments and electorate offices and regional departmental offices of other levels of government vary considerably. The complex, multi-layered scenario in Central Queensland also involved many organisations beyond formal government structures including a number with a regional focus. Figure 5.2 below presents a number of the sorts of boards, committees and organisations that existed in Central Queensland in the mid 1990s.

At the local level, the formal local government authorities (or councils) were supplemented by Landcare groups, chambers of commerce, voluntary welfare agencies and local progress associations. As well, a number of sub-regional networks and organisations had formed – either spontaneously, or with state encouragement. These included an active sub-regional organisation of seven councils. It was a subset of the ROC, known as the Central Queensland Local Government Association, with 18 councils that were less unified and active (the table in Appendix E shows the structure of ROCs and sub-ROCs before and after the CQANM regional planning process). In addition, there were Catchment Coordinating Committees for the Dawson and Boyne Rivers and NRM bodies like the Central Highlands Region Resource Use Planning Project (CHRRUPP). There were also bodies with an economic focus including RDOs17 like the Dawson Valley Development Association, Central Highlands Development Corporation, Rockhampton Regional Development Limited and Gladstone Area Promotion and Development Limited. Such organisations link, in turn, with the local chambers of commerce, area industry networks and tourism promotion boards.

____________________

17 The RDOs were initiatives of local businesses and councils in sub-regions and continued economic development activities when federal funding of Regional Economic Development Organisations (REDOs) ceased.
At the regional scale there were also a number of bodies. Some – like the Area Consultative Council\(^{18}\); the Regional Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) council\(^{19}\); and, originally, the Central Regional Economic Development Organisation\(^{20}\) – resulted from Federal Government programs (albeit some of them short-lived). Other region-wide bodies – like the Regional Communities Ministerial Forum\(^{21}\) and Regional Managers (of Government) Forum\(^{22}\) – were State government initiatives. Local government councils, for their part, all belonged to the Central Queensland Local Government Association as well as being grouped into sub-regional ROCs. The Fitzroy Basin Association\(^{23}\) is one of 14, regional, NRM bodies in the State. It has strong links with sub-regional organisations active in the same sector in Central Queensland including CHRRUPP, with Catchment Coordinating Committees for specific rivers, with Landcare Groups and also with regional conservation groups.

\(^{18}\) The Area Consultative Committee (ACC) is one of sixty-one such bodies nationwide appointed by the Department of Transport and Regional Services to link regional businesses and communities to Australian Government services.

\(^{19}\) The Central Queensland Regional Council of ATSIC was established in 1989 by the Commonwealth Aboriginal Affairs portfolio to meet ‘national, State, Territory and regional needs and priorities of Aboriginal persons and Torres Strait Islanders’ (Central Queensland Regional Council of ATSIC 2003: 4).

\(^{20}\) CREDO was fostered under the Federal Government’s Working Nation program in1994, but disbanded in 1998 when Commonwealth funding of REDOs ceased.

\(^{21}\) The Regional Communities Forums were initiated by the Queensland State Government in 1999 with a four year funding commitment of $27.5 million. Local forums have 20 members selected from the community.

\(^{22}\) The Rockhampton Regional Managers’ Forum (RMF) was established in 1989. It involved representatives of 19 state government departments and many more of the sections within state government. In 1994 Cabinet affirmed an information sharing, co-ordination and consultative role for RMFs and the adoption of protocols and strategies to achieve effective regional service delivery by the State government. From 2004 this became the Rockhampton Regional Managers’ Coordination Network.

\(^{23}\) The Fitzroy Basin Association (FBA) was established as the Fitzroy Catchment Coordinating group in 1992 and became FBA in 1997. It undertakes environmental repair work through the NHT and NAPSWQ as well as being responsible for the planning, funding, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and review of a natural resource management strategy for this extensive catchment.
This partial coverage of the multiplicity of organisations with governance responsibilities in Central Queensland omits some statutory authorities – such as Gladstone Port Authority (a State Government statutory corporation). As well, there are groups, active in the region but not necessarily having a locality base including industry based groups such as the primary industries peak body, AgForce. Some policy areas, such as human services, lacked links with a wider, peak body. Nevertheless, from these examples, it is clear that many of these bodies were portfolio-specific or functionally-specific – for instance concerned with natural resource management or economic development. They did not operate within consistent boundaries and their actions were not coordinated. They usually operated at just one spatial scale though some had established informal links with each other, for example, in a pattern of regional, sub-regional and local level bodies. A regional overview of the late 1990s recognised the variety of relationships between these bodies in the region, with diverse vertical and horizontal layers of partnerships having evolved in a largely reactive fashion (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 38). Such cooperative groupings, however, had limited connections to the wider array of networks.

The lack of functional integration was also evident within the partial framework of coordination that did exist. For instance, the State government had a system of inter-departmental committees at both State and regional levels and, most significantly, the Rockhampton Regional Managers’ Forum (RMF) that involved representatives of the 19 State government departments with a presence in the region. This commitment to regional coordination and cooperation provided only a limited means of integrating functions and reducing contradictory policies and practices across various portfolio areas. As well, there were inadequate mechanisms for coordinating across levels of government and some resistance to collaboration between departments that resulted in confused policy and service delivery (Reddel 2002: 55). The multi-layered system of decision making was not regarded as conducive to whole-of-government action in the regions (Bellamy et al. 2002).
The complex scenario in Central Queensland in the mid 1990s outlined above is summed up in Figure 5.2 and Table 5.2. They show the patchwork of bodies – including an increasing number of cross-jurisdictional, multilevel, multi-sectoral and multidisciplinary ones – that existed in the region. This one region provides an example of a wider national phenomenon whereby regions are populated by an array of diverse boards, advisory committees, action groups alongside statutory bodies and local offices of departments and agencies of all three levels of government.
Table 5.2: Summary of characteristics of major regional governance bodies in Central Queensland 1995-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Queensland</th>
<th>Regional Planning Advisory Committees</th>
<th>NRM regional bodies</th>
<th>ATSIC Regional Councils</th>
<th>Regional Organisations of Councils</th>
<th>Area Consultative Committees</th>
<th>Ministerial Regional Communities Forums</th>
<th>Regional Managers of Government Forum</th>
<th>Regional Economic Development Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>9 regional committees</td>
<td>14 designated regional bodies</td>
<td>7 (Abolished as of June 2005)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12 (61 nationally)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20 of which 11 are State funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans produced</td>
<td>7 complete including CQ RGMF, 1 under review, 1 recently commenced</td>
<td>10 accredited plans in Qld including Central Qld Strategy for Sustainability</td>
<td>7 developed including CQ’s Regional Plan 2003 and Beyond</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Each region has a 3 year Plan. Currently in CQ: Strategic Regional Plan 2004-2007</td>
<td>Action plans for addressing issues raised at each Forum. No strategic planning role</td>
<td>None as a group, but some from individual agencies eg IRTPs, Regional Action Plans</td>
<td>Each develops strategies for economic development; and promotion of sub-regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope/ issues focus</td>
<td>Integrated and coordinated plan for sustainably managing regional growth and development</td>
<td>Sustainable management of resources and environments of the catchments of the region</td>
<td>Indigenous well-being; culture and heritage; economic and community development</td>
<td>Researching common issues; Resource sharing; Advocacy and promotion</td>
<td>Identifying opportunities. Linking the region to Federal Gov services.</td>
<td>Identifying priority needs and presenting them directly to State Gov’t Ministers.</td>
<td>Coordination &amp; collaboration especially on priority cross-agency initiatives.</td>
<td>Business Development; Regional Infrastructure; Marketing and Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders involved</td>
<td>21 member RPAC with 3 levels of government plus community and private sector.</td>
<td>Stakeholders Council with 30 representatives of groups and sectors</td>
<td>12 member elected Indigenous people from five (geographically defined) wards</td>
<td>Representatives chosen by the 14 constituent councils</td>
<td>5 person board appointed by Federal Gov usually from business, trade unions, trainers</td>
<td>Ten forum members represent geographic and community diversity. 2 MPs</td>
<td>Public sector regional managers based in Rockhampton</td>
<td>Boards have regional leaders from private sector, local gov’t, and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>14 LGAs 141,617 sq km (8.1% of state). Population of 185,000</td>
<td>An area over 200,000 sq km, population about 185,000.</td>
<td>Approx. 10000 Indigenous people from Rockhampton to Longreach and Wide Bay</td>
<td>14 LGAs – as per CQANM minus Tiaroom, plus Broadsound</td>
<td>24 LGAs from Capricorn Coast to NT border. 517,000 sq kms. 200,000 people</td>
<td>Capricorn Coast to NT border.</td>
<td>No uniform defined territory. Rockhampton plus varying additional areas.</td>
<td>4 sub-regions of Central Queensland each have at least one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary alignments</td>
<td>Local Government Areas</td>
<td>Fitzroy basin and adjacent catchment areas</td>
<td>Determined federally by the Indigenous Affairs portfolio</td>
<td>Local Government areas</td>
<td>Statistical Divisions and Local Gov’t Areas</td>
<td>Statistical Divisions and Local Gov’t Areas</td>
<td>Varying administrative boundaries of State agencies.</td>
<td>Boundaries usually close to LGAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory basis and links</td>
<td>Elements have statutory effect in Local Gov Planning Schemes</td>
<td>Plans endorsed by State and Federal governments</td>
<td>Established by Federal Act 1989 (but disbanded 2005)</td>
<td>Voluntary collaborations recognized by State Local Gov Associations</td>
<td>Advisory role – links to federal government funding and programs</td>
<td>Advisory status but with direct participation of government ministers</td>
<td>Implementing government policy</td>
<td>No Statutory basis – many are autonomous companies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the mid 1990s the governability of such regions was being questioned because of the ‘congestion’ of a multiplicity of players having diffused responsibilities and blurred spatial, functional and sectoral boundaries (Montgomery 2004). This congestion was also being questioned because duplication, inconsistencies, contradictions, gaps, waste of money and confusion continued to compromise good governance (Lynn 2005: 186).

This institutional context aggravated the challenges for governance posed by three levels of government and the lack of intergovernmental collaboration and cooperation (Bellamy et al. 2002; Gordon 2002). The challenge was to achieve coordination of the ‘fragmented, often conflicting efforts’ of the multiple regional actors (Sansom and ALGA 1993). This was needed both vertically – between bodies operating at different scales from local through regional and State to national – and horizontally – between the array of organisations with overlapping or interrelated concerns at the regional level. A second challenge aggravated by the developments in governance practices over the past two decades was the lack of integration and inter-disciplinarity highlighted earlier, that resulted from ‘confused and contradictory legislative responsibilities’ (Robertson 1999: 109), and government departments organized around supposedly discrete functions (Dovers 2003a).

The capacity of any of the existing bodies to be an effective forum for regional coordination and integration was seen as being constrained for a number of reasons. For instance, there was a documented history of inadequate inter-governmental cooperation and ‘buck-passing’ between levels of government (Troy 1995: 276-277). As well, bodies formed for cooperative action on specific programs were not connected to all levels of government and other sectors (Sansom 1994). Finally, not all organisations at a sub-regional or local scale had umbrella bodies to facilitate their action at a wider geographic scale. Such coordination and integration of disparate initiatives as existed has been attributed to the desire for economic efficiencies rather than for holistic, comprehensive and coordinated governance (Spiller 1996: 16).

Nevertheless, all levels of government, as well as other observers, were seeking more coordinated approaches:
It is apparent that Commonwealth and State Governments are becoming increasingly aware of the need to avoid fragmented, often conflicting, efforts and to pursue a more strategic approach towards meeting the needs of local areas. Themes such as taking into account a wide range of factors; clarifying roles and responsibilities; expanding community consultation; and improving inter-governmental relations are being raised from many different perspectives (Sansom and ALGA 1993: 19).

The State governments’ recognition of these imperatives is demonstrated by the joint Commonwealth-State programs referred to above and the adoption of ‘whole-of-government’ and ‘joined up government’ rhetoric in the 1990s (Szirom et al. 2002). Some of these, as previously mentioned, involved the formation of further regional bodies. Consequently, the concerns persisted as illustrated by the following words of the chair of the Australian Local Government Association:

> It is time to capitalise on our regions and end the inefficient use of taxpayers’ funds and the duplication of services that comes through a lack of consultation and coordination. It is time for a whole of government approach to regional development and governance (Montgomery 2004: unpaged).

Attempts to facilitate joint efforts of different levels of government culminated in the formation of the Regional Development Council by the Federal government (in 2003) chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister. This Council includes State and Territory ministers for regional development and Australian Local Government Association representatives and has endorsed improved co-ordination of regional planning activities by collaboration between all spheres of government (Montgomery 2004).

**The Queensland Response**

The specific impacts of these concurrent historical, political and legislative developments meant that for successive governments in the 1990s in the comparatively decentralised State of Queensland it was imperative to find new ways of working to achieve effective governance. As was suggested earlier, the State government in Queensland responded to the practical challenges of lack of
coordination, integration and regional relevance by implementing regional planning processes. When these processes were formalised in April 1996, the (then new) coalition government made it very clear that they did not see enhancement of regional planning as involving any devolution of power to Regional Planning Advisory Committees (RPACs). This limitation of their role to advisory only was stressed at a meeting to discuss regional planning in Central Queensland, as the meeting notes record:

Regional planning will not become a fourth tier of Government and regional planning authorities will not be established. Regional planning advisory bodies are not decision-making bodies in their own right, but provide a regional perspective to assist State and Local Government decision-making (file document 24 July 1997).

Consequently, none of these plans was produced by a statutory regional planning authority or development commission such as those introduced in other States to develop regional plans. Instead, Queensland’s plans were drawn up by largely voluntary groupings with only advisory status. It was said the State Government

…opted for a voluntary/consensus driven model based on Regional Planning Advisory Committees (RPACs) … RPACs may be initiated by either state or local government and would generally include representation from a wide range of sectoral/interest groups (the business sector, environmental groups, the professional sector, community services and interest groups etc). RPACs are formally recognised by government and are commissioned to prepare overarching planning frameworks within which more detailed local (statutory) planning may take place (Spiller 1996: 17-18).

The constitutions of the RPACs specify that their role is advisory and that they ‘have no formal statutory role in the Queensland planning system other than that identified in the Integrated Planning Act’ (CQANM 1999a). This Act was mentioned earlier as recognizing the desirability of both coordinated and integrated planning. It requires councils to demonstrate that their local plans conform to aspects of regional plans designated as having a region-wide dimension. The policy and program framework
for the regional planning processes involves consideration of many other pieces of State and federal legislation as well as relevant government programs – a sample of these is included in the table in Appendix F.

The adoption of regional planning by RPACs involved a qualitative change, not just an incremental one, so that governing regionally was increasingly associated with a number of aspirations. One of these was integrated planning, meaning a triple-bottom line focus and a particular understanding of sustainability. As well, broad involvement of stakeholders from all levels of government and beyond, and coordination between all stakeholders and regional actors was sought. Finally, relevance to a scale intermediate between the State and local government was preferred to homogeneous, top-down, central direction. This was evident in the particular structures and processes adopted for the regional planning process in Central Queensland which was a product of the contingencies outlined above. CQANM represents a key response to the increasingly complex environment resulting from the program and policy directions discussed above, as well as the associated lack of coordination of planning and regional development activity in the region. In describing CQANM in the following section, use is made of the interviews, documents and files that provided the raw data for this research as detailed in the previous chapter, and only direct quotes are attributed.

Description of CQ A New Millennium (CQANM)

Initial consultation between local governments through CQLGA and what was then the State Department for Housing, Local Government and Planning, in late 1992, indicated ‘general support for the concept of regional coordination and planning’ (file document 9/11/92). However, this exploration of regional planning for Central Queensland faltered – partly because of lack of unity among councils in the region and partly because some momentum was lost in the lead up to State and Federal government elections in 1996. As well, the new State Government in 1996 was not initially supportive of regional planning (Abbott 2000: 88). The impetus for regional planning in Central Queensland regained momentum after those elections, during dialogue between the Central Regional Economic Development Organisation; the recently re-established Central Queensland Regional Organisation of Councils
(CQROC), consisting of seven councils; and the Rockhampton Regional Managers (of State Government) Forum.

Figure 5.3: Map of the Central Queensland region showing municipal and shire councils involved in the regional planning project

Source: Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee (2002: 1).

Late the following year, the CQROC formally requested the Minister for Local Government and Planning to establish a regional planning project and, on 17 February 1999, with initial funding from the Department of Premier and Cabinet, the proposal to commence the CQ A New Millennium regional planning project was approved. It was the eighth project of this nature across Queensland following similar regional planning projects mentioned earlier. Together, these regional planning processes covered almost ninety-five percent of the State’s population and 60 percent of the local government areas (Cunningham 2003: 7) as shown in Figure 5.1 above and Table 5.1. CQANM itself encompassed the 14 Local Government areas within Central Queensland: Rockhampton and Gladstone Cities, the Shires of Livingstone, Fitzroy, Mount Morgan, Calliope, Banana, Taroome, Duaringa, Emerald, Bauhinia, Jericho, Peak Downs, and the Woorabinda Deed of Grant in Trust
Aboriginal community (see Figure 5.3). The stated intentions of the CQANM regional planning process were to:

[I]mprove coordination of planning for infrastructure and development activities, …[and] to foster greater communication and cooperation between State Government agencies, local government and the wider community in Central Queensland (Department of Local Government and Planning 2002: 2).

Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC)

A voluntary RPAC was formed to oversee the collaborative planning project. It was referred to as the Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee or CQRPAC. This advisory committee had the responsibility of identifying, through community consultation and collaborative research, the major issues facing this region. It was also to advise the government on these regional issues which were assumed to include (but not be limited to): sustainable economic development, infrastructure provision, management of resources (including water), waste management, transportation and communications.

The CQRPAC included representatives from all three tiers of government: federal with one representative, State with four representatives, and local with seven representatives in total – three each from the CQROC and the CQLGA, and one representative from Woorabinda Aboriginal Council. As well, there were non-governement representatives from market sectors (tourism, rural/primary producers, business, industry and mining), and also from a broadly conceived ‘community’ sector (environment, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, human services and education) (see Figure 5.4).

At the outset of CQANM there were sessions designed to provide information on the planning project to as many individuals and organisations as possible and to discuss ways the various sector groups could best be represented on the RPAC. In many cases, processes within a sector determined the RPAC members – usually where some identifiable umbrella group, region-wide or sub-regional group existed. Others responded to public calls for nominations where unity and networking within the
sector was less well-established. Some of these people had been elected within their sectors to represent its interests in certain forums – for example AgForce representatives or local government councillors for each shire. Individual members were positioned as ‘interlocutors’, able to make representations and advocate specific sectoral interests but not as delegates or elected representatives of those constituencies, nor were they statistically representative of them.

Figure 5.4: Membership of the Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC)

The RPAC was not established as an elected body to replace or add to any of the formal tiers of government. An early information flyer said:

CQ A New Millennium is a new project, totally unique to the region. It does not duplicate other planning projects but provides one very comprehensive program that covers all aspects of planning instead of specifically looking at just water needs, or employment opportunities for example. It will pull

---

24 AgForce Queensland formed in 1997 as a peak agri-political organisation representing Queensland's rural producers. It represents the broadacre industries of cattle, grain, sheep and wool in Queensland. It has a State council and five regional councils including one for Central Queensland.
together the many planning activities and strategies undertaken in recent years in central Queensland.

The project is not another sphere of government or a controlling body. It is a committee of local people planning its needs to be put to the State Government to consider for future infrastructure planning and project funding considerations.

It is a local project with local significance using local intelligence to build local communities.

The 21 member CQR PAC was therefore regarded as a network creating formal linkages and interaction between public, private and community (or state, market and civil society) spheres in the region.

The first year of the project consisted of providing information and foundational work such as team-building, designing operating structures and processes and making initial contacts. An early two-day meeting of RPAC members (in July 1999) refined the objectives and parameters of the planning process. The objectives that emerged, according to the file records, were to:

- improve regional coordination (between sub-regions and across sectors);
- develop a process of balancing future development (including the effective use of resources);
- help build community capacity to manage change;
- provide a regional framework for sharing and consolidating purpose and direction;
- recognise diversity and address inequity; and,
- be future focused.

Project Office and Working Action Groups (WAGs)

Besides this Advisory Committee, which met at roughly two-monthly intervals, the structure that emerged consisted of a project office and a series of action groups. The Executive Officer of the project office team was the State Government-appointed, Brisbane-based Manager from the Department of Local Government and Planning.

The project team in the region consisted of the Project Director and an administrative officer as well as temporary Project Officers – for instance four who supported the
activities of the Working Action Groups. Recognising the importance of information and knowledge management, the CQANM project team collected a wide range of spatial information and had a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) officer. Their capacity was also supplemented by a temporary communications officer with responsibility for keeping Central Queenslanders informed about the project by widely disseminating information to stakeholders and the general community.

The CQRPAC determined a structure of action groups that divided the formidable task of integrating planning within the region into manageable components. Earlier regional planning projects in Queensland had decided in advance the key issues for the region and established a committee structure to prepare regional strategies for each issue. These typically included: environment, natural resources, water management, solid waste management, social planning and human services, economic development, tourism, urban growth and infrastructure, and integrated transport. In contrast to this, the CQRPAC established three multi-sectoral working groups to determine relevant issues through wide consultation, and then develop regional action proposals. The operating structure is shown in Figure 5.5 below which elaborates on Figure 4.1 in the previous chapter. The structure was intended to provide a framework for considering the region’s issues and priorities in a holistic manner while being flexible enough to accommodate different structures and processes for various stages of the plan formulation. For instance, it allowed a focus on specific areas at certain stages while ensuring the issues were synthesised rather than considered discretely.

Within this structure, Working Action Groups (WAGs) were formed as the main research drivers of the process and their task was to identify relevant issues with the participation of people and networks with an intimate knowledge of the region. Their contribution was vital to the 18-month long second phase of the project that concentrated on information gathering, consultation and engagement (see chronology in Appendix G).
Three of the WAGs used the themes of ‘People and Work’, ‘Leisure and Lifestyle’ and ‘Sustainability, Conservation and Environment’ when identifying issues. This established, early in the overall process, the importance of considering the social and environmental, as well as the economic implications of the policies, outcomes and actions to be proposed. Whatever their area of focus, WAG members were encouraged to consider all of these dimensions of each sub-theme being examined, to maintain the ‘triple bottom line’ perspective. This was inculcated by the assigned project team member and the cross-memberships of committees. Frequent discussion of this is recorded in meeting minutes. Project officers and RPAC members recruited
the participants in those action groups, seeking combinations of professional expertise and local practitioner insights. These groups contained representatives of government agencies, local councils, businesses and community groups who had generally not worked together before.

There was a fourth WAG called the Regional Community Identity and Development WAG. It comprised members with expertise in community development and capacity building. As well as identifying issues, this fourth WAG assisted the others in their community engagement processes. The capacity of the voluntary members of all WAGs was boosted by significant in-kind support from government agencies and community organisations that included the participation of personnel. The Institute for Sustainable Regional Development at Central Queensland University in Rockhampton also participated in the various groups, thereby helping to link the research and community development needs of those groups with the wider work of the University. The constitution of the four WAGs therefore extended the breadth of involvement in the process, with sizes of WAGs ranging from twelve to thirty-two members.

**Community Involvement**

In addition to this targeted stakeholder involvement, the CQRPAC sought to, ‘engage local communities widely, frequently, and as effectively as possible,’ as a project newsletter in 2001 stated. The process was intended to be very participatory as evident in the Terms of Reference for the RPAC, one of which required them to:

> Ensure inclusive consultation processes are established to facilitate effective community participation in the preparation of CQ A New Millennium

(Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 152).

Likewise, the Terms of Reference for the WAGs (CQANM 1999b: 2) state that:

> It is an imperative [that] the primary focus of the project is the community. Considerable emphasis will be placed on engaging and energizing the community and developing/retaining community identity.
All activities associated with the project are to operate utilizing the following operating principles

- targeted engagement of peak bodies including vocal and silent groups
- engagement of special interest groups and sectorial [sic] networks
- ensure community and geographic spread is achieved

Consequently the project built in opportunities for numerous community groups to provide input, and sectoral groups to review progress reports as well as visits to hear from residents in a number of centres in the region. These visits were called ‘community conversations’.

One of the four WAGs, the Regional Community Identity and Development WAG, was charged with facilitating this community engagement. They designed mechanisms to provide opportunities for extensive engagement of the almost 200,000 regional residents in the process as a major component of the comprehensive research phase. Different means were proposed for different communities or sectors including public meetings, formal presentations, smaller conversations, outdoor meetings and picnics. As well as a comprehensive program of sectoral interviews and focus-groups in key centres, during May, June and July 2000, twenty-six community conversations involving 143 people were conducted across the region. This process established the relevance of issues to communities and stimulated local responses and action. In this respect, there were two-way benefits in that many relevant issues were brought to the attention of the CQRPAC and, as well, communities were assisted to address concerns. In August 2000, the WAGs produced *Key Issues in Planning for Central Queensland’s Future*. This document attempted to reconcile diverse policies, strategies and action plans of various bodies in the region with the community input and perceptions. A year later, a second major round of sectoral consultation meetings and community conversations were undertaken to validate the resultant discussion papers and draft policy framework produced by WAGs and Technical Action Groups and seek community and stakeholder comments. For instance, one meeting specifically solicited indigenous community input and involved the Fitzroy Basin Elders and over 50 members of regional Aboriginal family groups.
Technical Action Groups (TAGs)

The issues gathered in the first stage of the project were collated by the Project Team into an ‘issues database’ that captured the extensive and diverse perspectives emerging through the process and facilitated a tracking process. In the second stage of developing policy responses and actions for the issues, commonalities and differences across the region were identified and the issues were clustered under six commonly emerging themes:

- Resource Use, Conservation and Management
- Economic Development
- Infrastructure
- Social and Cultural Development
- Education, Training and Research
- Planning and Governance.

The themes were further divided into specific sub-themes to enable a more detailed analysis of the data and development of the policies and actions. Each of the thematic areas had between three and six sub-themes as shown in Figure 5.5 above. For instance the six TAGs for Resource Use, Conservation and Management were: Atmosphere; Energy supplies; Conservation of the natural environment; Water resources and water supply; Land resources; and Biological resources. However, often multiple thematic groups drew on the work of a particular TAG. For instance, the sub-theme of Information and Communications Technology Infrastructure provided data for the issues paper on Knowledge and Information and the paper on Infrastructure. Altogether twenty-seven TAGs were formed around these sub-themes to provide both technical and local information about the issues, and to develop principles, policies and goals to address them. The six to twenty people in each TAG were typically drawn from State government agencies, local government officers and councillors, community organisations and local businesses and industries based in various geographic locations of the region. Although planning throughout the 1990s moved away from reliance on technocratic, professional information (Healey 1994), the work of these technical groups informed decision-making and supplemented the more diverse grass-roots information from the community conversations.
The TAGS, like other groups, therefore worked cooperatively with a large number of existing organisations and processes in the Central Queensland region. These included: the Fitzroy Basin Association (FBA); the Central Highlands Regional Resource Use Planning Project (CHRRUPP); Central Queensland University’s Institute for Sustainable Regional Development; Capricorn Tourism; up to three Regional Organisations of Councils (ROCs) (see Appendix E); regional economic development organisations; human services networks; and, community development processes such as Action Capricorn and Vision Emerald. Figure 5.2 and Table 5.2 above, give a representation of the governance landscape that includes these bodies. Estimates of voluntary efforts harnessed by the project exceed ten thousand hours and include meetings of the RPAC and action groups, community meetings, workshops, interviews and focus groups (Department of Local Government and Planning 2002).

Other aspects of structure

The operating structure also included a small group known as Critical Friends that met at irregular intervals to provide an objective, peer review of the process. The critique provided by the Critical Friends group was designed to enhance CQANM’s processes and outcomes. Rather than review the content being gathered, this group focussed on the processes to make sure the end product was relevant and would make a difference. The group comprised independent people not associated with the project and in many cases from outside the Central Queensland region. They were invited by the RPAC as respected people with a strategic vision and experience of collaborative endeavours. The Critical Friends group was invited to challenge existing paradigms of regional planning, regional development and community consultation as well as to question aspects of the process. Their comments were sought to improve the engagement and re-engagement of the communities of Central Queensland, and the overall structure of the document. As well, they identified challenges for the subsequent implementation phase.

More central to the outcomes of CQANM was the Integration and Innovation Team. The core members of this group were the RPAC Chair and Deputy Chair, the Chairs of each of the four WAGs, the Project Director and Project Officers, with others being involved as required. At times, it operated as a merged group of key people
from each of the action groups. The task of this group was to integrate the deliberations of the four WAGs and to provide an additional pathway for the inclusion of innovative ideas and concepts and for underpinning evidence from the TAGs. The principles, outcomes, strategies and actions produced by the WAGs and TAGs served as the blueprint for the final phase – preparation of the Central Queensland Regional Growth Management Framework (CQRGMF) by the Integration and Innovation Team and the project team. The final year of the project was devoted to refinement of the CQRGMF in light of all the input from citizens, community groups, sectoral bodies, action groups and technical experts. This was then subject to political approval processes.

A multilateral network

In sum, CQANM’s structures and processes constitute a system of governance exercised through multilateral networks, not confined to the constitutional framework and territorial boundaries of any single tier of government. In this respect it is an example of the kind of networked governance familiar from the literature reviewed in Chapter Two. CQANM was itself bigger (in scope and in some cases in area) than any of its constituent networks or existing, more focused regional organisations and projects (see Table 5.2). For instance, although it was situated within State government, it was distinguished from, say, the Regional Managers’ Forum by drawing in considerable expertise from beyond government agencies and prioritizing accountability to the region rather than to higher echelons of State government in the State capital. The RPAC constitution suggests this both in describing the advisory role of the committee as ‘convey[ing] advice to the Minister and to member Local Governments on the range of views expressed at the Committee meeting’ (CQANM 1999a: section 3.1.3), and also in specifying a two way communication process:

Committee members will ensure the deliberations and recommendations of the Committee are reported to their respective sector groups and shall consult with their sector groups so that the views of the sector groups can be put forward at Committee meetings (CQANM 1999a: section 3.1.6)
Through processes of harnessing existing networks and expertise, the regional planning project sought to build upon the substantial body of knowledge and experience within the region rather than duplicate groupings or activities that already existed. From the outset, the goal was to enhance and complement existing community activity by drawing on previous strategies and processes, especially those taking an integrated catchment approach which was regarded as the perspective most suited to the scope and scale desired in the CQRGMF (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 14).

CQANM: A socio-historically located phenomenon

As has been shown, during the 1990s in Queensland, there were changes to local government legislation and a number of other developments that shaped CQANM. These included new directions in Commonwealth and State government programs and policies (particularly with respect to regional development and planning), increased assertiveness and cooperation among local governments, and the imperatives of electoral politics. CQANM is an example of a future-oriented, strategic form of planning across local government boundaries rather than the largely reactionary land-use planning at the local level that characterized earlier planning. It was the first regional planning process in Queensland under the Integrated Planning Act legislation that introduced sustainability as a fundamental principle. It also networked key actors in the region rather than relying on the decision-making powers of one level of government. These actors, who were integral to the governance activity, included all three levels of government as well as private sector and community group advocates.

The detail in this chapter has indicated the complexity of the phenomenon of regional governance under investigation in this case study of CQANM. However, regional planning practice is not just a contingent response to wider forces such as those identified in this chapter. It is also an active force enabling change and enabling the management of this complexity (Healey 1997). In the words of Albrechts (2003: 264):
It [planning] forms knowledge, produces discourse, constitutes a productive network and builds institutions that act as a catalyst for change.

The next chapter will analyse the knowledge, discourses, networks and institutions formed by this specific regional planning process, CQANM. In doing so, it addresses the research question, which seeks to understand the mentality of governance implicit in the structures and practices described above, and their inherent discourses, or discursive practices. Familiarity with contemporaneous developments and with the surface appearances of the regional planning process provides the basis for understanding the thinking about the problems of governing that prompted this specific project, in this region, at this time, and in this particular form.
Chapter 6: The Official Doctrine of CQANM - Networked Deliberative Governance

As earlier chapters have shown, the establishment of the CQANM regional planning process in Central Queensland, in 1999, paralleled legislative, policy and political changes and broader governance trends. These gave increasing priority to the regional scale, to participation by local stakeholders and citizens, to strategic planning, to institutional coordination and to achieving integration and sustainability. Such measures were all intended to address perceived shortcomings of government and public administration. In this sense the initiative embodied an emerging discourse of ‘better governance’ that, in some respects, countered the alternative conceptions of governing that were evident during the 1980s and 1990s. The latter were manifested in the enthusiastic embrace of new public management, marketisation and liberal democracy (Rhodes 2000: 57). This chapter profiles the emerging discourse inherent in the ideas and practices adopted in the regional planning process. Chapter Three argued that conceptions of good governance are constituted through the ways of thinking about and enacting the tasks of government that represent a mentality of rule. It outlined a conceptual framework for analysing the discursive formations of a mentality. The governmentality framework considers, first, the construction of a field to be governed and the intentions of government – known as the problematics of governing. This term conveys that such constructions emerge as authorities pose themselves questions about the problems of governing. Second, the governmentality framework analyses the characteristic routines, mechanisms and techniques through which actors operate to realise their goals. These are called the technologies of government. Finally, the framework draws attention to the relatively systematic logic (or rationality) that is intrinsic to both the problematics and the technologies. In addition, Chapter Three defined models of networked governance and deliberative democracy, outlining specific characteristics of networks and deliberation as technologies of government that are also relevant to this chapter.

In examining the notion of good governance inherent in the political discourses of CQANM, the chapter scrutinises the repertoire of actions, ideas, principles and
norms adopted to coordinate and shape programs, behaviours, people, places and objects during the regional planning process. The analysis of these discursive practices, including the associated distinctive language of the regional planning process, shows how CQANM *insiders* construed the tasks of governing. One of the main patterns evident within the multiple accounts was that one particular understanding of good governance was privileged (Waitt 2005: 176). This was an identifiable, consistent interpretation found in both internal and external communications and in documents – especially in the *Central Queensland Regional Growth Management Framework (CQRGMF)* which was the name given to the final regional plan and, as such, was the major output of the project. This ‘version’ of events was also found in the accounts of many of the central players in the regional planning process, notably members of the Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC) and the project team25. Much of this rhetoric was also widely adopted by participants in Central Queensland. This can therefore be understood as a kind of ‘official doctrine’ even though it appeared to be as much aspiration as achievement. Rather than portraying stable relations of dominant-dominated among discourses, this research seeks to profile various discursive formations and their underlying rationalities. The use of the terms ‘rhetoric’ and ‘official doctrine’ rather than ‘dominant discourse’ is intended to recognise the asymmetrical power of various discourses without attempting to establish that a particular discursive formation (or set of related discourses) is ‘true’. The discourses were influential in defining the practices adopted as legitimate, rational and superior to other modes of regional planning and they had staunch advocates among central actors in CQANM. However, at the same time this process was regarded as a tentative and experimental alternative to established practices of policy development and public administration that retained significant influence.

As mentioned above, Chapter Three argued that there are a number of important dimensions to consider in any formulation of regional governance that seeks to have analytic value, and it is these aspects of the rhetoric with which this chapter deals. First, the issue of problematics of government is examined. This involves identifying

---

25 A profile of six attributes of various people represented here by pseudonyms is provided in Table 4.2 in Chapter Four.
the questions various actors and authorities in CQANM asked concerning the art of government and how they defined good governance in terms of the objectives it should prioritise and the territory it should manage. It also involves considering how they diagnosed the conduct that should be regulated and the problems in Central Queensland that came within the scope of the regional planning process because they required a collective response (Rose and Miller 1992: 181). In addition, the processes for assembling different agents and investing them with specified authority are analysed. This involves considering not only the actors or players through (and by) whom government is accomplished, but also understandings of them as citizens, and assumptions about their capacities and the forms of action available to them (Dean 1999a: 29). All of these aspects of the problematics of government can be seen in the programs and procedures through which CQANM rendered the territory, population and issues of Central Queensland governable.

The second section of this chapter scrutinises the means and techniques (also called the technologies) employed in governing. These include not only the institutional structures, decision-making practices and routines adopted for the regional planning process, but also the forms of knowledge and expertise used to shape outcomes, especially the major planning document, the CQRGMF. The chapter will also highlight the intrinsic logic or inherent rationalities of each of the discursive practices as they are discussed. This infers the reflection that has generated them and the implicit justifications for acting in those ways.

It will be argued, in the third section of the chapter, that together these dimensions constitute a distinctive way of thinking about the task of governing. This is both a cluster of discourses of regional governance and a governmentality. In the latter sense this particular discursive formation can be seen as ‘a way of viewing institutions, practices and personnel, of organizing them in relation to a specific ideal of government’ (Dean 1999a: 32). It will be argued that this mentality shared characteristics of the networked governance and deliberative democracy models described in Chapter Three in that it involved a network of stakeholders from within and beyond the state reaching decisions by deliberative means.
Defining ‘good’ governance in Central Queensland

Despite the changes in legislation, policy and politics described in Chapter Five, in the late 1990s there was no coherent blueprint for regional planning in Queensland. Nevertheless, evidence from the Central Queensland region indicates that a desire for improved governance resulted in initiation of the CQANM regional planning process. The perception that change was needed, was frequently expressed. For example, one participant said:

I do think frankly that the old models of regional governance are starting to fail us these days for a whole bunch of reasons. One is the expectation of communities to be involved. … There’s a good argument for this kind of devolution, structured devolution (Gregory).

Likewise, Peter, a local government mayor, likened the lack of good governance arrangements to a ‘fool’s paradise’ where ‘Rome burned’ while ad hoc responses were made by various departments and by isolated groups and communities. To meet this perceived need for change, CQANM was conceived as an example of good governance, as well as a means of improving on shortcomings of the prevailing modes of governing. The objectives of the regional planning process that was to improve this situation were not necessarily the same as imperatives in other regions. Participants in CQANM were at pains to point out that Central Queensland was not facing the crises of population growth and urbanisation that prompted earlier regional planning processes in southeast and far north Queensland. In this vein, one argued that Central Queensland…

… was originally conceived as a region without a problem, but looking to try and manage its future in a more holistic and integrated way and to provide a better future (Edward).

One characteristic of good governance, then, was that it would plan to avert crises rather than address them reactively. This plan was envisaged as what participants called a ‘living document’ in contrast to a ‘doorstop’ (Richard) or ‘dust-collector’ (Ben). By such comments, participants expressed the idea that the CQRGMF was
intended as a dynamic means of implementing governance, rather than an arcane document that would never be consulted.

**What are the objectives of governing?**

Chapter Five documented that a widespread desire for coordination and cooperation was one factor that led to the establishment of the Central Queensland RPAC. Certainly there is evidence that in Central Queensland, as elsewhere in the State and nation, that one specific kind of conduct the regional planning process was intended to foster was coordinated action. As detailed in Chapter Five, there were multiple organisations manoeuvring in the region including the Central Queensland Regional Organisation of Councils and the Regional Managers Forum. Such bodies were not construed as delivering good governance because collaboration was too limited and there was insufficient coordinated joint action. Consequently, one of the Terms of Reference for the RPAC directed them to:

> Facilitate a co-ordinated and co-operative approach across all levels of Government and key regional stakeholders to the resolution of regional planning issues in order to achieve better planning and development outcomes for the region (CQANM 1999a: 13).

This objective is corroborated by the identification of key issues for the region during the early, information-gathering phase of the regional planning project. Among them were: ‘Limited coordination and collaboration between community service providers’ and ‘Limited cooperation and coordination in the operation of councils, State Government agencies and regional development organizations’ (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2000: 11, 34). These issues are elaborated with a series of dot points that further emphasise aspects of the situation identified as inimicable to good governance (see Table 6.1).

CQANM was therefore conceived as addressing this challenge of coordination by enhancing links, cooperation and effective communication. One State government officer on the RPAC summed this up in these words:
There were clearly a number of fiercely independent ‘silos’ and they had no interest in really working together, in fact they were quite competitive. … The idea [of CQANM] was really a journey whose real outcome was about linking the various stakeholders toward working in partnership for the common good. That was the overarching theme (Edward).

Table 6.1: Extract from ‘Key Issues in Planning for Central Queensland’s Future’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited coordination and collaboration between community service providers</td>
<td>• Continued uncoordinated and ineffective community services networking&lt;br&gt;• Duplication of services within some communities&lt;br&gt;• Limited resources are not shared for maximum benefit&lt;br&gt;• Some service positions remain vacant for long periods of time due to lack of coordination between local communities and regional centres&lt;br&gt;• Many clients are unsure of how to access the services they need&lt;br&gt;• Some clients’ needs are not met&lt;br&gt;• Uncertainty regarding who is providing services and what they do&lt;br&gt;• Isolation and inappropriate service response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited cooperation and coordination in the operation of councils, State Government agencies and regional development organisations</td>
<td>• Economic development can be hampered&lt;br&gt;• Region gains reputation as being a poor area to do business in&lt;br&gt;• Projects are either delayed or lost to the region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee (2000: 11, 34).

Regional observers from within and outside government commented, during interviews, on the preceding system of government as confused, with a large number of agencies and organisations engaging in unconnected and piecemeal programs. They also remarked on the lack of coordination within the state administration. Such commentators expressed perceptions of tensions between different government departments and different levels of government and friction between local governments. As well, they noted competition between localities – for instance over attracting infrastructure development or investment. One participant summed up the 1990s as years of relatively ad hoc funding and programs that built up a ‘mish-mash’ of groups and networks with diverse skills, understandings and capacities. Various
other participants similarly articulated the problems of what they saw as the congested governance landscape that prevailed by the late 1990s. According to them, these ‘failing systems’ (Allan) were ‘costing a fortune’ (Daniel) as well as requiring considerable isolated effort without benefiting from cooperation and sharing of information and resources. The resultant duplication, inconsistencies and incoherence were the perceived disadvantages of having offices of State departments, local councils and other organisations operating autonomously, and often competitively, in the Central Queensland region.

The planning project was contrasted with this situation and cited as exemplifying good governance in so far as it stimulated cross-sectoral cooperation in the diverse region and resulted in a more desirable, united, regional approach to government and potential investors. One participant recalled the expectation that ‘there’d be a cooperative spin-off’ (Russell) from having State and local government working together with the private sector and other groups. CQANM was cited as epitomising ‘a real move towards a whole-of-government approach to planning and collaboration’ (Ann). Descriptions of CQANM and criticisms of the situation that prevailed at the outset of the regional planning project, such as those above, suggest that one objective of the regional planning process, and of good governance as the rhetoric portrayed it, was coordination. Coordination here implies various agents acting harmoniously together. Where the actions to be coordinated are those of various government departments or agencies, or of different levels of government, the terminology ‘joined-up government’ or ‘whole of government’ (House of Representatives Standing Committee on Primary Industries and Regional Services 2000; Szirom et al. 2002) is sometimes used to convey this coordination. The notion of extending such coordination to non-state actors is increasingly referred to by government officers using terms such as ‘engaged government’ (Hellmuth 2004).

The perceptions of lack of coordination persisted well into the regional planning process though, as evidenced by the report on the Ministerial Regional Community Forum held in Central Queensland on 26 March 2001 – two years after CQANM was initiated. This provided an overall summary of the Central Queensland meeting in these words:
Discussions centred on current working groups across government being more coordinated and integrated; support to maintain regional identity, less duplication of current activities; and coordinated involvement of community organisations (unpublished file document).

It then listed eight ‘strongly inter-related’ priorities for the region including this one:

Planning, Coordination and Decision-making: To ensure the region uses its resources more efficiently, a common understanding and framework for effective planning needs to be developed between the three tiers of government and the community.

Although CQANM’s contribution to enhanced coordination was not initially recognised by all interested observers, the overwhelming sentiment of the official rhetoric embraced the objective of greater coordination and cooperation. These governance goals related to a conception of ideal relations between governing actors. Further objectives can be inferred from analysing the objects of rule.

**What are the objects of rule? The scope of governing**

The data also suggest particular understandings about the matters to which good governors should attend. The document, *Key Issues in Planning for Central Queensland’s Future* (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2000), for instance, indicated matters regarded as primary governance responsibilities. It provided three groups of issues: Leisure and lifestyle; People and work; and Sustainability, conservation and environment. These correspond to the titles of the three working action groups (WAGs) and were therefore enshrined in the operating structure adopted for CQANM. However, interestingly, the document went beyond listing these priorities and highlighted the multiple dimensions of the various issues identified. For instance, decisions about mining industry development were not portrayed as purely economic decisions, but also social, since coal mining, alone, was a key determinant of employment and accounted for 18 percent of the workforce in one of the four sub-regions (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2000: 43). As well, it had impacts on the environment and on safety, education and training, Indigenous landholders and workers, and on health and
lifestyle (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2000: 43, 59, 20, 40, 60, 61). This inter-linking of the issues is conveyed in the document by cross-referencing both the issues identified and the possible policy responses. It was regarded as a foundation of effective decision-making and good governance to consider the interrelationships between issues.

Participants clearly described the shortcomings in relation to the scope of governance that they perceived in the early 1990s. There was concern that diverse issues and functions were inadequately addressed, and addressed in an isolated rather than an integrated way, by all three levels of government. Project documents support the contention that the conventional approach had limitations, not only because some responsibilities were neglected, but also because the links between issues were inadequately recognised. With respect to the prevailing neglect of some areas, the language used in the CQRGMF is revealing. This eschewed descriptions of ‘the economy as the engine of growth for our community’ that were typical of the early 1990s and suggested that prosperity was based on environmental resources in these words:

Land based resources are the key drivers of economic activity in Central Queensland. Efficient planning and management of the natural conservation areas and natural economic resources at the regional level is actively encouraged to ensure these resources are conserved and protected for future use and not degraded (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 43).

There was also reflection on the negative impact of treating government responsibilities as discrete rather than inter-linked. One of the papers prepared by the Technical Action Group on Planning and Governance said:

The concept of portfolio responsibility has historically resulted in a functionally structured state public sector and, while integrating mechanisms such as Chief Executives forums and interdepartmental committees exist, both governments and the public sector continue to struggles [sic] with integrating their efforts across these functional barriers (CQANM 2001: 21).
Documents further indicated that CQANM was conceived as a better way of governing because it addressed all such problems more holistically. They presented the scope of the process as:

[T]o provide an integrated, whole of region approach to planning and governance. …[This would] effectively integrate both long and short term economic, environmental, social and equity considerations (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 14, 16).

As well as this endorsement in the documents for consideration of social, environmental and economic issues and their interconnection, statements by participants corroborated this as the scope of the project. They indicated that integration of functions or policy areas was characteristic of good governance and hence one of the ‘ambitious’ aims of the process:

[T]o try and establish a planning framework which was genuinely thinking about the broad sustainability dimensions of economic, social and environmental. So it had that fairly ambitious conceptual goal (Gregory).

In defining the broad scope of interlinked social, economic and environmental concerns as a ‘goal’, this statement reveals the overlap between the objects and the objectives of government and shows that in taking a holistic view of the objects to be ruled, sustainability became another objective of good governance according to the rhetoric. This language of sustainability was a common way for participants to refer to the challenge of scope and integration. Others talked of ‘the triple-bottom-line’ to indicate the range of priority issues. CQANM’s structure broadly grouped government departments and other interests in the private and community sectors into social, environmental and economic dimensions. Significantly, the rhetorical embrace of the discourse of sustainability recognised the potential for conflict if these issues were considered separately. This comment was a typical way of expressing such perceptions:
I interpreted the triple-bottom-line bit to be one of the underlying principles of all the issues: that we consider the three dimensions for each issue – three legs of the stool. Not to have the environmental blueprint and an economic blueprint because they’ll clash. You’ve got to look at each issue and deal with the three (Allan).

This theme was elaborated further by a participant from the industry sector who indicated that the enhanced collaboration and commonality was to be with respect to the range of dimensions encompassed by the triple-bottom-line metaphor. He said CQANM would:

…bring all the various stakeholding groups around the region together and try to formulate, via discussion, some common principles about how the region should approach various issues of importance such as infrastructure, you know, water, environmental matters all those sorts of things – which was an immense task (Fred).

Fred’s description of the immense task reinforced the point that a second governance challenge was the absence of a holistic approach that recognised the interrelationship of the full range of significant policy areas. However, as with coordination, there was no specific organisation or agency among the many operating at various levels in the region, with responsibility, or an established mandate, for achieving integration of, as a participant put it, ‘everything from art to zebra crossings together in a holistic plan’ (Regan). Consequently, CQANM was conceived as addressing that challenge of considering ‘all the social, economic and environmental dimensions … in a truly integrated way’ (Frank). The project sought to achieve better governance with greater integration by adopting a sustainable development framework that explicitly acknowledged the interrelatedness of environmental, social and economic issues. Here ‘integration’ is used to refer to a holistic approach that interlinks social, economic and environmental dimensions rather than treating them as functionally distinct. Such inter-disciplinarity contrasts with the convention of addressing public interests in separate portfolio areas and jurisdictions each concerned with a specific substantive issue (Dovers 2003a: 3).
What territory needs governing? The scale of governance

The specific historical and social context in Queensland in the late 1990s led to the evolution of the discourse of good governance to prioritise coordinated, collective action and attention to economic, social and environmental matters in a holistic way. These priorities, in turn, influenced conceptions of the appropriate territory and scale of action. At a national scale, Rose (1999: 34) has argued that a central feature of modern governmental thinking has been the territorialisation of spaces according to the problems to be addressed. He gives the example of the national focus being linked to a specific perception of the economy as a priority. Such territorialisation applies equally at the sub-national scale. In Central Queensland, the link between perceived problems of coordination and integration and a territorial focus was often expressed in phrases like ‘the logic of a catchment as the base’. This indicates that considerations of scale were also integral to conceptualising the governance task in Central Queensland. Rather than being achievable on a national or even State-wide basis, or operating within an ostensibly homogenous, local community, these desirable outcomes were seen as requiring action in a heterogeneous, regional context. The documents and interviews indicated that good governance was characterised by action across multiple scales, especially spaces intermediate between State and local. The RPAC’s Terms of Reference, for instance, charged them with:

Facilitat[ing] the resolution of issues that transcend local government boundaries or involve more than one government agency (CQANM 1999a).

Consequently the CQANM process linked a number of organisations in the region to facilitate thinking, as a private sector representative on the RPAC said, ‘outside the square of parochialism’ (William). Others, too, emphasised the relevance of the regional scale rather than the local, but in a way that tapped into the diversity of existing structures at the local, sub-regional and regional levels. One observer, for instance, perceived that successful integration required recognizing local government, but operating at

… the regional scale which is, I think the emerging fourth level. You know in Queensland we’ve 120 odd councils. It [local government] seems to me to
be just greatly flawed as a concept. You know in the old days of roads, rates and rubbish it was fine, but with these cross-jurisdictional and complex NRM [natural resource management] and other issues it’s a hopeless scale if you’re trying to do anything very much in my view. So you’d anticipate the regional planning would pick up those local structures (Gregory).

Despite the absence of a formal tier of government at the regional level, there was recognition from various quarters of the value of acting together at an intermediate level. This partly related to perceptions of catchments, or bio-regions as naturally occurring units appropriate for considering interlinked issues and consequences. For instance,

I thought the catchment was a logical way to approach it. It happened to almost mirror the Local Government stuff and it almost mirrored some of the State Government and almost mirrored the circle of influence that would go around Emerald, Rockhampton, Biloela and Gladstone. So it sort of did and it’s not quite perfect but it sits OK …The synergies are incredibly strong (Allan).

Besides providing appropriate physical boundaries, participants also considered the region as a generally cohesive grouping of a number of recognized sub-regional communities, despite some widely recognized schisms. As well, they believed action at the regional level would achieve economies of scale as suggested in this comment:

I think the regional level is about maximizing resources and doing things strategically because there’s not enough money to support every little local group to do their little bit of patch protection. …So I think the regional level is the level at which to work (Molly).

As Chapter Five outlined, a similar perception of the salience of the regional scale has only occurred during a couple of brief periods since federation in Australia. In this latest manifestation, regional action was conceived as rendering territories and populations governable in a way that neither central organisation by the state nor local community action managed. It was also the level at which improved
governmental action – in the sense of better coordinated and better integrated – was deemed most achievable.

This rhetoric shows how, in Central Queensland in the late 1990s, good governance was assumed to involve the development of sustainable, integrated plans for pluralist regional spaces and greater coordination of the activities of multiple actors from state, market and civil society sectors. There were also assumptions about which actors should bear responsibility for these governance tasks, in other words who should govern.

Who governs? Actors in regional governance

Concerns about the lack of collaboration between the multiplicity of actors in the region, and the appropriate territory and aspects of social life to govern, resonated with increasingly popular ideas about devolution and enhanced democracy discussed in Chapters Two and Five. Besides the objective of coordinating multiple actors and achieving integration by addressing economic, social and environmental matters at a regional scale, a third dimension of the official doctrine related to fostering ‘ownership’ and broad involvement. This is clear in the RPAC’s Terms of Reference which required the committee to:

Facilitate the involvement of major Government and key community and stakeholder interests in the preparation of CQ A New Millennium. [and]
Ensure inclusive consultation processes are established to facilitate effective community participation in the preparation of CQ A New Millennium (CQANM 1999a: 13).

The winter, 2001 project newsletter corroborated this emphasis under the heading ‘A Word from the Chairman’, in these words:

[T]he CQANM model of planning and decision-making seeks to engage the community as widely and frequently as possible. …Community consultation and involvement is the linchpin of planning for the region (file document).
These documents indicate that those concerned to improve governance of the region, beyond defining this in terms of better coordination and integration were also questioning who was best positioned to govern. This is to be expected since a mentality of government typically involves convictions about the ‘proper’ distribution of tasks and responsibilities among various sectors (Rose and Miller 1992: 175) and about the attributes of those with the capacity to govern (Dean and Hindess 1998: 8). The rhetoric and practices of CQANM reveal a number of assumptions about who should be involved if governance was to be improved. As mentioned, one of these assumptions was that good governance required widespread participation by stakeholders and the community. The documents cited also made it clear that regional planning was not regarded as the exclusive preserve of state actors.

Again, the aspirations of CQANM to good governance are evident in the critique of the existing situation as much as in the rhetorical claims about CQANM itself. This critique highlighted the incapacity and inadequacy of the existing tiers of government that dominated decision-making. It indicated that, in Central Queensland, as observed elsewhere, there was cynicism about the public service and a parallel ‘high level of disenchantment with politicians’ (Sawer 2002: 41). These concerns were evident in the list of issues identified in community conversations described in Chapter Five. This list included claims of an ‘imbalance between government and community participation in decision-making’ and of ‘people outside the region making most major decisions both in the private and public sectors’ (CQANM 2001: 17). These express community perceptions that they had too little voice in regional decisions.

As well as a desire for greater non-government input, there was also a mutual lack of confidence between existing levels of government in Central Queensland. Some local government councillors appeared dismissive of State government policy-making as being bureaucratically driven, lacking transparency and being top down. However there was reciprocal scepticism from State bureaucrats about the capacity of local government. One State public servant rejected councillors’ claims that their election gave them a mandate on all issues. He emphasised the value of a range of perspectives from the community:
I honestly believe that every elected representative needs at least ten, possibly twenty, people that they can ring, that they know have got varying opinions on issues, that are not the same as their opinion, but that vary … I believe there needs to be processes put in place to keep in touch (Regan).

Many stakeholder groups and citizens therefore regarded CQANM as a superior form of governance because, in their view, it was not just a reflection of the Central Queensland Local Government Association (Susan) or a form of matrix management by State government (Peter), and nor was it another level of government and bureaucracy at the regional scale (Kevin). As well, each level of government felt able to influence the process while recognising measures to contain the influence of other levels. This was because, although the CQANM regional planning process included politicians or bureaucrats from all three levels of government, it also built on what one participant called ‘the existing social capital’. This meant the avenue for involving civil society and private sector interests was through the many relatively independent and disconnected groups operating in the region. In this way the regional planning process did not ignore the established tiers of government, but it also included players beyond the state as a way of keeping in touch with a range of opinions. In addition, it helped meet another key issue identified in the region – the increasing expectation that communities have a role in determining their own futures (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2000: 77).

While Central Queensland is widely recognised as an appropriate regional unit, there was recognition of considerable demographic, geographic, cultural and economic diversity and uneven development within the region. However, capturing such diversity by universal participation is not feasible for a regional exercise. The impracticality of including all 185,000 residents and hundreds of interest groups in Central Queensland was addressed by dual notions of equal opportunity for all to participate while simultaneously ensuring an array of collective positions from civil society and other sectors were represented in various committees.

Chapter Five illustrated that this was achieved through involving multiple stakeholders in the region. This stakeholder concept involved organising or including
groups regarded as having a stake in the relevant issues to give voice to collective positions. A State government officer who participated in the Regional Community, Identity and Development Working Action Group explained that this approach was regarded as ensuring that CQANM decisions genuinely reflected the public interest:

We felt that the legitimacy for the decisions that CQANM was going to make was going to be from the stakeholder representatives on the board [RPAC] and committees (Leo).

Rather than being a definitive solution, though, a stakeholder approach raises further questions for governing authorities such as: Which interests or stakeholders can be identified? By whom should each stakeholder group be represented? This is a long-standing challenge. For instance, the Tennessee Valley Authority, over half a century ago, acknowledged a distinction between ‘institutional grass roots’ and ‘popular grass roots’ as well as problems of assuming that the citizenry can be ‘identified with its organized expressions, existing local governments and private associations’ (Selznick 1949: 63). The CQANM project team and other participants were asking themselves similar questions about these challenges. One team member said:

I think it was always going to be difficult as to who was around the table and what sectors were and what sectors weren’t and was that a good model (Pamela).

The ideas espoused and practices adopted by CQANM in response to these questions can be interpreted as implying not only notions of governmental responsibilities but also conceptions of democracy. This becomes evident from analysing what they hoped was a ‘good model’ for stakeholder participation. For the RPAC, the various levels of government were recognised as stakeholders. However, to counter community alienation and meet the expectations for popular voice mentioned above, there was an expressed desire by those at various levels of government to go beyond state actors and include others. As a local government councilor said:

[T]his plan, needed to be more open and more influenced by the whole of the region, rather than just being local government biased (Peter).
Consequently, the private and civil society sectors provided additional stakeholders, and there were further divisions within each of those broad sectors as well, with a total of twelve non-state stakeholder groups constituting the RPAC. They were chosen to represent a range of interests from the private sector and civil society, as indicated in Figure 5.4 in Chapter Five. Local governments not only provided representatives of one of the state stakeholder groups, but also picked up the diversity of spatial interests – for instance between cities and rural areas or coastal and inland shires. So one-third of the seats were for local government. A State government officer explained one intention was to avoid giving precedence to any one sector in that committee:

There was going to be more local government than State government and then if you took the sectors, there’d be more sectors than State government (Russell).

Predictably, non-government sectors appreciated being involved in decisions previously dominated by governments. The view of an industry spokesperson was typical:

I feel we had that voice which we wouldn’t have had if we hadn’t been involved. And I guess for major industry it’s a big concern to know that we’ve been dictated to but we haven’t had a say (Lynn).

Her perception indicates that the stakeholder approach picked up voices that would have been excluded by simply relying on government. Dryzek (2001: 653) has identified stakeholder processes as a democratic means of serving a twofold purpose. As suggested above, it is a way of restricting the number of people involved in deliberation, but it also ensures that the individuals who do participate are in some way representative of those who do not. It is evident that both of these dimensions were significant in the rhetoric of CQANM and its inherent conceptions of good governance. In including stakeholders other than governments and elected politicians, the project team, and the various sectors, grappled with such issues of representativeness (and problematised notions of representative democracy).
Peak bodies from sectors were regarded as the ideal non-government spokespersons. The choices involved in determining the sectors to be represented seem vindicated by the widely held view that a good range of stakeholders was included, as epitomised by this comment:

I would say that they had a very good cross-section of the community. They really did endeavour to do that. They looked at all of the major sectors and drew them in and when they actually set up working groups they drew people into those. Each one of those engaged their appropriate sectors within their community and sort of drew those in. …Certainly there was a wide-range of people, I don’t think anybody was left out of it (Valerie).

While such comments indicate that the selection of sectors with a stake in the region’s future was deemed by many to be appropriate and comprehensive, the process of determining representatives of each of the stakeholder sectors presented further challenges. Some feared that relying on organised interests might compromise broad representativeness by involving essentially partisan interest groups such as ‘Stop Nathan Dam’ or ‘Save Byfield Forest’ lobby groups. It is apparent that, in this respect, the rhetoric made a distinction between stakeholders and interest groups or lobby groups. The stakeholder ‘sectors’ were regarded as complex and internally differentiated groups with diverse interests – as distinct from single issue, sectional, groups formed to pursue the advantage and the interests of a limited, homogenous section of the community.

Many regarded it as ideal to have the choice of ‘leaders and strong representatives [with] good networks’ (Ann) made within the sectors themselves, relying on the diversity of sectors and their internal selection processes. This is evident in the RPAC chair’s comment which highlights that a contrast was drawn between ‘being representative’, as in a random sample, and having a range of perspectives represented:

Because there were only a couple of dozen people on the committee [RPAC], it was never going to be representative. What we were looking at was diversity of interest, diversity of intellectual capacity, and the ability, if you
like, to provide commitment. So … going to groups and saying ‘who would you like to represent you and your interests on this committee?’ So all of those groups nominated from their own networks and linkages.

The implicit distinction between being ‘representative of’ a group or ‘representing’ that group’s interests was deemed significant in ensuring the full spectrum of public opinion was presented. Many participants believed that relying on internal processes within sectors (particularly those with significant capacity and established democratic processes) conferred greater legitimacy on those from the various identified stakeholder groups than a region-wide ballot or selection of elite expertise would have done.

In addition, those ‘representing’ sectors, but not ‘representative of’ society were recognised as having the sort of multiple affiliations Hirschman has identified (1994: 212). Hence they could speak on a broad range of issues across various cross-cutting cleavages. In other words, the stakeholders were encouraged to move beyond entrenched allegiances to a particular sector, organisation or locality and instead collaborate to develop an integrated regional outcome. It was remarked that this made the process much more effective than people simply ‘wearing their sectoral hat’ (Christopher) and only being prepared to comment on a narrow range of issues.

The CQANM process is an example of a multi-stakeholder process, with the emphasis put on sampling a range of discourses and relying on the varied constituencies and processes of each stakeholder sector to ensure citizen participation and input. It was summed up as effective governance in these words:

Difficult! Time-consuming! Resource-hungry! But, at the end of the day, if you do it well, very effective. And different sectors were more difficult than others. Some sectors have that capacity already because they’ve got the infrastructure, the social infrastructure already in place... Something like the pastoral sector, there’s a strong political framework there. Grain sector – strong political framework. Local Government, there wasn’t an issue because there was an identifiable group. So some were much easier than others (Rosemary).
Rosemary and others recognised the differing capacities of various sectors and the impact of their diverse histories, experiences and relationships. While the environment sector was regarded as having a strong foundation of collaboration because of the activities of the Fitzroy Basin Association in networking a range of groups, other sectors were regarded as more disparate. Some sectors, the social services sector for example, lacked existing regional frameworks. Partly because of such differences, but also because the engagement practices that were employed privileged sectors accustomed to representing their interests in certain ways, the inclusive ideals were not fully achieved. More than one participant reflected that the Indigenous voice was hard to capture, for example, because of the heavy reliance on committee meetings as the main fora for networking, deliberation and decision-making. In general, members of the Indigenous community in Central Queensland were not as practised with Westminster-style meeting formats as, say, the local government councillors and bureaucrats who predominated in CQANM arenas.

Most of the insights above relate to the composition of the 21-person RPAC. There were two other key strategies for broadening the actors involved and giving voice to the full range of community perspectives. The first of these was the many sub-committees, especially the Action Groups. Membership of these bodies was more open than for the RPAC, though their connection to the RPAC ensured outcomes and perspectives were channelled through to decision-makers. Such connections have been emphasised as a crucial design property of participatory governance (Fung and Wright 2003b: 21). The stakeholder processes were also supplemented by provisions to give an avenue for individuals not aligned with any organised groups to engage with the process and to include interests that are without ‘voice’ (for example the natural environment, children or future generations). A freecall hotline was established for individual citizen input and information. As well, public meetings were held for various sectors in the main centres, and finally, two rounds of 26 community conversations were designed to reach out to citizens in specific localities. To raise awareness of these locality-based forums, a range of outreach strategies was used from media advertising to word of mouth. The community conversations were designed to encourage participation and generate input by being convenient and family-friendly. Florence, for example, regarded them as:
[A] quite innovative attempt to at least groundtruth back with the real, grass-roots communities … It gave the whole process legitimacy for me.

In this vein, many stories shared during fieldwork in Central Queensland praised the accessibility and options for public involvement in the regional planning process. This suggested that people in the region viewed good governance as being inclusive and providing new opportunities for democratic involvement of citizen interests.

This examination of those involved in the Central Queensland regional planning process and how they were selected highlights convictions about ‘public sovereignty’ and the conception that governance should involve a diversity of stakeholder representatives with legitimacy in the eyes of their constituency (and the region generally). The credentials of this governance exercise were based on widespread participation, collaboration and shared vision, as illustrated by this assessment:

So that’s one of the greatest accomplishments of documents like this is that they did listen to everyone and they did put reasonable strategies and actions there that met all the different perspectives from the community (Kim).

The practices adopted by CQANM imply ideal attributes of those involved in governing the region and that particular discourses of democracy underpin those ideals. The data suggest a widespread conception of democracy as ‘government for the people and by the people’, with a particular understanding that the will of the people needs to be expressed by giving voice to the plurality of interests and identities in the region. The rhetoric of CQANM positioned a stakeholder process, which empowered a variety of actors and was supplemented with opportunities for citizen input, as a superior mode of governance. These aspirations of good governance were augmented by practices deemed appropriate ways of implementing the ideals.
Technologies for putting governmental ambitions into effect

The RPAC Chair explained that the regional planning exercise sought to establish ‘where we wanted to get and how to get there’. In this sense, it was an example of a wider phenomenon of regional experimentation (Morgan and Henderson 2002) and envisaged changes not only in policy goals but also in how they were developed and implemented. The previous section illustrated ambitions of coordination and integration underpinning the regional planning process. It also examined the rhetorical portrayal of the CQANM process as good governance because it democratically included a range of voices from state, market and civil society sectors. However, the regional planning process was not regarded as an example of good governance simply because of these aspirations, but also because of the mechanisms put in place to ensure these ambitions were met. This section therefore turns to the techniques and processes used for the regional planning project and considers these as technologies of government and as discursive practices that influenced the behaviour and relations of individuals and groups in Central Queensland. It notes that the use of some procedures was restricted by these discourses while others were facilitated or endorsed as the best way to achieve governmental objectives in the region.

It has been argued above, that the initiation of the regional planning exercise indicated a conception of good governance as coordinated and integrated, and involving widespread participation by diverse stakeholders. Moreover, there was a simultaneous concern about the limitations and inadequacies of prevailing forums and processes for planning and decision-making. Many people rejected top-down decisions by ‘faceless’ bureaucrats. Instead, the premise of CQANM was that the desired coordination and integration could best be achieved by involving a network of stakeholders from within and beyond the state in reaching decisions by deliberative means and in drafting a comprehensive, holistic, plan for the region. This section elaborates what this meant in terms of three technologies of government. First, it analyses characteristics of the structures of CQANM, participants’ views about the merits of those particular ways of connecting stakeholders, and how they relate to defining features of networks. Second, it considers the mode of interaction and kinds of decision-making processes aspired to in CQANM, in this case noting parallels to key qualities of deliberative processes. With respect to both of these
dimensions, there will again be a focus on the justifications people gave for these preferences. The final technology discussed in this section of the chapter relates to the process of drafting the CQRGMF – the document that was the primary output of the regional planning process. This involves examining the kinds of information used in it. Knowledge acquisition and deployment is a loaded exercise and scrutinising the types of data considered; the means for collecting and processing them; and the rationale for those choices, provides further insights into the rationalities of governing that prevailed and the ways the region was constituted as governable.

**Joining up to govern better – the value of networks**

Rather than focusing on the apparatus of the state, contemporary notions of governance draw attention to the articulation of diverse interests to form dynamic assemblages of rule. Here, articulation is used to refer to ways of joining up, engaging with, or relating to each other. It is a corollary of the desire to coordinate activities and recognises inter-dependencies within the state and between it and other actors. Such assemblages have been described as networks:

> To the extent that actors have come to understand their situation according to a similar language and logic, to construe their goals and their fate as in some way inextricable, they are assembled into mobile and loosely affiliated networks (Rose and Miller 1992: 184).

While this language of networks is widely adopted in the governance and public administration literature, and by practitioners, it embraces some quite different forms of interaction with different configurations as previous chapters have argued. These variants are rooted in distinct rationalities. This complicates our understanding of the Central Queensland region where a variety of inter-organisational relationships existed. Few of these were called ‘network’, and one that was – Gladstone Area Industry Network – might more accurately be considered as a coalition of large industries. Nevertheless, participants regarded CQANM as a mechanism to link, in a network, the constellation of local, sub-regional and regional organisations and actors in Central Queensland. This was portrayed as a better way of governing than, say, linking them in discrete, nested, hierarchies or contractual partnerships.
The term ‘network’ was frequently used to describe CQANM, its constituent committees, and even many of the stakeholder groups in the region. In fact, one participant described CQANM as a ‘network of networks’, suggesting that each of the stakeholders groups that connected and interacted in CQANM arenas was itself conceived of as a network because members had multiple links and interactions with other groups. This multi-network alternative to using the representative institutions of liberal democracies as the primary forum for political deliberation was described by one participant as:

An umbrella that brought together existing networks … drawing on the synergies and the linkages … it really was the spider’s web that brought all the bits together (Edward).

People’s ability to draw on, and feed out through, these links and networks was seen as enhancing the effectiveness of the regional planning process. Assembling this supra-network and maintaining the multilateral relationships within it was expected to reduce confusion and enhance coordination, including between government departments, as a State government officer claimed:

One of the great things is, we will get a better whole-of-government working relationship, it built a lot of relationships across departments (Regan).

This practice of linking pre-existing networks and sources of discursive order in public, private and community (or state, market and civil society) spheres was utilized for the various arenas (committees) within CQANM. It was portrayed as a way of achieving effective governance as illustrated by this description of the sort of network formed by one of the four Working Action Groups:

The Environment, Sustainability and Conservation group was very effective… because of the work that the FBA had already done. And not just the FBA, but the Central Highlands Regional Resource Use Planning Project – no doubt you’ve heard of that – CHRRUPP. So that made it a bit easier, that we already had in place some of these networks… yeah we had quite
extensive networks because I’d already been the Landcare rep on the FBA and networking with people there (Douglas).

Participants claimed network technologies contributed in a number of ways to improved governance. They allowed greater flexibility and responsiveness and provided a framework and an arena for resolving conflicts and fostering ‘ownership’. That, in turn, reduced the likelihood of subsequent resistance to implementation. As well they expanded the pool of available knowledge, skills and resources. These qualities resonate with the potential efficiency gains achieved by governance networks detailed by Sorensen and Torfing (2005: 198-199). Participants claimed that the heterogeneity, inclusion of non-state actors and harnessing of synergies found in CQANM were virtues of its operating structure. These characteristics are those identified with networks by Rhodes (1997) and others (including Flyvbjerg 2001; Healey 1997). They are also associated with broader conceptions of political power beyond the state (Rose and Miller 1992: 193).

In Central Queensland, a network was formed by cross-sectoral connections linking a diversity of constituent bodies (some of them networks in their own right). One feature of the CQANM groups and committees, emphasized in the rhetoric, was that the actors connected in these were various stakeholder groups from three distinct sectors – community groups, business and the state. Further, they emphasized features that distinguished the form of network they aspired to, from some other kinds of alliances and connections that have also been described in the language of networks. Specifically, CQANM was a deliberate and contrived multilateral linking of stakeholders as distinct from a spontaneous series of (possibly unrelated) interconnections. The various committees were designed as networks that met regularly ensuring interactions were not as casual as is the case in such phenomena as an ‘old boys network’. In addition, the actors engaged with CQANM espoused the purpose of articulating and furthering the broad public interest. They portrayed their sense of unity and commonality as different from the kind of networking undertaken by bodies such as the Gladstone Area Industry Network where people engaged primarily to advance their own companies.
Besides the diversity of actors, a second distinguishing feature of networks is that the relationships in a network are on-going, and are described in terms of interdependence or mutuality rather than as principal-agent, manager-subordinate, expert-layperson or carer-client (Rhodes 1997: 53). This highlights the characteristic collegial interdependence, and also the importance of trust and of collectively negotiated norms of interaction (Sorensen and Torfing 2005: 198). The new institutionalists mentioned in Chapter Two, are examples of analysts who stress such procedural dimensions of the cooperation associated with networks (Moulaert and Cabaret 2006: 57). The literature documents various positive effects of trust-based relationships including the balancing of power (Huxham and Vangen 2005). Resonating with these observations, people in Central Queensland alluded to collectively developed ground-rules for open and productive relations and to the value of building trust through regular interaction, ‘facilitated discussions’ (Molly) and other processes. The rhetoric of the regional planning process expressed intentions of building a dense web of relationships, rooted in mutual respect, trust and interdependence, which were inclusive and collegial rather than merely professional. Participants noted that the levels of trust and cooperation required to engage stakeholder groups in this cross-boundary, multi-disciplinary exercise were not characteristic of the prior situation. Previously many of these actors had not exchanged information or interacted with each other. Many participants regarded the ‘good working relationships’ (Ann), trust and degree of openness that developed as an important legacy of the project. Improved governance outcomes were attributed to such relationships. As one of the local government officers said at the end of the project:

It’s subtle. We’re not all singing from the one chorus sheet, but there’s greater appreciation of various perspectives, more linkages and more thinking outside the box (Megan).

A third characteristic stressed in the literature on networks is the interaction of autonomous equals or the absence of hierarchy and the autonomy from the state (Rhodes 1997: 53). The conception of a network as a much flatter, polycentric, arrangement resonates with the accounts of participants in CQANM. The absence of a single dominant actor and a hierarchy was portrayed as another of the virtues of the
Central Queensland regional planning process. As well as explicit aspirations to give equal status to all actors, this was sometimes expressed by extolling the inclusiveness of the process; other times by alluding to the numerical balances of stakeholder representatives as equalising. In reporting the rhetoric of egalitarian relationships, this analysis is not intended to disingenuously deny the exercise of power in the networks. Issues such as the existence of power imbalances and the presence of some concerns that certain interests were privileged will be explored in the next chapter.

The intent of CQANM, though, was a significant departure from traditional government decision-making processes where key decisions are taken in the national or State capitals. The balance of stakeholders on the RPAC and other mechanisms – such as having all committees choose their own chair and providing equal administrative support to each Action Group – were claimed to ensure the independence and freedom from state dominance regarded as important for good governance.

Other features of networks such as their potential value as flexible coordination mechanisms in complex situations and the opportunity they provide for exchange, interactive learning and innovation (Moulaert and Cabaret 2006: 57, 58) were also features of CQANM according to the rhetoric. For instance, it was suggested that the involvement of Central Queensland University in many of the networks contributed to the development of Central Queensland as a learning region. Again, the implication was that this allowed the achievement of otherwise elusive objectives.

This positions CQANM as a case of the sort of ‘regional experimentalism’ identified by Morgan and Henderson (2002) as occurring in Europe. Participants indicated that, in their view, they had crafted a dynamic network using a ‘consensus-based process of interactive learning within and between the public and private sectors’ (Morgan and Henderson 2002: 4).

Despite the conceptual confusion associated with the term ‘network’, the rhetoric of CQANM posited this as the institutional mechanism for achieving good governance and an important component of the discourse of articulation and coordination underpinning the regional planning process. Moreover, this term is deployed in a particular, limited and precise way in the idiom of participants. Not only does it imply multilateral relationships between the diversity of actors; but also relationships
characterized by egalitarianism, mutuality and trust, and so distinguished from a variety of other ‘ties’. The stakeholder network was the preferred mechanism for ‘joining up’ diverse interests and practices. The rationale was that networks provided a number of flexible arenas or forums where democratic working relationships could develop and increased communication could take place so that the governmental ambitions of greater coordination, integration and citizen participation would be realised. In other words, networks were embraced for their perceived contributions to good governance by reducing duplication and other inefficiencies (resonating with arguments of Sorensen and Torfing 2005). In addition, networks were endorsed for their perceived contributions to democracy – resonating with characteristics of stronger democracy identified by Fung and Wright (2003b), Dryzek (2000a) and Barber (1984).

**CQANM - a public forum for deliberation**

Given the involvement of diverse actors in networks of stakeholders, the communication practices in the networks and processes for balancing the competing discourses of stakeholders were a significant technology of government by which governmental objectives of coordination, integration and participation were achieved. Participants described the communication processes employed at some length, as these examples show:

We had these Working Action Groups, these Technical Action Groups, consultation processes, one-on-one meetings, going to existing meetings to try to raise the profile a bit. So it was very much driven by getting communities involved, just talking to people, consulting, and that sort of thing (Richard).

[C]ouncils, industry, sectorial [sic] interest groups, State, Commonwealth governments, could sit down round the table and argue openly and transparently about issues, and seek a common resolution of them. And there were a lot of very heated discussions… [T]he ability to communicate and discuss issues, hard nosed issues, in an open, rigorous, way is now available (Frank).
These were among many similar claims that open dialogue and broad-based argumentation were central to achievements in the regional planning process. In this reliance on dialogue and particular communicative processes, CQANM is an example of a number of recent processes that imply that the key to legitimate decision-making is deliberation. Chapter Three argued that deliberative processes are primarily characterised by open, public reason or dialogue that allows many competing social interests to be expressed (Habermas 1996a: 170). Here ‘public’ implies open, community, dialogue giving equal consideration to many perspectives and seeking to advance collective interests. ‘Reason’ is the exchange of arguments over the merits of contending perspectives and their justification on the basis of serving the public interest (Dahlberg 2004; Gutmann and Thompson 2004). Many accounts of participants highlighted the significance they attached to deliberative processes in the regional planning process. They contrasted the transparency and diversity of such public reasoning with the pragmatic, self-interested bargaining and adversarial debate common in parliamentary legislatures. In this respect they echoed the concern about the dangers of collusion when the state relates to a small number of large organisations (Leat et al. 2002: 103).

As has been described earlier, the central deliberative arena for CQANM was the RPAC – the 21-person group steering the whole process. However at various stages of developing the plan, there were other groups, notably more than 30 Action Groups, many with close to 20 members (see Figure 5.5 in Chapter Five). Additionally, the broader community conversations were claimed to ensure the final plan reflected the diversity of grass-roots views. The community conversations, and especially regular committee meetings, were conceived as spaces for dialogue and confrontation of viewpoints between actors from multiple levels of government and society. The meetings of these groups were not restricted to committee members but were also attended by the project staff and a range of other observers. Box 6.1 shows the typical array of observers from state, market and civil society sectors attending one particular RPAC meeting, as well as the people who felt interested enough and connected enough to send apologies. Even just this one forum clearly provided access for a breadth of viewpoints to engage on an equal footing in open exchanges.
Box 6.1: Observers and apologies for sample RPAC meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State sector:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and Recreation Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Services Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Natural Resources and Mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Minister for Environment, Local Government, Planning and Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Natural Resources and Mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Natural Resources and Mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calliope Shire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Builders’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capricornia Training Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connell Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance People Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgForce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Queensland Forest Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters of Mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy Basin Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Queensland University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Sustainable Regional Development (Central Queensland University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOLOGIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Member for Rockhampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Member for Capricornia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy Shire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Child Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Queensland Local Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhampton Regional Development Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centacare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darumbal Community Youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: File documents

Some deliberative democracy literature suggests that allowing interest groups to advocate for their cause distorts communication because the arguments put may not be rational and objective and will certainly not be impartial (Cohen and Rogers 2003). This view holds that it is necessary to ‘create a neutral deliberative space beyond the conflictual and competitive environments in which interest groups conventionally operate’ (Hendriks 2002: 69).

The rhetoric of the regional planning process and the practices within CQANM did not go to such lengths of requiring stakeholder groups to put aside their partisan positions. The presentation of partisan and value-laden views familiar in the forums...
of representative democracy was accepted behaviour during discussions in the various committees and meetings of CQANM so long as people provided reasons for arguments not simply opinions. The rhetoric accepted that people were not totally objective and value-free and that there would be confrontation of opposing views, conflict and ‘a few stoushes around the table’ (Pamela)\(^\text{26}\). The following comment illustrates that the deliberative processes espoused by so many of the participants in the CQANM process favoured reasoned discussion while recognising it was not neutral and objective:

> What we’re looking for is informed opinions. Otherwise it’s not a fruitful conversation, right. So we need to talk to informed people. People who are informed enough about various issues in the region to give an informed argument. And sure that might be biased, and it might be pushing a certain barrow. But at least it’s informed (Leo).

This use of reason is a hallmark of deliberation and the practice of presenting and weighing up reasons was regarded by participants as facilitating the achievement of objectives as this comment shows:

> [O]nce all the areas were teased out and all the pros and cons were put on the table, one could get a better understanding or a more balanced view of what we were trying to achieve (William).

People in CQANM’s committees formed, and articulated, reasoned arguments. Their reasons may not have been universally accepted but needed be recognized as rational, not simply reiterating prejudices. This is not to suggest that only instrumental rationality was recognized. People’s claims could be justified on a variety of grounds – technical or scientific evidence could certainly be presented, but moral and aesthetic values were examples of equally valid reasons accepted so long

\(^{26}\) The rhetoric suggested that achieving rational deliberation is even more of a challenge in parliamentary debates since elected representatives are no more objective, value-free and impartial than stakeholders.
as they had general application. The rhetoric claims participants’ arguments were a mix of objective and subjective contributions. As one participant said:

While the evidence-based approach is technically rigorous, the decisions of individuals and organisations are often a mix of information and emotion (Ben).

Reasoned argument and ‘facts’, but also (potentially conflicting) interpretations of facts, subjective and values-based points of view, and rhetoric, were all admissible communicative strategies in the deliberative arenas of CQANM. People spoke about putting their ‘heart and soul’ into the deliberations (Nelda); needing to be sure it was ‘kosher, ethical’ (Pamela); and airing ‘frustrations’ (Kevin). Insisting on neutral, objective, deliberation in all of the groups and committees would have precluded such forms of communication.

It has also been argued that decision-making processes adopting dispassionate, logical and formal communication styles are open to domination by the articulate (Lane et al 2004: 106). Further, they can marginalize even some ostensibly ‘included’ voices by privileging those with certain skills (and therefore those interest groups positioned to develop them) (Dryzek 2000). For example politicians are regarded as more adept at public verbal argument than, say, spokespersons for youth or Indigenous interests might be. One State government participant, however, associated such bias against the less articulate with conventional political processes and posited that:

[CQANM’s] clear decision-making framework [contrasted with those]… bargaining exercises … where the most powerful person or the best-articulated or the most popular person can gain support for their idea (Michael).

This comment, like other frequent references to a ‘common framework’, highlights an additional dimension of deliberation in the regional planning process: the practice of ‘public reason’ conformed to shared norms of argument for presenting and evaluating competing claims of public interest. These specific disciplined practices,
were adopted to minimise domination and bias. Again, the rhetoric presented such a disciplined set of practices as integral to the communication, discussions and decision-making that produced the regional plan. Three interrelated criteria can be identified as important to this framework in the accounts of participants. These are: mutual respect and empathy, minimising coercion and manipulation, and reflexivity. They align with the characteristics of deliberative norms (Gutmann and Thompson 2004).

The importance attached to mutual respect and empathy is evident from the common claim that involvement in CQANM facilitated genuine, constructive dialogue based on respectful, albeit critical (even sceptical) listening. As Douglas said, ‘We’d grown a strong respect for each other by the end’. Such mutual respect and empathetic consideration of competing claims entailed taking a broad, public-spirited perspective on questions of common interest (Gutmann and Thompson 2004: 11). In Central Queensland, the participants’ comments make it clear that listening respectfully to others’ views was regarded as the basis for developing understanding of quite disparate perspectives. One such statement was:

It was all about negotiation … It was about first of all understanding very clearly what the differing points of view were. Understanding why, where that came from and what the information was that they were basing those decisions upon. You know, getting all that data behind things (Ann).

Assumptions about open communication and mutual respect underpinned the second norm – that practices should minimise coercion. While the practice in CQANM was to adopt a broad conception of legitimate forms of communication, participants claimed that manipulative, abusive or antagonistic argument and behaviour was frowned upon. As well, there was a written conflict resolution policy that emphasised dialogue between opposing parties. In addition, the preference for reflection and learning and for resolution by consensus rather than majority vote discouraged the entrenchment of polarised positions. To avoid ignoring, or exacerbating, conflict the various deliberative arenas of CQANM relied on people expressing their diverse viewpoints as reasoned argument and avoiding potentially distorting power-plays that would entrench the status quo.
Ever-conscious of the effects of power, Foucault has recommended regulating relations of dominance by saying:

The problem is not to try to dissolve them [relations of power] in the utopia of completely transparent communication, but to acquire the rules of law, the management techniques, and also the morality that will allow us to play these games of power with as little domination as possible (Foucault 2003a: 40).

Those involved in the regional planning process attempted such management techniques in adopting processes of public argumentation that followed shared norms – especially mutual respect, avoidance of coercion, and self aware reflection on the issues, processes, arguments and reasons with preparedness to act differently. Participants accepted that conflict was inevitable and did not unrealistically expect to eliminate conflict or the distorting effects of power that permeate communication (Flyvbjerg and Richardson 2002: 48). Rather, they felt it was incumbent upon them to publicly identify any instances of manipulation, or undue pressure. In this way the regional planning process was similar to other participatory technologies in encouraging individuals and groups to talk about the ways particular techniques and methods affected them (Allen 1996: 331).

Deliberation does, however, imply more than mutual respect and the absence of coercion – it assumes the potential for changing people’s thinking (Gundersen 1995: 9). An attempt was also made to implement the third deliberative norm, that deliberation is an iterative process with an ideal of people being prepared to question the complexities and ambiguities of their own positions and those of others; to actively confront challenges to their own beliefs and parochial interests; and to explain the persuasive reasons for their positions. The official doctrine assumed that CQANM’s promotion of open-minded dialogue would encourage lateral thinking, ‘outside the box’ of people’s ‘tunnel vision’ (Gwen) and lead to shared learnings (Frank). This accords with suggestions in the literature that deliberative processes advance both individual and collective understanding as participants learn from each other (Gutmann and Thompson 2004: 12). The range of accounts above shows
agreement on three criteria of the reasoned exchange that was espoused during the regional planning process.

A final characteristic of deliberative decision-making warrants exploration in this section. This is the expectation that such processes lead to resolutions with general, if not universal, acceptance as fair, rational and in the public interest. Central Queenslanders exhibited the same divisions as are evident in the deliberative democracy literature over the matter of reconciliation of opposing views (these were explored in Chapter Three). It was evident that, despite the heterogeneity of interests represented, and the time-consuming nature of trying to balance interests, participants in CQANM aspired to:

…keep general consensus about things, because you know, there are here, as there are in any community, quite a range of diverse views (Jane).

While some people argued the value of unanimous decisions, most of the rhetoric from CQANM insiders regarded unanimity as unrealistic. As well, participants recognised dangers in consensus-seeking. These included both the suppression of difference and the danger of reaching a related ‘false consensus’ or what a number of people labelled ‘motherhood statements’. It was notable that most insiders acknowledged the temptation to avoid conflict and generate unrealistic forms of consensus but argued their processes helped them resist this. They insisted that the final CQRGMF did not ‘water down’ any views (John). The rhetoric in CQANM implied that deliberation was more likely than majoritarian, aggregative approaches to produce agreement and, even when it did not succeed in that, to promote mutual respect for difference. It was obvious that people believed that the relationships and style of deliberation within committees improved the chances of reaching a collective decision that was generally agreed, rather than consensus in the sense of a unanimous vote. Appropriate procedures were claimed to explain the success in producing a rational consensus (or general agreement) despite competing viewpoints, as illustrated in the following statement:
The absolute conflicting ideals of an environmentalist compared to an industrialist are so diverse that for them to agree on something in a nice way is very difficult to achieve. But it did that (Kevin).

The range of perceptions of the CQANM experience indicates that the rhetoric, or official doctrine of insiders regarded broad interaction, reasoned argument and informed debate among heterogeneous interest groups as practices differing from conventional rhetoric and strategic bargaining. Deliberative practices were seen as vital for producing a collective result acceptable to all stakeholders and founded on mutual respect and understanding. Participants adopted a discourse of deliberation that privileged reasoned argumentation over the strategic struggle between elite interest groups that characterises decision-making in liberal, representative systems (Habermas 1996a: 362). In the regional planning process, the public reason – that occurred through mechanisms including the community conversations but more particularly the reasoned argument in Action Groups and the RPAC – was the primary technique employed to balance the diversity of views and resolve conflicts. In justifying these practices, participants stressed ideals of communication as undistorted, open, reasonable, and committed to the public interest. These can be summed up as communicative rationalities. These technologies constituted a particular discourse of deliberative democracy. As well, the internal network interactions and their links to external political constituencies and to wider societal norms expressed a particular rationality of democracy (Sorensen and Torfing 2005: 201).

**The CQRGMF – Using knowledge and expertise to plan for the region**

The commitment to deliberative decision-making implied balancing competing validity claims, exploring reasons rather than just opinions, and reaching informed conclusions. The ability to govern the region well was therefore seen as requiring an integrated plan with three key characteristics. It should be based on sound knowledge of the region and its inhabitants; be developed collaboratively by them; and take a documented form that would create ‘ownership and commitment’ (Leo). Participants suggested that a ‘shared database’ was as vital as a common framework of operation to achieving effective communication and ultimately good governance. There is evidence in the accounts of participants and in project documents that there were
perceived inadequacies with previous planning in the region. For instance, a State
government officer observed:

DPI was dealing with land use issues for agriculture and we’re dealing with
them here but we obviously overflowed into Local Government and into their
planning arrangements. We overflowed into Mining; into Energy. We knew
that with the State Department structure and the Local Government focus on
their local issues, we weren’t getting what the region needed in terms of a
combined plan (Allan).

One particular shortcoming identified in the official doctrine was with systems of
knowledge deployment by these actors. The *Planning and Governance Technical
Paper* for instance, noted ‘problems with access to, and ownership of information
required to make decisions’ (CQANM 2001: 16). It is significant that, in light of
this, some participants, rather than regarding the exercise and final document as a
‘plan’ or strategic framework, refer to it as a ‘study’. This conveys an understanding
that knowledge acquisition was an important determinant of the region’s future.
Hence both the methods of data collection and types of data collected were
significant technologies of governing. Based on these data, the various papers
produced during the process, and drafts of the *CQRGMF* itself, constructed a
particular knowledge of the region. The data, in turn, both shaped, and were shaped
by, the prevailing discourses and rationalities.

The following reflection illustrates that shared data and common language were
regarded as the foundation of reasoned argument and of reaching a collective
understanding:

The first thing was a shared understanding of what they were trying to deal
with and in order to get that they had to have a shared dataset so they all had
to be working from the same database and they all had to contribute to that
database in terms of their own intellectual knowledge and capacity and
understanding (Edward).
The value attached by many participants to a shared database highlights that knowledge of the region was contested. An inherent assumption of the CQANM process was that accumulating a shared dataset required drawing on multiple sources of expertise as is illustrated by this description of the regional planning process from a State Government participant:

There were technical advisory groups able to give us quantitative information on issues: how much water flows down the Fitzroy? How much of it is allocated? Hard, quantitative data. We then needed to overlay that with the values, aspirations and beliefs of the community (Frank).

Others participants agreed with this idea of the importance of both objective and subjective data or what some called democratic and technocratic views. For example, one person said:

The simplest way to put it is that there’s a time and a place for the statistical, your creditable scientific analysis of data or whatever, but I think it would be negligent to ignore on-the-ground input by people who are involved. That’s always going to have some level of bias, but it’s a matter of taking a reasonable sample (Lynn).

Just as the sampling of diverse discourses tapped existing organisational resources of the region for representatives, another intention of the process was to draw upon and build on the data that already existed in the form of surveys, assessments, plans, records and other material assembled by the constituent stakeholder networks. People agreed that bringing together information from stakeholders across all the sectors and the whole region yielded a wealth of diverse information. The resultant task of data processing was described as quite daunting:

[W]e had to get all the information, gather it, chew it over again, go through it, dissect it – or collect, collate, correlate, dissect it, disseminate it. We had to do everything! (John).
Certainly, the various groups involved worked with a vast amount of sometimes-conflicting data from diverse sources and of various types including scientific, financial, pragmatic, affective, aesthetic and ethical. Nevertheless, a number of observers and participants commended the balance between what Allan called ‘technical expertise’ and ‘grass-roots feeling’ that the CQRGMF incorporated. Such claims indicate that good planning was regarded as based on balanced information of diverse kinds. More specifically, the mix of expertise within Action Groups was also portrayed as preventing any one group from controlling information or claiming a monopoly on ‘truth’. One participant cited the example of the Sustainability, Conservation and Environment Working Action Group:

The balance there was excellent. Within our group we had people from the Department of Environment and the environment officer from Gladstone Port Authority, people who had really quite specialized knowledge. We also had an AgForce representative, we had people like, you know, Landcare representatives, whatever, so there was always that reality check there, so that if one of the, shall I say, academically-inclined people started talking about land management issues, you know the AgForce rep might say, ‘now hold on here …’ (Jane).

People commented that ‘a lot of knowledge got brought in’ (Nelda). Their examples indicated an acknowledgement of local expertise and diverse forms of both explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge. Maillat and Kebir (2001) associate this diversity and a decreased reliance on vertical flows of information with the phenomenon of learning regions in general. In CQANM, a similar discourse circulated of knowledge as ‘the new currency’ (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 32). Specialist scientific and technical data was recognized as a valuable form of knowledge. However, it was not the only one, and it was not regarded as exclusively possessed by experts in the establishment. For instance, one person commented on ‘a growing scientific capacity in the community’ (Gregory). Another said:

I certainly saw the science there – whether it was the economical science or the hard biophysical science or whatever. I saw how that was integrated …
was put in there. And I saw how the broader community was engaged on it and those, just that one step up from the broader community – people who were, not the experts, but knowledgeable (Rosemary).

That comment suggests that there was recognition of other kinds of knowledge, from other sources, as equally valid and valuable. The rhetoric endorsed what it called ‘Citizen Science’ and explained as ‘the collaborative interaction of technically trained experts and community members in an effort to solve problems of importance to the region’ (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 99). People spoke about the wisdom of experience, the bodies of ‘informal knowledge’ available (Kaye), and the importance of including aesthetic and even emotional considerations although such information was hard to quantify.

Foucauldian scholars stress that such a diverse body of knowledge presupposes and constitutes particular power relations (McHoul and Grace 1993: 59). In this case the relationships established in the Technical Action Groups privileged State government officials, though also harnessed the knowledge of university researchers and industry – in other words, technical and scientific knowledge. Other kinds of knowledge were introduced to only a limited degree in these groups.

The asymmetries were stark in the Atmosphere and Energy Supplies group, one of the smaller Technical Action Groups. It had four State government members (two from the Environment Protection Agency and one each from the Department of Health and Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy). There were also five members from various industries in the region, and one from Central Queensland University. The RPAC link on that committee was a State government official from a social portfolio area and there were two people from environment organisations – one regional and one sub-regional in focus. The tensions were further complicated as these groups introduced information. For instance, some data from the university and from State government agencies was ‘leaked’ to the environmentalists for them to present in CQANM discussions or public arenas. This acknowledged their effectiveness at exerting countervailing power. It also expressed a lack of faith in the transparency of some state and industry actors who would also have been privy to the material, but unlikely to put it on the public record. The
ensembles of knowledge produced by these groups had a strategic and political function but were treated by the RPAC in its deliberations as objective knowledge – to be balanced with the ‘subjective’ data gathered during the community conversations.

Not only did the knowledge come from a variety of sources, it was also collected in diverse ways. Much of the ‘democratic’ information was gathered in a series of forums that were deliberately called ‘community conversations’ to highlight their interactive and discursive style. At the same time, the decision-makers had access to considerable ‘evidence’ from government departments (at three levels), business and industry, and non-governmental organisations in the region. Many participants conceded that a balance was hard to achieve. Nevertheless it was regarded as important to have both ‘participatory processes and evidence-based processes’ (Ben). By involving a range of stakeholder groups and communities, the networks harnessed a variety of experiences and knowledges as a basis for constructing the regional plan. That, in turn, expressed a notion of what good planning meant in practice and how it could be achieved by collaboration. Indications are that people rejected notions that there was a single valid form of knowledge of the region and that they felt making the full range of data widely available would equip them to plan for, and govern, the region well. The data thus assembled was subjected to the same processes of evaluation through deliberation as other arguments presented – that is, how reasonable and fair it was, whether it advanced the public interest and so on. Ultimately these diverse data determined the version of a desirable future for the region presented in the CQRGMF.

This documented plan is the third criterion of good planning according to the rhetoric. The CQRGMF does not provide a series of planning documents split into discrete areas such as spatial plans, social plans and economic plans. Instead it is shaped around a broadly expressed vision statement and guiding principles with a policy framework that flows from them. Participants in the regional planning process regarded it as a ‘high level, aspirational document’ (Thomas) rather than a ‘nitty-gritty’ plan (Kevin). Most people made the distinction between these two forms of plan. For instance one said,
The other ones [regional plans] that I looked at, they seemed to split issues up quite discretely into different areas whereas CQANM was trying to interrelate those areas to try and come up with more integrated responses. And a lot of the other regional planning would be economic development planning or industry – it was all sector based, it wasn’t across the board. And [CQANM was] trying to involve the community in the process, which I think is a very difficult thing to do in regional planning (Mary).

Mary’s comment on this distinctive type of plan also reiterates the participatory ideals of this conception of good planning and good governance.

The bulk of the CQRGMF is the policy framework section. Even the formatting of this section is instructive. It designates six policy areas, each headed by a guiding principle. For example the Resource Use, Conservation and Management section’s principle is:

The allocation, use and management of the natural resources of Central Queensland shall be in accordance with the principles of ecologically sustainable development and shall be undertaken through a process of integrated catchment management (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 42).

Like each of the other major policy themes, this one contains outcomes and specific actions and strategies to achieve them – in this case, nine outcomes with up to eight strategies and multiple actions each. Most of the outcomes are very generally worded. For example the one on Air Quality states:

Air quality is maintained at levels which ensure sustainable regional communities, protection of the natural environment and opportunities for continuing economic growth (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 49).

To reinforce the coordination effects, a lead agency and collaborating agencies are designated for each of the strategies. As well, the continual cross-referencing and
linkages throughout the document can be seen as intended to reinforce the integration effects.

It is clear that besides the democratic rationales identified earlier, a compelling part of the mentality of regional governance represented by the statements above and by the practices followed by CQANM involved communicative rationales and a discourse of participatory planning. Public argumentation, or deliberation, served to broaden particular perspectives through dialogue according to common norms and using knowledge that was constructed by diverse stakeholders in the region, and not narrowly controlled. This was communicated in writing in the CQRGMF – a document indicating broad ways of achieving a lofty regional vision which it expressed as:

Central Queensland aspires to be the most diverse and prosperous region in Australia.
This will be achieved by economic growth that is ecologically sustainable and where people and industry work in harmony with the environment for the benefit of both present and future generations whilst respecting the diversity of our past (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 7).

The official doctrine: discourses of development, democracy and planning
As shown above, within Central Queensland the rhetoric of the regional planning process construed good governance as being coordinated and integrated. It was believed to require governing of social, environmental and economic behaviours in a regional territory, by stakeholders from the state, market and civil society. The more or less implicit logic (or rationality) of the ‘official doctrine’ or rhetoric of insiders was akin to the collaborative planning, discursive democracy and EPG ideals outlined in Chapter Three. Hence it involved reliance on three communicative technologies. First, there was competition of discourses between actors occurring in a public sphere characterised as a network (of networks) whose features included a pluricentric array of heterogeneous actors, linked in interdependent, trusting and
egalitarian relationships. Second, deliberative processes were valued. The essence of these was public, reasoned argument following agreed principles including minimising coercion and manipulation; mutual respect and empathy; and reflexivity. They sought consensual decisions (although not unconflicting unanimity). Third, there was the drafting of a regional framework plan that, significantly, involved balancing of validity claims based on different kinds of knowledge (whether objective and scientific; subjective and experiential; or ethical and normative). These three technologies were deployed together. The actors in the network negotiated (through deliberation) different kinds of validity claims as the iterations of the CQRGMF evolved. The characteristics of networks, deliberation and planning elaborated above inform our understanding of the specific democratic and communicative rationalities inherent in those technologies.

The analysis in this chapter and the description of the observable structures and practices that were outlined in Chapter Five, have revealed a coherent set of discourses of regional governance. Specific conceptions of good governance can be inferred from the practices and statements about the regional planning process profiled. It was claimed the multi-stakeholder approach resulted in greater collaboration across sectors (state, private and civil society), across functional areas, disciplines or departments and across levels (local, sub-regional, regional and even national). It employed multiple discursive and deliberative arenas to tackle in an integrated, or holistic, way complex, inter-connected, cross-cutting issues that provided the main perceived governance challenges of the time in Central Queensland. These discourses of participatory planning, deliberative democracy and sustainable development provided a shared set of assumptions that influenced the behaviours of those who subscribed to them and made them complicit actors in a particular political regime. In this sense, together these discourses constitute a mentality of networked governance as summarised in Table 6.2.

This table was constructed by interpreting accounts from Central Queensland in terms of the conceptual framework outlined in Chapter Three. It presents the governmentality of CQANM according to the way it problematises the art of government. Hence it shows, first, the problematics of government. These include the objectives of government or goal orientation adopted, which, in turn, influenced
the objects of rule and spatial focus. Together, these can be seen as constituting a discourse of sustainable development. The analysis of actors or players depicts the implicit response to the problem of ‘who should govern’.

### Table 6.2: Summary of the mentality of networked governance in Central Queensland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problematics:</th>
<th>Networked governance – Deliberative democracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Coordination, sustainability and integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Triple-bottom line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territory/scale</td>
<td>Multi-scale including regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects of rule</td>
<td>Society, environment and economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors/ players</td>
<td>Stakeholders from state, market and civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologies</td>
<td>Communicative technologies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive forums for networking and participation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committees that are multi-stakeholder; non-hierarchical and autonomous; and involve collaborative, respectful relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community conversations with citizens, phone hotline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practices of collective deliberation – open reasoned argument; disciplined practices; consensus in the collective interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated plan documented in <em>CQ Regional Growth Management Framework</em> based on combined knowledge and expertise. Sets principles and a framework for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalities</td>
<td>Holistic and democratic rationales:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimating rationality</td>
<td>Legitimacy derived from widespread participation, collaboration and shared vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The section on technologies summarises the mechanisms employed to govern, noting the general style of practices as well as details of the specific networks, deliberative
processes and plan-making adopted. A discourse of deliberative democracy was embedded in the technologies for including actors, forming networks and deliberating. Another distinctive technology was the collaborative drafting of the CQRGMF as an aspirational plan for development based on combined forms of knowledge. This implied a discourse of participatory planning. Considering these problematics and technologies allows us to examine the logic, or rationalities at work in the regional planning process.

The specific problems to be addressed in Central Queensland in the late 1990s, according to the official doctrine of CQANM, were problems of inefficient government (being fragmented, duplicated and uncoordinated), and concerns about environmental degradation and the proliferation of organisations at local, sub-regional and regional scales. These intersected with aspirations for a holistic approach to policy areas and inclusion of stakeholders and citizens. Such problematising by authorities and citizens produced a particular discourse of development. In this case, a discourse of sustainability with development involving balanced and integrated environmental, social and economic goals.

The official doctrine of CQANM implied that a collective effort commanding widespread ‘ownership’ by residents of the region was both a more vibrant form of democracy and also necessary to achieve the governance objectives of coordination and sustainable development. This discourse of participatory democracy was summed up in these words:

It was a very large scale and ambitious project, particularly given the mindset that we had that it was to be driven from the bottom-up as opposed to the top-down. We were not going to use consultants; we were going to use the people within the community to find the future for the community. By those people, for the people (Frank).

As earlier sections showed, this ‘mind-set’, or rationality, led to the use of a double-pronged strategy of multi-stakeholder committees supplemented by community conversations and other forms of citizen access. These practices privileged actors from those stakeholder groups represented in the forums of CQANM. In respect of
these practices, the process met the four criteria for democratic anchorage proposed by Sorensen and Torfing (2005: 201). First, by including elected local politicians, it gave a voice to the electorate. Second, by including stakeholder groups, it included the membership base of participating organisations and sectors. As well, by holding the community conversations, the process acknowledged the territorially defined citizenry. Finally, through endorsed forms of expression conforming to the disciplined practices of deliberation while circumscribing other forums and other modes of argument, it followed a set of democratic norms. The rhetoric espoused what have been called ‘voice-based mechanisms’ (Morgan and Henderson 2002: 5) such as broad argumentation, to reach a reconciliation of conflicting interests. It discouraged other mechanisms like private deals or majority votes. The community conversations and stakeholder input were adopted as superior to the conventional processes of consultation employed by politicians and the State bureaucracy. Traditional consultation methods were regarded as ineffective in engaging disaffected citizens with the institutions of parliamentary democracy and as tokenistic. The following comment, about previous experiences of different, state-centric processes with a patina of consultation revealed cynical perceptions of bureaucrats’ mechanisms:

They came and consulted us but their priorities were already set, that’s the feeling I got. They had the priorities already there and they were just consulting us like, that’s one of the big scapegoats is, ‘Oh yes we consulted with that group of people’. Really they’re only telling us what they’ve already decided (Tina).

In contrast, the conception of democracy embodied in the rhetoric of CQANM endorsed giving a genuine voice in the process to many groups and individuals.

With its emphasis on ‘public consultation rather than planning methodology’ (Powell 2003: 113), CQANM implied a specific discourse of planning as well as a discourse of deliberative democracy. The first characteristic of participatory planning it conformed with was public involvement. As well, partly because of this broad participation, the rhetoric endorsed the second characteristic, namely the value to planning of a balance of objective and subjective knowledge from both participatory
and evidence-based sources. The third characteristic of good planning, as outlined above, was that it produced a documented plan for the region, the CQRGMF. People emphasized the aspirational qualities, rather than the specific content, of this planning document. Most of these features of the regional plan suggest further parallels to the participatory planning discourse. This is seen in Powell’s (2003: 114) description of the plans associated with this discourse as documents that, ‘rely mainly on ambitious vision statements and promises of community empowerment, … economic growth and ecological sustainability’.

It is obviously possible to amass considerable data to infer that a democratic transition occurred in Central Queensland and to laud CQANM as a participatory planning exercise. However, it is important to interrogate these ideas based on a naïve acceptance of the rhetoric of participants. Dryzek has highlighted that ‘true’ democracy and ‘true’ sustainable development are contestable concepts that have not been empirically realised anywhere (Dryzek 2000a: 123). It is certainly the case that in Central Queensland this conception of coordinated, integrated, democratic regional governance was aspirational rather than fully achieved.

Using an ‘analytics of government’ approach as discussed in Chapter Three, this chapter examined the mentality of regional governance in Central Queensland. The analysis suggests that institutions such as CQANM

…are improvised from available moral, intellectual and practical techniques in attempts to assemble pragmatic solutions to deal with specific exigencies and limited problems (Rose 1999: 275).

While the rhetorical construction of CQANM in this way provided a coherent and shared way of practising, thinking and speaking about regional governance, the question is raised whether this should be interpreted as an uncontested set of assumptions or monolithic mentality. As Dryzek has argued, ‘[I]t would be a mistake to see the contest in terms of one homogenous discourse fighting another’ (2000a: 134). Also problematic would be any simplistic representation of a discourse of collaboration between state, private and civil society sectors that implies these are single, homogenous entities with uniform mentalities. This research has identified
that the ‘ideal’ was not universally subscribed to and that there was some
dissatisfaction with the process and its outcomes from people espousing competing
discourses. Data show that rather than a universal conception of good governance
there was a range of other views and preferred practices that constituted two
significant conceptions opposing the rhetoric. These will be considered in the next
chapter which profiles this multiplicity and analyses the alternative perspectives –
about the aims and characteristics of good governance and of effective ways of
organising governance processes – that the discourses of development, democracy
and planning entail. This approach utilises concepts of discourse, power and
governmentality. It reveals how the internal contradictions shaped governance
practices in this regional arena and renders visible the complexity and diversity
within the state and other actors as well. It highlights the contrasts and
incompatibilities as well as overlapping aspects of these competing discourses and
the effects of these in the regional planning process.
Chapter 7: Coexisting Discourses of Regional Governance

The previous chapter examined how CQANM – and the policy problems it addressed – were discursively, rather than objectively, constructed in the official doctrine. This rhetorical construct constituted a particular mentality of regional governance. It was a mentality of networked, deliberative governance that embraced and blended discourses of deliberative democracy, sustainable development and participatory planning. It invoked holistic and democratic rationales and associated ideas of joined-up and engaged government with an integrated approach to economic, social and environmental issues. The mentality also manifested in practices of networking, community and stakeholder participation, deliberation and framework planning. This is not to suggest that there was a single synthesis of these ideas, nor that they were uncontested. Rather, regional governance involved competing discourses in respect of democracy, development and planning that were articulated by different actors within the networks of rule.

It was observed that the notion of development inherent in the official doctrine – with its discourse of sustainability – was contested. There were contrasting views to this first discourse which were evident, on the one hand, in discourses of social development (with goals of equity and security) and, on the other hand, in discourses of economic development (with goals of prosperity and growth). In total, three contrasting views of development shaped (and were shaped by) different conceptions of the problems or issues to address, desirable goals, and the preferred scale of action. In other words, these discourses of development reveal contrasting problematics of government and especially contrasting ideas about the objectives of government.

There were also two notions of democracy that contrasted with the rhetoric of deliberative democracy embodied in ideas about the preferred actors and decision-making forums and practices. By examining the different ideas and practices about these issues expressed in various discourses of democracy, dimensions of both problematics and technologies of government are identified. In endorsing both state
and non-state actors, the rhetoric of CQANM collided with discourses firstly of libertarian, self-interested bargaining and liberal democracy, and secondly of the majoritarian representation that is characteristic of social democracy.

Chapter Six further identified that the rhetoric espoused the value of another particular technology as a way to realise conceptions of sustainable development and deliberative democracy that were believed essential to achieving good regional governance. This technology was a documented regional plan that was an integrated framework for development. This was equally contested, with two additional views of planning observed. Some people upheld professionally designed and standardised sectoral plans as superior, while others discounted the value of planning altogether. These constituted three different discourses of planning that have been designated participatory, modernist and neo-liberal (Mees 2003: 287). Discourses of planning reveal contrasting technologies, notably contrasting practices and forms a regional plan might entail.

Contrasting ideas of what constitutes a superior approach to regional governance were manifested in Central Queensland as the discursive practices of CQANM competed with persistent neo-liberal and welfare state rationalities and practices. Each constellation of different ideas and practices constituted a mentality of rule. To gain more than a superficial understanding of this instance of regional governance, all three mentalities and their constituent discourses of development, democracy and planning must be analysed. This chapter dissects the complex discursive mix and indicates some effects of the multiplicity of discourses. Because the discourses are not discrete, each section briefly reiterates the official discourse, locating it in terms of the actors who championed that as good governance. It also highlights the main critique of the rhetoric before proceeding to elaborate, in more detail, the alternative discourses, the actors who espoused them and some examples of the effects of those alternatives. The fourth section summarises the trio of contrasting governmentalities evident in Central Queensland, again using the conceptual framework detailed in Chapter Three. Finally, it examines ‘the pressure of internal contradictions and struggles’ (O'Malley 1996: 170) within the region as these coexisting rationalities and discursive practices interacted, and each mentality countered other perspectives at the same time as it generated both support and resistance.
Three discourses of development: contrasting problematics

Central Queenslanders sought development of their region, and saw achieving this as a core governance responsibility, but the notion of ‘development’ was contested in the region. The rhetoric of CQANM embraced the ‘triple-bottom-line’ integration of environmental, social and economic goals. Lip service to sustainable development was also paid by those insisting that a thriving economy was both the goal and an indicator of development and, alternatively, by those who prioritised social equity and human needs. These different discourses of development generated contrasting conceptions of governance tasks and priority issues as well as of the preferred scale of operation.

The rhetoric - sustainable development

Chapter Six portrayed the discourse of development inherent in the official doctrine of CQANM as a discourse of ecologically sustainable development. One participant gave a graphic description of how he explained this discourse at an RPAC meeting:

I said, ‘I see it like this’: I drew a big circle, ‘This is environment’; I drew a circle inside it and said, ‘This is social’; I drew a circle inside of that – a little circle in the middle – and I said, ‘This is economics’. You know, that’s the way I see the world ... So they’re subsets …I made the point that all wealth’s basically going to come from there [the environment] so economics is dependent on the environment, not the other way around the way they’d have you believe (Douglas, italics added).

As the italicised words concede, the triple-bottom-line conception of development, evident in Douglas’s description and in the rhetoric of CQANM, was not universally subscribed to. Key proponents of the sustainable development discourse were environmental stakeholders. This discourse was also heard from some State government departments – notably the Environment Protection Agency and agencies with decentralised administration – and from some local governments. In the latter case it was usually those with a ‘niche’ economy reliant on pristine environmental assets such as coastal tourist destinations.
Economic development

Even the strongest advocates of sustainable development recognised that a contradictory discourse was entrenched in the State and the region. This conceived of development as economic progress and ever-expanding productive investment. Scholarly observations have likewise identified the prevalence of this discourse in Queensland (Head and Ryan 2004: 366). This explained Douglas’s experience of people arguing, even in CQANM committees, that economic development was the primary consideration and a prerequisite for environmental protection. Such market champions tended to criticise the regional planning process as giving undue emphasis to other considerations, for example:

In a lot of the discussion, sometimes there seemed to be a point of view that social development was more important than economic growth or that environmental management was more important. Now I’m not saying that they aren’t, I’m just saying that you won’t need environmental management and you won’t need social and welfare issues to be addressed unless you have economic growth. So without the investment, without the business community, without the mining development, without the minerals processing sector starting to drive growth, there probably is no reason for a plan (Christopher).

Often those who prioritised economic development still couched it in the language of sustainability. This allowed them to engage in CQANM and the rhetoric of sustainable development despite a different discourse of development and different rationale. Dryzek observes a similar phenomenon in international corporate usage. He gives the example of the language of sustainable development being invoked by the World Business Council on Sustainable Development: ‘because “sustainable” means “continued” and “development” means “growth”’ (Dryzek 2000a: 127). The following statement reveals how some people in Central Queensland discursively constructed the goal of sustainable development as implying continued industrial activity and economic growth:
It [a plan for sustainable development] has to take into account economic sustainability and talk about the importance of industry from the perspective of ‘we have to maintain these industries’ as well (Kim).

By construing sustainability in this way, such people expressed their conviction that the key governance challenges facing Central Queensland were maintaining existing economic activity and fostering entrepreneurial ventures in business and industry. They tended to criticise the final regional plan for not providing an economic blueprint for the region and a prospectus for potential investors. Nevertheless, most participants judged this a very influential discourse in CQANM’s deliberations. This conception of development as economic prosperity was prevalent among private sector stakeholders, those from economic and infrastructure portfolio areas of State government (such as the Departments of State Development and Natural Resources and Mines) and some local governments. For instance, many participants from local government areas whose council was active in a Regional Development Organisation, or from booming or heavily industrialised localities, subscribed to this discourse.

This discourse had an influence beyond the section of the CQRGMF’s policy framework devoted to Economic Development. The economic development discourse also shaped the policies on Resource Use, Conservation and Management for instance. In that section, this discourse did not allow consideration of the regional capacity for carbon sequestration by, say, tree-planting. Rather, the discourse frames any ceilings on net emissions as relating to gross emissions and so preventing any industrial expansion and economic growth. For example, one shire mayor said:

> When they were talking about greenhouse gas, ‘You must have control of the levels’. But in their wisdom they had a blanket cover that would have prevented, for the whole of Central Queensland, any industry coming here at all! Because they said ‘No extra greenhouse gas’. None at all. So if you do that, you couldn’t even buy another car (Joshua).

The strong resistance from such quarters, and portrayal of the issue in these terms meant the policies on Air Quality and on Climate Change and Greenhouse, are
specifically couched in terms that assume industrial growth. They emphasise more efficient emission control technologies, and mention a number of strategies that could be ‘promoted, encouraged or explored’ to minimise emissions, but stop short of committing to regional target levels of greenhouse gas emissions (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 49).

Social development

While these contending discourses of ecologically sustainable development and economic development were evident in the accounts from Central Queensland, there was also a third discourse of development. This resulted in a number of people arguing that the problems of the region were defined by the uneven quality of life of the region’s residents and the neglect of social development. A State government participant, for instance, said, ‘We forget the social aspect all the time’ (Allan). This discourse of development posited the lack of access to education, health care, employment and recreational opportunities for particular geographic communities (usually small ones like Woorabinda or Alpha), or particular segments of the population (for example rural youth, Aboriginal people or families in mining towns) as key governance challenges. One example is:

There’s always been a struggle about amenities and services and there was a fairly significant struggle in the early ‘70s. We got that pretty well under control through the ‘80s … and then there was a big push in the ‘90s to take a lot of those services away. And now we have an industry [mining] that’s very buoyant and very strong and I don’t believe too many services are there to cope with it (Leslie).

Like supporters of ecologically sustainable development, such people felt that the discourse of economic development dominated, with the result that inadequate attention was given to these social issues. They argued that this influenced the planning process to prioritise economic concerns and ‘hard’ infrastructure considerations. The following observation describes the exchanges in CQANM committees that reflected the struggles between these discourses:
There was a lot of rhetoric about the triple-bottom-line, people believed it. But when it came to social, social was a soft option. So what was really important was: would we get a new magnesium plant at Stanwell? And how much money was the port going to bring in? But the social stuff was seen as the soft option. …Social issues were really important – it’s all very well having your roads and your rubbish and drains and stuff, but people are the fundamental basis of society, so that was important to me to get that across. And I’d say, ‘Hang on, remember the roads are very important, but if you’ve got no people, you’ve got nothing’. ‘Yes, yes, we’ll remember the people BUT … do we need the airport; do we need the magnesium smelter’ (Nelda, emphasis in original).

This discourse was heard mainly from participants representing the smaller, more isolated local councils; State government agencies responsible for matters like health, education and communities; and from civil society organisations including unions, human and social services and Indigenous groups. Among such people, the perceived shortcoming of the regional planning process was not that it failed to provide an economic blueprint, but rather that it did not ensure social equity across the region and did not succeed in redressing the neglect of social development and withdrawal of services that had occurred in the early 1990s as both government and private enterprise ‘rationalised’ their activities. Here is what one of those calling for a ‘balance’ between economic and social considerations said:

I think we need to look at balancing up between the economic development and dealing with the social aspect of things. There are a lot of social issues for [us], as a regional community, that we need to balance up and weigh up. Because I think if we can get a lot of the social things in order a lot of the economic development will be right because everyone’s going to be on an even platform. … Education and health are the two, big, key issues that a lot of people always come back to. And of course housing (Neil).

As Neil’s comments suggest, those prioritising social goals placed an emphasis on equity, or, in the words of one mayor, what people needed was, ‘…to become the same as every other Australian with a bit of equity’ (Rohan). This orientation to
equity competes with the notions of development as sustainability or as prosperity. The influence of this perspective was particularly strong in the Leisure and Lifestyle Working Action Group which reached the conclusion, in drafting key regional issues, that:

[A]ll Central Queenslanders should:
- Enjoy equitable access to services and programs
- Have equal rights and responsibilities
- Have opportunities to participate in, contribute to and benefit from all aspects of life in Central Queensland
- Share responsibility for the continuing development of Central Queensland as a cohesive and harmonious society


Contending discourses of development

The selection of quotes above clearly illustrates the contradictory rationalities – equity, economic or holistic – expressed in the three discourses of development. These depended respectively on whether participants believed development was founded on the well-being of people (or social considerations), or alternatively of the economy or of the environment as well. People were not simply contesting whether triple-bottom-line notions of sustainability had been achieved or not; they were disputing whether that was the most important goal. It is evident not everyone espoused the rhetoric outlined in Chapter Six that portrayed good governance as advancing the mutual interests of businesses, the environment and the residents of the region. Associated with the various discourses of development were diverse ideas about how to achieve a desirable balance between economic, social and environmental goals. In this respect, one participant made the distinction between regulation by market forces, by government policy, or by ecosystem limits:

The balancing process has always been around and probably always will be around – trading-off different values. That is, if you assume the system is a stable system, once it heads too far in one direction, it’ll naturally bring itself back. Whether that’s through market forces or the response of the natural resources or whether there might be a response of government or the response
of the consumer who buys the products and wants [them] sustainably produced (Ben).

Each of these discourses of development was a discursive practice, as identified in previous chapters, in that each was not just a way of talking about development, but also had practical outcomes and effects on priorities, programs and expectations. The interaction of the multiplicity of discourses is also evident.

One of the six sections in the policy framework of the CQRGMF is devoted to infrastructure and specifically two key infrastructure areas – transport and public utilities. Four pages of that, document five outcomes and ten main strategies for future transport infrastructure. All of the outcomes voice a general concern with meeting the needs of both the community and industry while avoiding negative environmental impacts. However, close scrutiny of the detailed list of actions indicates considerably more emphasis on servicing freight requirements and the needs of the economy than on passenger services. For example, the first strategy relates to development of a strategic transport network that caters for projected growth and development. The list of sample demands includes:

- potential growth between Gladstone and Rockhampton associated with major industrial developments in each area;
- developing strategic transport opportunities between Stanwell, Biloela and Gladstone [sites of current or projected industries];
- accommodating growth in military training services and the transport of military vehicles (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 71)

As well, objectives of ensuring economic profitability and prosperity prevailed over public order, equity and security. Hence, the provision of freight transport options was regarded as vital, but public transport and street lighting as unproductive (and therefore less justifiable) infrastructure.

The implication is that the discourse that was most influential on this part of the policy framework was the economic development discourse. This resonates with Dryzek’s analysis of discourses of development that found a current ‘master-discourse’ of market liberalism (Dryzek 2000a: 166) that was equally contested by a
discourse of sustainable development (Dryzek 1997: 129-136). Some of the actions included in the *CQGRMF* indicate this market discourse did not eclipse all other discourses in Central Queensland either. For instance, one strategy is:

> [E]ncouraging rail passenger services to operate between Gladstone, Rockhampton and Mackay so the people of Central Queensland have alternative transport options to attend work, sporting and cultural events, and for tourism travel (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 73).

However, the frequent positioning of passengers as commuters implicitly privileges economically productive travel. A number of strategies and actions like this led to a criticism of the *CQGRMF* for being ‘ambiguous and yet blatantly pro-development’ (Douglas).

The diverse conceptions of policy goals and the governance task also resulted in tensions between differing spatial or territorial orientations. The economic development discourses in Central Queensland suggested that, in a globalised world, economic prosperity was best ensured by an emphasis on local competitive advantage utilising endogenous resources. Therefore a fairly self-reliant, locality- or industry-focus was often associated with this discourse. This perspective rejected the national, State, and even regional, scale as top-down ‘dictating’ as this comment shows:

> You could manage it as little hubs, like cluster groups. That’s the way a lot of business is going these days, trying to develop cluster-groups so you’ve got your hub, your sort of related issues. So it could work because the issues for Livingstone Shire are absolutely different to issues at Gladstone City Council which are different to Calliope Shire. Let alone Emerald! So you have to lean more towards this cluster grouping, resolving these issues from a community point of view rather than trying to dictate that *this* is the best for the region (Lynn, emphasis in original).
This links to Rose’s (1996b: 330-331) argument that in ‘advanced liberal democracies’ community is the new territory of government where citizens take an active role in directing their own behaviour and shows that the scale of action has implications for the actors involved in governing.

In contrast, those who prioritised social concerns often assumed that operating at a local scale was likely to aggravate disparities or differences between communities and localities. Their discourse of social development privileged a more universal, State-wide, or even national, scale as most likely to result in the desired equitable outcomes. A third view, as the previous chapter showed, regarded the regional level as most meaningful and effective. This was advocated by those with the more holistic perspective that characterised the discourse of sustainable development, because the eco-system or bio-region as a unit is usually larger than a locality, but smaller than a State (Brunckhorst 2000). These contrasting ways of spatialising the task of development are significant to an examination of the analytics of government. Rose (1999: 36) suggests that, in the late nineteenth century, the perceived problems of governing the population meant the slum became a key territorial focus. This was because it was the location of the masses whose conduct needed state attention. In the late twentieth century, environmental awareness and the discourse of ecologically sustainable development have given the ‘region’ a comparable salience as a territorial focus. Such discursive (and related institutional) construction of the scale of operating has other effects. It can, for instance, strengthen the ‘power and control of some while disempowering others’ (see also Jones and MacLeod 2004; Swyngedouw 2000: 71).

In the CQANM case, the planning process privileged the regional scale. This strengthened the influence of those actors with a regional capacity such as the Fitzroy Basin Association (FBA). It also acted as an incentive for many of the organisations profiled in Chapter Five to develop this sort of capacity. Hence, one of the oft-cited outcomes of the process was more united action by local governments in the region – especially through the formation of strong sub-regional ROCs. Over the course of the project, inter-governmental relations at the local level strengthened, as did the CQLGA itself. By 2003, the two ROCs with overlapping membership, CQROC and CQLGA, merged to become the single, proactive voice of local government at the
regional level. As well, CQLGA recognized four distinct sub-regional groupings of councils in the region. Other sub-regional organisations (such as the RDOs) also strengthened their linkages, largely in response to CQANM’s territorial focus. This practice served both to constrain some of the independent actions of particular local government authorities or autonomous actors and also to encourage more unity and collaboration. Over time, discourses of local focus, self-help and competition were toned down by the technique of collaborating at a regional level.

Despite this regional emphasis, the planning process also catered in some way to each of the alternative perspectives. On the one hand, specific localities that initially ‘wanted to do their own thing’ (Fred) participated in the process. While this was partly a defensive response, it appears local communities also felt a degree of empowerment through council representation and the two rounds of community conversations. Local governments, many of whom were among the protagonists favouring a local scale, were empowered in the process by being the only scale of government with statutory commitments to it, through the Integrated Planning Act (IPA). While councils initially interpreted their obligations under the IPA as an impost, they later realised, Ben suggested, that the potential that they ‘could walk away at any time’ gave them considerable leverage in the process. On the other hand, centralists were also placated because the final CQRGM did not only rely on agreement from all local governments in the region, but also required State cabinet’s endorsement. In practice this meant that the higher echelons of the public service in head office, or even the ministers, could ‘have the final say on the phrasing of policy directions’ (Gregory). The project files record that some State departments effectively exercised this power of veto by making last minute demands for changes to the CQRGMF document. Even apparently small adjustments reveal the tensions between the competing discourses of development and the conflicting objectives among various State government departments. For instance, it was claimed that the Office of Energy:

…moved beyond the direction of the Cabinet decision and … rejected lead agency status for any strategies under section 3.2.11 Energy (file document, briefing note to Minister for Local Government and Planning 28/10/02).
When one examines the specific actions the Office of Energy were objecting to taking lead responsibility for, one finds:

Support research and development of alternative strategies and the development of new products and markets (eg renewable energy from agricultural produce and by-products) (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 64).

Instead, the Environment Protection Agency (EPA) and Central Queensland University took responsibility for this strategy, indicating it was not regarded as compatible with economic development objectives. In contrast, the Office of Energy accepted lead agency status for strategies that explicitly sought to boost power generation and cater for high energy demand like the following action:

Capitalise on energy resources, generation capacity and clustering opportunities of the region (Gladstone, Stanwell and Biloela) (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 65).

The impact of the potential of defection by local government, and of the resort to the Office of Energy’s external authority to override unwelcome decisions illustrate that CQANM was vulnerable to some of the compromising ways of exercising power identified by Fung and Wright (2003b: 33-37) such as ‘forum shopping’ and protecting the status quo.

Another effect of the continued influence of the economic development discourse was the failure of the CQRGMF to curb the industrial expansion ambitions of some powerful State government departments. For instance, at the end of the planning project, the Department of State Development came up with an independent plan recommending intensive livestock production as having significant potential in the region. It identified ‘precincts’ where there could be cattle feedlots or piggeries, and suggested appropriate numbers of animals as well as nominating other areas for growing the grain and the forage to feed them and still others for processing plants. In addition it specified infrastructure needs in terms of roads and supplies of steam and water. However, all this was done without consultation with other State
government departments, such as Natural Resources and Mines, Main Roads, EPA or even the Department of Primary Industry which, according to the CQRGMF, had joint lead agency status (with the Department of State Development) on action to ‘seek to attract new intensive animal industries to the region’ (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 61). Nor was this negotiated in CQANM’s forums or with the CQLGA or the FBA. People were reportedly ‘gobsmacked’ (Allan) by this unilateral action. This demonstrates that the influence of single departments was not insignificant, that there were significantly different objectives and rationalities even among the various state actors, and that adoption of the discourse of sustainable development was constrained because other discourses – notably the discourse of economic development – retained currency in the region.

Three discourses of democracy: contrasting actors and technologies

The previous chapter outlined a democratic ideal characterised by stakeholder deliberation that encouraged broad-based input from people in the region, whether from the state, private sector or civil society, and used communicative structures and processes. As with the notion of sustainability, this bottom-up discourse of deliberative democracy was contested. Given 'the contemporary hegemony of the discourse of democracy' (Dryzek 2000a: 63), the discourses of democracy that prevailed in Central Queensland warrant further analysis. As well as the discourse of a kind of participatory democracy akin to deliberative democracy, the analysis identified two other discourses – those of liberal democracy and social democracy. These alternative conceptions of democracy influenced who had a voice in the regional planning process and what means of contributing to and making decisions were sanctioned. To examine how these aspects were discursively constructed, concurs with the argument that any analysis of government must consider:

[C]onflicts over who can speak, according to what criteria of truth, from what places, authorized in what ways, through what media machines, utilizing what forms of rhetoric, symbolism, persuasion, sanction or seduction (Rose 1999: 29).
The differing ideas and practices of democracy associated with these discourses resulted in disputed claims about the democratic credentials of various practices of representation and decision-making. This section examines the ideas and practices embodied in each of the forms of democracy championed as alternatives to the official discourse of deliberative democracy. It gives attention to which actors, which forums and forms of expression, and which means of making decisions were privileged by each discourse. In this way it considers most of the issues raised by Rose (1999: 29). The issue of which truth claims were respected and which disqualified, or deemed inadequate, within each discourse is also raised by Rose’s words. It will be addressed later in the chapter.

The rhetoric - deliberative democracy

The previous chapter argued that the particular discourse of democracy adopted as the official doctrine of the regional planning process fostered deliberative decision-making processes among stakeholders. These construed CQANM committees and meetings as public forums for reasoned argument that complied with shared norms of communicative practices. Central Queenslanders cited disenchantment with processes of representative government as an important stimulus for CQANM and the more participatory processes it espoused. Having a broad cross-section of competing voices engaged in deliberative networks was regarded as more democratic than top-down decision-making processes dominated by elected governments and bureaucracies. The discourse of deliberative democracy was common among participants from civil society organisations, but was also espoused by some State government departments (such as the Department of Communities) and a few local governments (usually from smaller councils with relatively homogenous communities where party politics played little role).

However, the institutional design still led to tensions over who could participate as stakeholders, and resulted in some voices being subdued. For instance, there was minimal involvement of Trade Unions (they had no representative on the RPAC and participated in very few Action Groups). As well, people conceded the stakeholder process privileged existing elites disadvantaging some groups even though they had a role in the process such as Green and Indigenous groups. The following statement claims that men were advantaged over women, the assertive over more timid:
You know the people who were reps on CQ A New Millennium on industry things were assertive… assertive men, reasonably large players in local industry – who had a voice, had standing (Nelda, emphasis in original).

The practices of reasoned argument also constrained some of the forms of persuasion employed. They were therefore acknowledged as similarly reinforcing some such imbalances because they relied on communicative capacities and resources not possessed by everyone such as being articulate in English and familiar with meeting conventions. Perhaps as a result, the process had little impact on some forms of power relationships that prevailed in the region, such as the control of the labour market exerted by a few major employees. In addition, the rhetoric that posited CQANM, with its discourse of deliberative democracy, was a superior form of democracy was contested in the region.

**Liberal democracy**

The participatory aspects of the official doctrine of CQANM in some respects resonated with another view, rooted in liberalism, although there were some significant points of difference as the discussion below shows. The essence of liberalism is that it extols the largely unrestricted pursuit of individual interests (Burchell 1991: 127). It regards state intervention in the self-regulation of the private sector and civil society as undesirable (Burchell 1991: 126). The discourse of liberal democracy, therefore, respects the exercise of free choice by individual citizens as captured by elections while also seeking to minimise the extent of state regulation and intervention. Insofar as it also positions such intervention as undesirable elite dominance, this discourse contains the seeds of conservative populism (McKnight 2005: 11). For liberal democrats, the ‘freedom’ associated with democracy is enhanced by de-regulation, privatisation and reduction of the public sector (Rhodes 1997). Rather than implying governing less, the emphasis on freedom, autonomy and self-regulation epitomises particular notions of governing better (Barry et al. 1996: 8). Opportunism, initiative and entrepreneurship by individuals, groups, firms or localities responding (more or less spontaneously) to market opportunities and operating in their own self-interest are regarded as ideal ways to ensure prosperity.
The following statement indicates that participants in CQANM included adherents to this discourse:

Governments can do things, but I really do believe communities need to do things. And one of the things that I say to people is, ‘Look if you’re not interested in your community, don’t expect anybody else to be. Don’t expect somebody to come over the horizon and be interested in your town or your community or what you’re doing, if you’re not. If you’re not in there going hard, and they can’t see you going hard and being very active, they’re not going to come and help you (Leslie).

Liberal democrats endorsed the effectiveness of working ‘competitively’ and ‘in isolation’ which participants said had prevailed earlier in the decade. This is not to say that individualistic values precluded any joint activity by these actors. Indeed, they were often advocates of local self-help partnerships and frequently used terms such as ‘community’, ‘network’ and ‘partnership’ to endorse limited forms of collective action. The connotations of this usage might be better captured by a term like ‘coalition’, and it indicates that the disparity of views was not always superficially apparent. Miller and Ahmad (2000: 5) note for instance the mismatch between partnerships construed as quasi-market forms of organisation and those envisaged as collaborative inter-agency forms of relationships. The comment below shows how the usage of terms like ‘community’ and ‘partnership’ in Central Queensland celebrated local initiative and self-reliance in preference to dependence on paternalistic government action:

It’s more about what we can do to achieve things. The positive stuff is what we can do, not the things. If you focus on the things you become cargo cult. Focus on what we can do. What is it we can do better? How are we going to attract developments? How are we going to do whatever we want to do? And that’s the only aspiration we can have as a community. Otherwise you’re reliant, or demanding on others to service you and I don’t think that works. … Once you’ve got a sense of community, people start to be able to deliver more things (Michael, emphasis in original).
People in Central Queensland of this persuasion argued for the unfettered operation of entrepreneurship and of mechanisms of self-regulation and hence against politicians and bureaucrats monopolising the governance role. Instead, they advocated privileging the voice of individual communities or firms with the state having a facilitation role or, at most, a joint role:

> It’s not just government that makes the decisions. What government does from my perspective is provide the environment to allow the private sector to do a lot of investment. And while government also provides a lot of infrastructure, no doubt about that, but it’s a partnership. If the two of them are not working hand in hand it’s not going to happen (Susan).

This indicated the perceived value of a governing ‘coalition’ – often of strategic elites. The strength of such partnerships (as they were usually called) between state agencies and self-help community groupings or businesses was seen to lie in working together parochially using endogenous resources. Cooperation within the coalitions was instrumental, based on complementarity, and frequently underpinned by a contract or memorandum of understanding. Such governing coalitions could include public, private and voluntary sector players. There was no requirement that they be democratically chosen or broadly representative. Rather, they were usually chosen for the resources they could contribute. The coalitions relied on compatible interests and selective incentives to achieve cooperation (which usually manifested as ‘bargaining’ and ‘making deals’). Their resources were assembled through contributions by the coalition partners, but they also used their market leverage and ability to do such things as attract grants, qualify for funding schemes, mobilise contributions and sponsors or to influence budgets. Where the state was involved, its role was providing enabling conditions to elicit entrepreneurial and competitive behaviour from other sectors rather than coordinating or implementing regional programs itself.

In Central Queensland, there were both individuals and organisations that had what they called a ‘self-interested’ approach (Jane). They employed practices such as lobbying, using personal contacts and what they described as ‘pulling strings’ (Leslie) or using others with influence or in leadership positions. This independent,
self-interested discourse did not come exclusively from private sector participants, but also from some state sector participants. These included Federal government participants, officers of State agencies with established programs of partnership (such as Main Roads), as well as some councils, as the following observation claims:

Quite a lot of the players who became involved, particularly local government, were there to make sure that this thing [CQANM] didn’t stop them doing anything that they wanted to do in their region … It was very much a ‘protecting the patch’ thing in the beginning and there was a really strong feeling about that (Valerie).

Advocates of this approach engaged with the planning process in a very pragmatic way as essentially providing an arena to manoeuvre in their self-interest rather than to negotiate any collective perspective. They were induced to participate because they could interpret their status as stakeholders as giving them an additional arena to lobby and bargain. They were also reassured by CQANM’s perceived similarity to bodies such as the Regional Communities Ministerial Forum or the Central Highlands Development Corporation, both of which they regarded as effective regional bodies. The Forum, for example, aims to draw in regional leaders from a range of areas and provides an opportunity for direct lobbying of State government ministers. It deals with issues on a discrete and ad-hoc rather than long-term basis, seeking immediate and pragmatic solutions to problems as they arise. Some regarded the RPAC and Action Groups in a similar vein, for instance welcoming CQANM’s system of stakeholder representatives since they interpreted it as similarly recognising local leadership rather than as giving a voice to the full spectrum of interests. In according voice and authority to people with a high profile, this perspective highly valued initiative and leadership qualities demonstrated in various arenas, whether council or parliamentary elections, or through market success. One participant even suggested that people’s influence in the regional planning process should be proportionate to their economic ‘worth’, saying:

Quite obviously, geographically our area is much smaller, but what is [the value of] our total exports and then the downstream flow-on of our processes? … it’s just what is your real worth, real value and that being the
case, then who should have more say and where do the services most belong? (Lynn).

Others contested the notion that locally prominent people should have a privileged voice in the process and suggested that practice merely entrenched existing elite influence. The liberal democrat rationality, though, dismissed those excluded as not ‘key players’ or leaders of significance. This discourse approved CQANM’s involvement of strong leaders from relatively focussed and homogenous interest groupings, in words such as:

It was important that key players like that were recruited in this process. At the same time I’m quite sure that you’ll find most probably 30 to 50 different groupings from various areas whether they be in development, agriculture, or environment – there are interest groups all over the show and each one of those wants to have a seat at the table and articulate their concerns and their issues (William).

Here, it is relevant to make the distinction between such interest groups and the stakeholder groups envisaged in the official doctrine of the regional planning process. The latter viewed ‘sectors’ as much more heterogenous groups with diverse interests – what some have labelled ‘movements’ (Marsh 1995: 48) as distinct from interest groups. Because of the ambiguity of some notions in the rhetoric, in this case of ‘stakeholders’, there was potential for liberal democrats, and others, to see CQANM as formalising practices of lobbying by sometimes-undemocratic interest groups.

In privileging lobbying and bargaining between individual or parochial interests, this discourse favoured competitive decision-making processes with, as much as possible, market-type forces determining outcomes. It countered the discourse of decision-making by deliberation and lauded decisions that had been achieved by lobbying – especially of State government but also of other governments or industry. In such situations, the resolution of conflicting self-interests was achieved by strategic ‘deals’, or as a kind of individualistic populism, rather than negotiation of long-term, generally satisfactory, arrangements. An example of how this discourse was
deployed in the region is found in the tactics various actors used to influence decisions about water supplies. A number of people used established routines that were posited as effective practices in the discourse of liberal democracy. One mayor reported a trip he made with the council’s chief executive officer and engineer to lobby the minister and department in Brisbane. They took with them two bottles of their town’s water that looked like ‘gurgly mud’ (Ted). This strategy to dramatically demonstrate the need for an upgrade to the town’s water supply succeeded in gaining project funding from the State government’s Rural Living Infrastructure Program.

However, the trends identified in Chapter Four, and practices associated with new discourses of collaborative planning, integrated regional approaches and whole-of-government coordination, meant such strategies were losing effectiveness. One example of this diminished effect came when a mining company wanted the State government to build a water storage dam. The company reportedly tried directly lobbying the State government to provide the infrastructure. Leslie, the community sector participant who related this, classified such lobbying by big industry as seeking ‘subsidies’ and no longer as likely to get a sympathetic response as in the past. According to him, unions convinced the company that the contemporary climate demanded joint development of a case by industry and unions as well as local government and Indigenous organisations, and including scientific data to get it ‘environmentally correct’. The State Government reacted much more favourably to this case than to a single issue, single interest one. This suggests the pluralising of discourses led to the formation of new alliances and the intertwining of the capillaries of power that had previously accorded considerable leverage to large mining companies, but little to unions and Aboriginal interests.

Social democracy

There remained a strong body of opinion in Central Queensland that decried such decision-making practices as biased, particularly towards influential business interests. The discourse of social democracy portrayed majoritarian, representative democracy as the most effective and fair form of democracy. Social democratic practices involve the mass popular election of representatives who rule through
parliamentary and bureaucratic processes according to the majority preferences so indicated. They represent a conception of modern mass democracy as a system where electing representatives, ‘giv[es] government the powerful legitimation of at least formally deriving their power from the will of the governed’ (Hirst 1994: 28). This discourse privileged the state as the authoritative player to provide good governance. Consequently, elected politicians, as the ‘voice’ of a majority of people, had considerable influence; as did bureaucrats appointed on the basis of ostensibly objective expertise and accountability to elected representatives. Among participants, there were people who considered elections – especially local government elections – to be the most feasible way to represent people as a whole in CQANM committees. One said:

Actually I don’t know how it [CQANM] can … how the citizenry as a whole are represented on there… But there’s local government reps and I tend to see local government as, you know the old cliché, being closest to the community and voted by the community and having an obligation to look after community interests (David).

David was a State government officer and, not surprisingly, this discourse of democracy was common among other state participants, especially from local government. Such people argued the social democrat view – that elected local councillors, other politicians, and also government officers represented the interest of the majority of people. One mayor said people with an electoral majority were key spokespeople, so he, and other councillors, resented situations they had experienced whereby:

[Y]ou go to meetings and you’re elected and you’re sent to those particular meetings and then you’re outvoted. But actually you are the only person

27 The various systems of vote-counting in elections – such as first-past-the-post, preferential and proportional – in fact mean that many of those elected in multi-candidate seats are not supported by more than 50% of voters. However, the concern here is with the discourse which equates electoral success with the wishes of the majority.
there, oh well, there’s probably four or five of you, local government people, that have been elected and have any, well, credibility to make policy (Ted).

People like this, who were supportive of the representative system and the established institutions of government regarded bodies such as the Rockhampton Regional Managers’ Forum (consisting of senior officers of State government in the region) and the CQLGA (consisting of councillors) as key governance bodies in the region. They embraced CQANM to the extent that they perceived it as giving a lead role to these bodies and operating through such formal government hierarchies. Only by being perceived to give a prominent voice to various state sector actors could the regional planning process recruit those of a social democrat persuasion. They voiced concerns about the stakeholder approach because it included voices outside the three levels of government.

This discourse positioned non-state stakeholders as a ‘noisy, whingeing minority’ (James). Sawer (2002) has commented on this discursive shift whereby, rather than being presented as more inclusive and democratic, extra-parliamentary forms of representation marginalise some groups as ‘non-mainstream’. From the social democrat perspective, this participation of private and community sector interests unwarrantedly elevated vocal minority groups and essentially partisan interest groups that lacked legitimacy. A council mayor expressed this opinion thus:

A regional plan is a responsibility of local government. And there were too many other smaller, minority bodies, involved in the input. It was a great concern to me… When it first started local government wasn’t even involved. They went out to all the minority groups not the big circle ones, minorities. And they were the ones that had input. And it suited those small groups, but it didn’t suit the large majority… And that’s when we came in from the local government side saying, ‘Hey, we’re the elected people representing the masses of people not those little pipsqueaks’ (Joshua).

A council officer, similarly, expressed the view that this compromised democracy saying:
Greenpeace and whoever else, they aren’t democratically elected people and I
don’t think we respect enough… we all love our democratic system of
government and then when we start these processes we suddenly want to
throw it out the window (James).

In this way, the social democracy discourse privileged political representatives and
government employees as having greater legitimacy than other stakeholder groups
whose inclusion they portrayed as compromising broad representativeness. To the
extent they conceded their preferred practices resulted in some exclusions, they
explained that these were minority interests. Their influence was evident in project
documents that explicitly positioned some community voices as minorities despite
frequent references to social and cultural diversity as attributes of the region in the
CQRGMF (see, for example Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory
Committee 2002: 7, 38, 79, 84, 85, 94, 95). For instance:

Central Queensland has a relatively low proportion of people from a non-

In terms of decision-making processes, the practices formed by this discourse are
those of parliamentary debate (that is, debate between representatives elected by a
majority of people). The social democracy convention was that elected
representatives should arbitrate between conflicting interests by adversarial debate
and voting in council, State or national legislatures, supplemented by their legal and
bureaucratic machinery. This statement by a local government councillor on the
RPAC embodies such a perspective:

So I consider myself to be an elected person representing six councils at that
level to go up there and vote for or against; debate for; debate against; and
contribute to the decision-making process. …Because when you have to
make the hard and fast and the tough decisions, it’s got to go to the vote. You
can’t have it warm and fuzzy and say, ‘Well, those in favour, those against,
those uncertain, those who don’t care, those who…’ That’s not democracy at
its best (John).
Routines consistent with this discourse include such practices as recruiting sympathetic participants to ‘stack a meeting’ and ensure having ‘the numbers to vote things down’ (Molly). The ability to deploy these techniques was constrained in part by the practices formed by the discourse of deliberative democracy, including the balance of stakeholders and also the preference for consensual decisions in CQANM committees. These practices meant that ‘number-crunching’ tactics, where proponents of a particular position try to ensure that a majority of people at a meeting supported them, were less effective in these forums than in traditional political situations. This was a source of some frustration for social democrat participants as John’s phrase ‘warm and fuzzy’ reveals. However, social democratic practices were sometimes used, and file documents reveal that some issues were resolved by majority vote. One instance that caused disquiet among those who endorsed the consensus decision-making practices of the deliberative democracy discourse was recorded thus:

The mission [sic] statement got up nine to eight with the Chair’s vote which indicates there was nothing like consensus on the statement (file document – email 23/4/02).

Just as those espousing majoritarian representation critiqued the discourse of deliberative democracy, their construction of democracy was disputed in return. Critiques of the representative system evident in Central Queensland reflected the observation by Hindess (1997a: 264) that:

[O]ne of the merits of representation … is precisely that it secures a form of popular government in which ‘the people’, in their collective form, are excluded from a part in government.

For instance, people argued that successful politicians were often elected by a slim majority, ‘so there could be 49 percent who weren’t happy’ (Nelda). Another problem identified was the lack of continuity and the short-term view encouraged by three-yearly electoral cycles. Indeed, both State and council elections were held during the planning process, posing turnover problems and shifts in departmental responsibilities that were remarked on by a number of RPAC members. The critics
also identified the significant (albeit invisible) influence of unelected people in state-centred decision-making given the important role of ‘faceless’ bureaucrats (Ted). They dismissed portraits of public servants as dispassionate experts and regarded them as being just as manipulative and unaccountable as the interest groups were portrayed. Finally, the absence of an actual regional level of government meant people favouring elected representation differed over which elected bodies had legitimacy. Given the context of rivalries and hostility between, and within, various levels of government alluded to in Chapter Five, this provided a dynamic challenge to those endorsing a leading role for state actors and the social democratic system of government. Participants remarked, for instance, that the divisions at local government level necessitated ‘enormous tip-toeing around’ (Pamela).

Despite the attempt to minimise such recognised problems by positioning CQANM outside the social democrat mould, the influence of this discourse was significant. One result was the prominence given to state voices in the regional planning process. Even the rhetorical attempts to distance the stakeholder process from institutions of social democracy were couched in the language of majorities. For instance the official doctrine referred to non-state sectors outnumbering local government and local government outnumbering State government on the RPAC. Also, as indicated above, many decisions like the one on the vision statement, were resolved by voting. As well, some committee discussions bore the hallmarks of adversarial debate rather than reasoned argument.

**Contending discourses of democracy**

Discourses constructing democracy as government by a majority of elected representatives or self-government by autonomous individuals (or individual firms or communities) contrasted with the official doctrine of participation by stakeholders. The collision of these discourses had practical consequences in terms of the authority accorded to the various actors in the regional planning process. It also determined the kinds and effectiveness of the practices such actors employed to exercise their governmental responsibilities and make decisions. The examination above highlights that, even to participants, there was not always a clear distinction between stakeholder representatives with legitimacy in the eyes of their constituency (and the region generally), and say, state appointees from elite minority groups. Hence some
regional residents regarded the CQANM RPAC as an unelected quango (quasi-non-government organisation). As well, not everyone regarded the broad cross-section of competing discourses as an improvement on decision-making processes confined to elected politicians.

In some ways the multistakeholder approach dovetailed with techniques familiar and acceptable to democrats with a majoritarian preference, for example by highlighting the electoral mandate of stakeholders from democratic civil society organisations as well as by treating the state as among the organisations in society (Hirst 2000: 20). Thus the various committees and deliberative arenas were open to both elected politicians and elected representatives of other stakeholder groups. At the same time, the multi-stakeholder process was compatible with liberal democratic practices in apparently providing strategic arenas in which all could advance their own interests without necessarily any overarching vision or sense of ‘public interest’. This has been negatively described as a kind of ‘interest-group tribalism – a patchwork coalition that is an alliance of convenience’ (McKnight 2005: 213). In practice, the struggle between these different discourses had the effect of privileging participants whose legitimacy came from a combination of sources – elections, leadership and stakeholder affiliations. One respondent pointed out that local, State and federal politicians were not the only elected representatives. He approved the inclusion of people from democratic organisations with good consultative or participatory practices and a ‘mandate as elected people’ (Neil). In this respect, the plurality of discourses produced the multiple ‘democratic anchorages’ identified by Sorensen and Torfing (2005: 201). The four sources of democratic legitimacy that they identify derive from: democratically elected politicians; membership bases of participating organisations; a territorially defined citizenry; and conformity with democratic rules and norms.

Each of these differing discourses of democracy involved not only assumptions about who should have a voice in governance processes, but also related practices of inclusion and exclusion. Concerns about ‘elective despotism’, the tyranny of the majority, and other aspects of representative government, led to aspirations to temper the influence of politicians with more participatory practices or with leadership forums. While the undemocratic nature of both self-interested individuals and of top-
down state intervention was stressed in the rhetoric, even the apparently broad-based multi-stakeholder discourse excluded some voices from the deliberative arenas.

Examining criticisms of the selection process for representation of the environment movement illuminates some of the contradictions between these discourses of democracy. The project team contacted various organisations that could be considered public interest groups: the Capricorn Conservation Council, Wildlife Preservation Society, World Wide Fund for Nature, Central Highlands Regional Resource Use and Planning Project (CHRRUPP), Fitzroy Basin Association (FBA) and the Queensland Department of Environment and Heritage to put forward nominations. That resulted in the nomination of a Capricorn Conservation Council member who was also involved with other natural resource management bodies in the region including the FBA, CHRRUPP and Landcare. Deliberative democrats, while acknowledging that numerical constraints meant some perspectives could not be represented at the RPAC table, nevertheless pointed to the range of other arenas – especially Action Groups and community conversations – where these voices from other local, sub-regional and even State-wide environment and conservation bodies with a regional presence, could be heard. Despite these opportunities, some environment organisations felt the position being held by the Capricorn Conservation Council ignored the divergent interests between organisations within their sector and felt bypassed in this process. There were other people who argued that it resulted in a biased, minority, perspective. For instance, one local councillor said the FBA would have presented a more balanced environmental view than a conservationist. Still others felt that the regional chapter of a State-wide organisation would have had more clout to push an environmental perspective and more experience at lobbying. This sort of controversy over the representation within sectors was more likely to occur where the aim was to introduce the multiple perspectives of large and diffuse movements that lacked a single peak body or unified voice.

There were participants from many sectors – from the environment sector, social sector, business sector and even from local government – who complained about the limited voice accorded to their perspective. As well, there was a notable absence of some stakeholder groups. For example, the limited Trade Union representation was mentioned above. Other omissions were of specific age groups such as youth and the
elderly. As well, the RPAC membership was overwhelmingly male and Anglo-Saxon, with little reflection of any cultural diversity in the region and the significant Indigenous population. The discussion above suggested that these exclusions were variously explained and justified according to the discourse of democracy adopted.

The different discourses also resulted in contrasts between various processes for handling the inevitable competition in CQANM’s committees especially with regard to ways to resolve the conflicts and to sway opinion and influence decisions. The main contrasts in terms of resolving conflicting positions were between (a) voting, (b) ‘deals’ (or transactions) and (c) reconciled (or consensual) agreement. The voting ensures the majority (albeit sometimes a slim majority) hold sway; a transactional approach means those with most resources or bargaining power prevail; whereas the consensual approach requires broad acceptance of an outcome fair to everyone. In terms of forms of interaction endorsed for influencing decisions, the distinctions were between (a) adversarial debate, (b) competitive lobbying and bargaining and (c) reasoned argument (see Hillier 2002b for similar distinctions). The contrast between these three is that reasoned argument relies less on opposition and more on identifying commonalities and trying to appreciate alternative viewpoints. The aspiration of CQANM was to achieve consensual agreement through reasoned argument and avoid the alternative techniques of counter-discourses. In this, it conformed to the practices associated with good governance in a cross-national comparative study of environmental policy and practice that found the best results in countries that ‘eschew both adversarial policy making and unbridled capitalist competition’ (Dryzek 1997: 141). Nevertheless, people deploying the counter-discourses outlined in this section participated as well. This is consistent with observations that norms of decision-making are deeply socially embedded, making it difficult to produce changes through wider participation (Cleaver 2004: 272).

An examination of one technology employed – the series of community conversations devised by the Regional Community Identity and Development Working Action Group – shows how the co-existence of three discourses of democracy worked in practice. The community conversations adopted and adapted routines of all three discourses. This practice conformed to the deliberative democracy discourse as an opportunity for a large proportion of Central Queensland
residents to make a genuine contribution to deliberations and the content of the CQRGMF. They were also aligned with liberal democrat practices of community self-help meetings where local people, especially prominent local leaders, agree on local issues to be addressed and devise an action plan on those issues to implement themselves. The former case appealed to participatory rationales whereas the latter gave prominence to self-help ones. The third discourse, of social democracy, positioned the community conversations as a familiar and efficient routine for elected representatives to consult their constituents thereby invoking administrative rationales and legitimising majoritarian consultation technologies. The operation of the community conversations expanded on the characteristics of deliberative democratic practice so that the forums also had some characteristics of these contrasting practices of self-help and consultation. This shows how the dynamic interaction of the discourses in practice entailed flexible accommodation of inconsistent elements. It also indicates how this was related to the contrasting rationalities associated with each.

Examining the interplay of these various discourses of democracy has illustrated that the actors with most influence varied for different decisions. This pattern of multiple, and shifting, centres of power departs from other research findings that have detected less dynamic power relations. In Aalborg, for instance, Flyvbjerg (2001: 147) found a private interest group sandwiched between two groups with constitutionally determined powers – the political power of council and the executive powers of public servants. The present case has also shown how the repertoire of available practices expanded by embracing, but also reshaping, techniques posited as good democratic practices by individual discourses. This concurs with previous observations that new rationalities, for instance empowerment of citizens, embrace heterogeneous and hybrid practices to mould ‘responsible’ behaviour by citizens in line with conceptions of optimal governance (Higgins and Lockie 2002; Somerville 2005). While these studies focussed on expansion of state capacity by these diversified practices, others show the limitations of a one-sided interpretation and suggest that what occurs is accommodation, adjustment and re-shaping of practices by all players (Cheshire 2006; Herbert-Cheshire 2003). The CQANM case, likewise suggests new and re-formulated practices became available to all players in the regional planning process. Further, it suggests that this reformulation, and the
interaction between discourses, called competing rationalities into question more than is usual when entrenched mechanisms of government elude conscious scrutiny (Sorensen and Torfing 2004: 6).

**Three discourses of informed planning: contrasting technologies**

Each of the discourses of democracy and development identified above implies, and utilises, specific ‘technologies’ (Dean 1999a; Rose and Miller 1992). These are the administrative practices, instruments, mechanisms or means used to implement the forms of governance espoused. Of particular interest are the planning practices that are either endorsed by these discourses of democracy and development, or enabled (or constrained) by a specific discourse of planning. In the case of planning too, three discourses can be detected in the region. In this case, they echo the three approaches to planning identified by Mees (2003: 287): modernist, neo-liberal and participatory. As detailed below, modernist planning emphasises notions of systems and design, while neo-liberal approaches advocate a very limited role for planning in land-use regulation and infrastructure-provision. The rhetoric of CQANM construes planning as a very broad activity – governance – warranting community participation. Modernist and neo-liberal forms of planning practice are regarded as antagonistic to such participatory approaches and contain assumptions that:

> Planners, with their expert knowledge of design, of urban systems analysis, or of the inherent superiority of the markets, are entitled to overrule the community, which lacks the necessary expertise (Mees 2003: 287).

Key rhetorical concepts associated with these discourses – for example ‘participation’, ‘community engagement’, and ‘whole-of-government’ in the participatory planning discourse – are symbolic of the practices and also the specific social relations endorsed within the relevant discourse. That is to say, they construct particular relationships and allow the exercise of power by some actors, and they also become inscribed in particular practices and programs of planning and allow them to operate. One result is that the form and content of the written plan will exhibit the influence of the discourse. In the previous chapter, the drafting of the *CQRGMF* as a comprehensive framework plan for the region was identified as one of the specific
practices endorsed in the official doctrine of CQANM. Its significance was stressed in this comment, ‘As soon as you put it in writing, …as soon as they see it in words on a page, it’s a whole different story’ (Pamela). The three discourses of planning embody different perspectives that interacted to shape the nature, form and content of the CQRGMF, and the kinds of knowledge of the region and expertise used as a basis for drafting that kind of plan.

The rhetoric - participatory planning

In the official doctrine of CQANM, proactive, forward-looking planning was strongly endorsed. For instance, one RPAC member said:

I think planning is absolutely critical. But planning must be something that actually starts from within the community and not from a bunch of people in a building a thousand kilometers away coming up with some bright idea (Douglas).

The first of three main characteristics of good planning, according to the rhetoric, is evident in that comment: it was construed as a collaborative exercise involving a range of regional experts and lay people rather than a small number of professional planners. The other two requirements for good participatory planning were the introduction of diverse knowledge about the region and residents, and a specific documented form of regional plan that provided broad principles and a vision. As outlined in Chapter Six, the technologies for achieving these three features of planning were stakeholder networks, deliberative practices and the CQRGMF which provides a policy framework.

This discourse was not confined to specific sectors, nor consistently held by all in specific stakeholder groups. Though not common in State government agencies with a strong service-delivery focus, nor ones with an economic emphasis, it was found in departments with a more regulatory brief such as the Environment Protection Agency or the Department of Local Government and Planning. Similarly, the community organisations where this prevailed tended to be those with a role in advocacy or coordination rather than service-delivery. There were few private sector participants
deploying this discourse and among local governments it was confined to outward-looking councils already engaged in cross-boundary collaborations.

The following comment shows that all elements of this notion of planning – the broad participation, the kinds of knowledge used, and the content of the document – were criticised:

[I]t was unfocussed, disparate, and involving, in my view, a lot of people who really shouldn’t have been… weren’t competent as frontline troops to shape that sort of document or planning program (Thomas).

**Neo-liberal planning:**

A second discourse measured good governance by pragmatic, focussed and immediate responses to problems and opportunities rather than high-level and long-term visions. The neo-liberal perspective tended to reject planning and attempts to articulate and pursue collective (public) interests – whether bottom-up like participatory planning or top-down like the modernist planning discussed below. The following comments from Central Queenslanders imply this discourse:

You get a feeling that there’s been a whole lot of planning but not much is really done sometimes (Kim).

It’s very hard to look into the crystal ball for perhaps the next hundred years, because things change pretty rapidly. … you can plan as much as you like and suddenly things will happen that change your plan (Ian).

[T]his document [the CQRGMF] is now based on thinking that’s two years old and I know my thinking’s changed a lot in two years. So it’s not a responsive process. … I tend to follow more a strategic *management* philosophy than a strategic *planning* philosophy (Ben, emphasis in original).

According to this discourse, the CQRGMF would interfere with market mechanisms for determining future development and resolving conflicting interests, and would place constraints on entrepreneurial activity. From this perspective, a regional plan
lacked the accountability delivered by investor, shareholder and consumer decisions about worthwhile ventures. One person indicated the resistance from this quarter to the regional planning process:

They wanted to continue on an ad-hoc basis – when a problem comes up, it will get solved – rather than look forward and do the forward planning part of it. So there was quite an on-going bit of opposition or unwillingness to participate from Gladstone and Calliope. … Their question was often ‘What will we get out of this? Why would we want to?’ Which is in itself I guess missing the point (Russell).

This perspective tended to be dismissive of the remote bureaucratic expertise that was perceived to dominate many state-centric decision processes. It was an example of a wider phenomenon that has been observed in most western democracies whereby:

There has emerged a deficit of trust in the ability of public officials to effectively deal with the wicked problems of society and in this context citizens today are more ready to challenge perceived technocratic hegemonies built on foundations of professional knowledge and expertise (Lovan et al. 2004: 7).

Some Central Queenslanders conformed to this observation and contested professional knowledge and expertise. In contrast, they ascribed high value to local or endogenous knowledge of what had proven profitable and effective in the past and of entrepreneurial perceptions of what would work in pragmatic and market terms. Consequently this discourse portrayed the influence that property developers in Queensland have traditionally had over planning as acceptable practice. Because it used valid, practical and market-related data and allowed considerable influence to elite interests, such an approach was judged superior to broad regional planning.

The neo-liberal discourse was particularly critical of the CQRGMF for its aspirational, rather than concrete content. This discourse sought to shape the
document to be ‘a prospectus for the region in terms of outside investors’
(Rosemary) and to:

[G]ive a bit of a guide to the future economic growth and development of the
region, giving … a blueprint for future development. And in some respects
they [companies] felt that the document should have been, they used the term
‘a marketing tool’ for growth and development. …Like it didn’t identify a
priority area or things to pursue for economic growth (Christopher).

Christopher’s comment suggests the CQRGMF fell short of these assumptions about
the form of a good plan. Nevertheless, this discourse influenced the form and content
of the document to include some specific development proposals notably enthusiastic
endorsement for new metal and minerals processing and other industries near the
Stanwell Energy Park in a number of places (see for example Central Queensland
Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 30, 35, 55, 63, 64, 99). Such
discursive practices, in turn, prompted criticism of the CQRGMF as ‘just a suite of
regional projects rather than tackling the issues of actually managing growth’
(Molly).

The neo-liberal view of planning was held especially by the private sector. State
government departments, such as the Department of State Development, that
espoused this discourse were often ‘terribly operationally focussed …busy doing’
(Allan). They did not regard planning as their core business.

Powell (2003: 114) suggests the neo-liberal discourse of planning has been very
influential in Australia in recent decades. He regards these planning practices as
government abdicating its responsibilities with respect to land use and infrastructure
planning and leaving the development of new residential areas, transport
infrastructure and utilities to the ad-hoc, opportunistic efforts of private enterprise
(Powell 2003: 118, 119). This sums up the collision evident in Central Queensland
between neo-liberal perspectives and a third, modernist, discourse of planning.
Modernist planning

The discourse of modernist planning also contrasts with the participatory planning rhetoric of CQANM in terms of the practices it posited as characterising good planning. Modernist planning relies on the specific ‘skills of town planning professionals’ and on considerable ‘statistical and engineering inputs’ (Powell 2003: 114). The resultant detailed spatial plans are concerned with form and function and provide designs for key systems including land use, transport, utility services, education, health and environment. (Powell 2003: 114). This characterisation, which contrasts in all three respects with both neo-liberal and participatory planning, resonates with a third discourse of planning evident in Central Queensland among participants who accepted CQANM’s emphasis on planning and rejection of ad-hoc development, but differed in that they regarded planning as basically a process of government, which involved local councils, planners and other professionals as reliable arbiters of the public good.

This discourse positioned planning with an institutional and professional base in land use planning, local authority operations and public sector management. It was a state-centric practice of planning that took a compensatory and reactive approach. It manifested as an emphasis on uniformity and universal, one-size-fits-all programs from a range of central government departments. Implementation, like the planning itself, was by specialized units of administration and sought measurable and equitable outputs and the achievement of specified (often centrally-determined) objectives, goals and targets (Glasson 1992). While Queensland had almost no history of regional planning prior to the 1990s (Head and Ryan 2004), respondents described the few early attempts, such as the Moreton Growth Management Strategy in the 1970s, as centralised, state processes, ‘from George St28 with not much support at the local level’ (Matthew). In the late 1990s, there remained a number of people who regarded the regional planning project as essentially (and properly) a process of the State Department of Local Government and Planning and local governments in Central Queensland. Adherents of such a view were found particularly in local government. As well, it was still common practice in many State departments that,

28 State Parliament and the head offices of many State government departments are located in George St, Brisbane (the capital city of the State of Queensland).
‘in planning or policy areas …pretty much everything comes from Brisbane’ (Kim). However there was also criticism of these top-down practices even from local governments who were accorded a fairly powerful role in planning. For instance one private sector participant claimed:

Most of the decision-making is done at the State level and then of course it just gets foisted on the local council who have to make it happen (Luke).

In this discourse, considerable importance was ascribed to gathering data as illustrated by reference to the task as a ‘study’ rather than a ‘plan’. Further, the state was regarded as the main repository of knowledge and source of credible information. The reliance on bureaucrats with professional expertise for the technical-rational information on which to base plans indicates particular assumptions associated with this discourse about what constitutes valid knowledge. Data regarded as objective, technical and expert was enshrined by those of this persuasion as most ‘factual’. This included not only scientific, economic and technical data, but also information about government-established priorities, planning objectives and future needs (Powell 2003: 116).

In contrast, the on-the-ground knowledge and experience of practitioners and those at the grass-roots was deemed less adequate. The inclusion of some such data, led to criticism of the CQRGMF as not based on valid knowledge:

CQANM is not factual. That’s probably a bit harsh. But it isn’t proven through a body of evidence which would say that the directions stated within it could well be achieved within the resources and financial capabilities of the region (Michael).

Good government decisions were regarded as using a rational-legal approach that relied on technical data and familiarity with established directions rather than the ‘uninformed’ views of laypeople who, it was presumed, were unable to grasp the complexity of the issues. As one person succinctly expressed it:
Joe Blow who lives in Depot Hill [a depressed suburb of Rockhampton] doesn’t know about planning or see the relevance of the issues (Rosemary).

However this techno-scientific data has been criticised by others as partisan, contested, provisional and prone to unpredictable effects (Burns 1999). This critique was echoed in Central Queensland where there were examples of disputes about likely scenarios and instances of two different State government departments contributing conflicting data about some issues. These became visible because the official doctrine provided the opportunity for open contestation of the details, interpretations and ‘facts’ presented to support the various arguments. One example related to water supply when the Department of Natural Resources and Mines, the Environmental Protection Agency, Fitzroy Basin Association and other groups presented different estimates of environmental flows, allocated usage and available capacity in the catchment. Participants were able to interrogate these diverse accounts and exploit some internal state divisions manifest in these knowledge discrepancies (Allen 1996: 342).

Nevertheless, the modernist privileging of state-centric planning with foundations in a limited body of ‘expert’ knowledge was reportedly still very influential in the region. Consequently there was cynicism among local government and non-government participants about CQANM because ‘…the State politicians had supposedly empowered them for their own planning process’ (Luke), but no-one believed that the State government and State politicians would unquestioningly accept outcomes with regional support that were contrary to their preferred directions.

By the modernist discourse, planning was construed as primarily physical and economic. This discourse shaped an expectation that the CQRGMF would take the form of detailed land use and infrastructure plans and regulations:

I’m actually looking for land use planning for urban versus agriculture versus mining to be more balanced or more than just an ad hoc approach. … [So that councils] have an understanding that you can’t just do it because the developer applied for it (Allan).
This envisaged planning documents that were fairly standardised in form and content as was common practice at the time. As one person commented on the situation in Queensland:

I saw a lot of centralized planning, [that]… seemed to be a lot more directive [than CQANM] with very clear, set, parameters (Nelda).

This discourse of planning shaped the practices and rationales of particular players in the regional planning process. Notable among these was the predominance of state officials in the Technical Action Groups. Nevertheless, some participants criticised the modernist practices as being, potentially, a hollow exercise despite the technical data they used and the detailed form of document they produced:

A lot of these regional planning efforts can be token. You can set up a steering committee of a whole bunch of government departments, they submit information, they think it over and they produce a plan (Leo).

The influence of this discourse was clearly moderated in that there was almost no role in CQANM for professional planners. As well, the CQGRMF did not have the format and content associated with good planning in modernist terms. Most significantly, unlike a central plan within a hierarchical system, it lacked, in their eyes, an important administrative feature, that is:

…structures to connect regional planning to government and government operations [as well as to] state priorities, planning and budget frameworks, and the resources of State government (Ben).

In addition there was little compulsion beyond what the Integrated Planning Act required of local governments, and the planning outcomes were not inscribed in performance assessments and other practices of government.
Contending discourses of informed planning

The discourses circulating in Central Queensland constructed planning practices across a spectrum of possibilities. As one participant said:

You get the ones that say ‘I don’t want to waste all this time planning, let’s just get in and do something!’ Then the others saying ‘No, No, no we’ve got to set out the process’. So we had the whole spectrum in that regard (Russell).

Even among those who favoured planning, there were contrasts between whether good planning was top-down or bottom-up; local or regional; immediate or long-term; reactive or proactive. One participant summed up some of these differences:

It’s that dilemma between long-term planning and short-term problems; regional, broad visions and what’s burning locally; regional goal-setting and a regional vision versus State vision-setting, goal-setting (Leo).

These conflicting discourses of planning shaped the planning practices adopted by CQANM and produced differing levels of acceptance of the CQRGMF and the knowledge on which it was based. The modernist planning discourse privileged technocratic knowledge, while the neo-liberal planning discourse favoured endogenous, instrumental knowledge, and the rhetoric of CQANM was a participatory planning discourse that endorsed both of these forms of knowledge as well as ethical and subjective considerations. To some extent, the latter discourse, by allowing such a broad range of data forms, articulated with each of the other discourses. For instance the administrative mechanisms used within state centric planning to formulate knowledge of citizens and the region could harness participatory technologies as forms of consultation (Allen 1996: 331). Nevertheless, there were tensions as a result of contrasting assumptions about what constituted valid knowledge of the region. The significance of such conflicting knowledge claims and criteria for truth has been highlighted by Rose (1999: 29). He suggests that the exercise of government is enmeshed with alternative understandings – in this case of the region as the object of government. The positioning of knowledge of the region as the Regional Overview section at the front of the CQRGMF, before the Policy Framework section, is therefore significant. It shows the particular knowledge
of the region that was regarded as necessary to govern it, and the particular version of reality it sought to construct. For instance, under the heading Greenhouse, the Regional Overview states:

The economic and infrastructure wealth of the region is currently largely underpinned through coal exports which provide high quality and efficient resources for global steel, electricity and other industrial sectors, while providing low-cost electricity and energy which support efficient downstream processing of minerals and other energy-intensive users in the region. As a result, the region has a high per capita emission of greenhouse gases, and must recognise the potential impact of state, federal and global government action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The region should aspire to develop a flexible Greenhouse strategy that takes advantage of the synergies between the region’s identified natural resources to contribute to net global greenhouse gas abatement while enabling the region to build on its existing strengths, and diversify its economic base (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 31)

The picture of the region this conjures is positive in terms of a number of economic ‘truths’ – about efficiency, lucrative industries and low energy prices. It constructs prospects of expanding this industrial activity in the phrase ‘build on its existing strengths’. The extract also portrays the more negative ‘truth’ that the region has high greenhouse gas emissions – tempered by the ‘fact’ that it apparently has some natural resources that could partially offset these emissions. It is notable though, that this information is provided in vague, even evasive, language with no specific details of the export and domestic value of industries, the basis of the claims about efficiency, the various impacts of low-priced power, nor the natural resources that offer the potential synergies. There is no mention here, or elsewhere in the Regional Overview of significant forestry resources, for instance. The Regional Overview is, however, more explicit in other sections about some of the other ‘facts’ included only obliquely in this extract. For instance, it claims the region has ‘in excess of 50% of Queensland’s electricity generation capacity’ (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 32) and that it ‘boasts …the world’s largest alumina refinery and Australia’s largest aluminium smelter’ (Central Queensland Regional
Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 33). We can infer that the admissible data about the competitive advantages of this region included availability of competitively priced power for large-scale industries, rather than giving equal weight to claims like this:

The region’s the net largest emitter of greenhouse gases per capita of any region in the world! Though I saw a great opportunity for those carbon emissions to be offset by the agricultural sector in the rest of the region (Douglas).

However, the Greenhouse statement included a concession about emissions that shows the influence of such counter-discourses in broadening the knowledge deemed legitimate to construct a ‘true’ picture of the region throughout the drafting process.

In ways such as this, the collision of these discourses is a further example of the more participatory processes first identified in dealing with complex environmental problems (Fischer 1993). As such, it weakened conventional models of professionalism based on a hierarchy of knowledge and introduced new practices of embracing the local knowledge of the community, the elite knowledge of the scientific establishment and the technocratic expertise of the bureaucracy (Fischer 1993: 182). It also forged new ways of governing that involved distinctive practices of regional planning to manage future development. In CQANM’s case, the practices endorsed by the rhetoric counteracted modernist planning practices in that there were no professional planners among key actors and the institutions were not embedded in the hierarchies and processes of formal government. It also countered neo-liberal planning in other ways and established broad, long-term planning as superior to isolated, reactive, problem-solving. So, according to one participant, a new kind of planning became core business:

At the time, or shortly after commencement, regional planning became, instead of being a one-off project in the department, it became core business. The department [DLGP] accepted that as core business, that’s what we were about (Russell).
However, the coexistence of these multiple discourses of planning did compromise the effectiveness of the process, especially because it was not embedded in government institutions. For example no costings appear in the \textit{CQRGMF}. As well, from the concept plan for implementation that forms the fifth and final section of the document, we can infer that the endorsement of the plan by State and local governments and non-government sectors did not entail any financial commitments. In a list of objectives for the next phase, this section includes:

\begin{quote}
Identify and secure the finances and resources required to support the \textit{CQRGMF} from the government, industry and community sectors (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 146).
\end{quote}

A second impact was that mutual adjustment between these discourses and the inclusion of such diverse data produced what some labelled ‘lowest common denominator’ decisions, or ‘motherhood statements’ with very little substance. This is illustrated by the discursive shifts found in some specific extracts of the \textit{CQRGMF} – the example of Greenhouse, mentioned above, being a case in point. As well, there is some evidence that commitment from various actors applied only to the extent the Policy Framework concurred with strategy proposals that would have emerged had there been no regional planning process. There were technical reports, consultation with the public, and stakeholder representatives on all Action Groups, but there was a consistent pattern of lack of commitment by various actors to strategies that ran counter to the priorities established within their sector, agency, or organisation. Some strategies were window dressing for actors entrenched in their particular discourses, but recognising political pressure to appear to be changing. In this respect CQANM demonstrates one of the potential problems of network governance according to Sorensen and Torfing (2004: 31) that by transforming conflict into compromise they might undermine the political contestation essential to deliberative democracy.

A third effect of the differing ideas and practices privileged by these discourses was to make people more proactive and also more collaborative. One person said this was a challenge for CQANM:
Once you think regionally then there must be some degree of giving up power to work on the broader basis. … Industry and business are about making money and some of this other stuff they’re not really interested in. It’s a cooperative process so a lot of its success depends on whether you can get people actually working together – and historically this region had problems with rivalries (Richard).

This suggests the rhetorical embrace of practices such as cooperative action and networking cultivated some new patterns of power-sharing, responsibility-shifting, and alliance-forming. To some extent these new relations undermined the hierarchies between the three levels of government and broke down entrenched rivalries. The new forms of collaboration, mentioned above, included stronger horizontal links between local governments as well as with regional officers of State government agencies – though there was less change in vertical relations between local and State actors in the region and State actors in the capital city head offices. These effects concur with the potential changes to patterns of power identified by other researchers (Cleaver 2004: 272; Sorensen and Torfing 2005: 200). There were also some less predictable instances of collaborative power such as an unlikely alliance formed between industry and environmentalists to convince hostile actors from state sectors to include the statement on Greenhouse reported above.

As well, power relations adjusted because the state was no longer considered the exclusive source of knowledge. Like knowledge, other planning resources were held by groups outside the state, giving them more influence in the process than modernist planning would do. The nature of relationships between key actors and the planning practices that were privileged both changed. No longer was competitive, self-reliance the only approach deemed appropriate; nor was the direction of planning professionals deemed essential. Instead, a role for other actors was normalised, as were practices such as those condemned by the modernist discourse as ‘Claytons’ or ‘semblant’ planning (Powell 2003: 115) because it has the appearance of planning without the substance.
A trio of (govern)mentalities in Central Queensland

In analysing the governmental rationalities at work when Central Queensland was governed (Flyvbjerg 2001: 131) we find that a complex accretion of competing discourses associated with different rationalities pervaded the planning practices adopted in the region. The mentalities of rule addressed the problems of government by considering: What is the task? Who’s going to do it? By what means? Or, as Hirst (2000: 3) poses it, ‘who shall govern what and how’. In doing so, they constructed discourses of development, democracy and planning. Three broad variants are evident although these competing governmentality ises are based on contested meanings of terms including networks, community, collaboration and sustainability. As well they sometimes employ ‘shifts and reutilizations of identical formulas for contrary objectives’ (Richardson 1996). While, superficially, they share some rhetorical emphases, for example on democracy, the underlying rationales and desired outcomes are quite different and often contradictory. As illustrated above, a specific practice such as ‘community participation’ was variously regarded as tokenism, autonomy or ownership. Its implementation could involve people voting in elections or referenda, or contributing to self-help initiatives and contractual partnerships, or engaging in deliberation within a network of stakeholders. Likewise, other stated intentions of regional planning – such as regional development – were espoused by participants for diverse reasons and with diverse notions in mind.

The data above demonstrate the value of unpacking conceptions of development, democracy and planning. The most striking finding of the study is the extent to which the mentality inherent in the rhetoric of CQANM diverged from both the mentality of the welfare state and the more recent mentality of neo-liberal regimes despite some appropriation and accommodation of technologies from both of these governmentalitys. This suggests a three-fold typology of governmentalitys that can be summarized as in Table 7.1. Each fuses together a number of distinct discourses into what Rose (1999: 26) calls, ‘a relatively systematic matrix of political thought and action’.
Table 7.1: Summary of three coexisting mentalities of regional governance in Central Queensland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problematics: Objectives</th>
<th>Hierarchical governance – Social democracy</th>
<th>Market governance – Liberal democracy</th>
<th>Networked governance – Deliberative democracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Territory/scale</td>
<td>Centralised</td>
<td>Decentralised/ subsidarity</td>
<td>Multi-scale including regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects of rule /scope</td>
<td>The population and exploitable resources</td>
<td>The economy</td>
<td>Society, environment and economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors/ players</td>
<td>State (elected politicians and bureaucrats)</td>
<td>Market, civil society and local self-help</td>
<td>Stakeholders from state, market &amp; civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologies</td>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>Communicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parliamentary arenas and expert advisory commissions. Subsidies</td>
<td>Partnerships and coalitions. Contracts, market incentives, audits</td>
<td>Interactive forums for networking and participation. Multi-stakeholder committees, community conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modernist planning. Central, standardised planning by professionals to provide designs for systems in different policy areas. Uses technocratic knowledge</td>
<td>Neo-liberal planning. Limited planning directing decentralised, strategic, market-driven action by entrepreneurs (like a prospectus). Uses instrumental knowledge especially economic</td>
<td>Participatory planning. Integrated plan documented in the CQRGMF, setting principles and a framework for development. Uses combined knowledge and expertise of professionals, affected citizens and practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalities</td>
<td>Administrative rationalism and equity</td>
<td>Economic and libertarian rationales</td>
<td>Holistic and democratic rationales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimacy derived from state obligation to rule in the name of society. Legal and electoral mandate</td>
<td>Legitimacy derived from free choices: electoral representation and leadership</td>
<td>Legitimacy derived from widespread participation, collaboration and shared vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public interest Social equity</td>
<td>Private interests Market liberalism</td>
<td>Mutual interests Participatory democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Constructed by interpreting field data from Central Queensland
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First, there is a mentality associated with a relatively long tradition of social democracy and the welfare state in Australia. This is similar to the hierarchical governance profiled by Davis and Rhodes (2000) and the rationalities of welfarism analysed for instance by Rose (1996b). It involves relatively centralised, top-down orchestration of public consensus and promotes national strategies based on equity principles. People deploying this cluster of discourses viewed the RPAC and other committees as arenas for the legitimate representatives of the majority of citizens to weigh technocratic knowledge and engage in adversarial debate. While the inclusion of ‘unelected’ people was a problematic deviation from their construct, the large number of RPAC positions held by people from the state sector meant that together they formed a majority of that committee. As well, inclusion of bureaucrats and the formation of Technical Action Groups re-assured them about the retention of state authority and the validity of the knowledge base.

The second governmentality has had more recent ascendancy in this country with shifts in the liberal tradition associated with market governance, waves of public sector reforms and other governance changes from the 1980s. Many dimensions of this conform to Rose’s (1996b) profile of an advanced liberal rationality. It envisages a separation between a limited state and the largely self-regulating sectors of civil society and the market economy. This is because it upholds individual freedoms based on parochialism or self-interest and hence limits ill-advised interventions of government through deregulation, decentralization, privatization and such practices as competitive tendering out of public services.

With a range of technologies, governing authorities seek to harness individual freedoms and capacities of self-regulation and self-help in ways consistent with objectives of competition, efficiency and entrepreneurship. For instance, contracts, pricing schemes and other market mechanisms strengthen competition and increase choice. Through such mechanisms, a more entrepreneurial state acts ‘at a distance’ to facilitate preferred behaviours and decisions (Miller and Rose 1990; Rose 1989). For instance it sets performance standards, and provides policy and regulatory frameworks rather than delivering services and planning. This cluster of discourses positions citizens as disaggregated and individualized with a number of personal affinities to relatively small, homogeneous groups like family, enterprise and local
community rather than holding collective notions of the public good. This mentality portrays unfettered competition between these vested interest groups as a more effective route to prosperity and economic success than planning. Those engaging in these discourses were able to locate CQANM as a further manifestation of the local self-help initiatives fostered early in the 1990s by a range of State and federal government programs and policies as diverse as Landcare, Neighbourhood Watch, the Rural Communities Program and the ‘Can-Do Community’ Awards. They viewed the RPAC and Action Groups as arenas for bargaining to secure their interests based on endogenous expertise gained in the market place. This governmentality is summarised in the middle column of Table 7.1.

Finally there is what I have labelled the ‘official doctrine’ of CQANM and described in Chapter Six. This perspective regards both state and market as having failed to provide adequate mechanisms for consulting, respecting and reconciling the full diversity of interests and delivering sustainable development. It embodies some of the mutations and hybrid mechanisms detected by Rose in Third Way politics (2000: 1408). The summary given in the previous chapter is repeated in the right hand column of Table 7.1. This tabulation is a heuristic device only and is not intended to imply an uncritical aggregation of multiple, contrasting, perspectives into simplistic and consistent tripart-isms. Nor does it suggest the operation of any one of these in pure form in Central Queensland. But, in the interests of untangling and understanding the complex discursive smorgasbord, it is helpful to use some classificatory shorthand for these particular assemblages.

In Central Queensland then, we can detect multiple, socially-constructed accounts of good regional governance. For those with a hierarchical, social governance mentality, regional planning is a way for appropriate state authorities to equitably and effectively coordinate universal societal goals; to administer various subsections of the population and geographic sub-units of the nation; and to provide the services needed by the population. For others, with a market, liberal governance mentality, it provides an opportunity for the state to ‘step back’ from direct service provision and encourage regional communities to engage in efficient, ‘self-help’ as active, entrepreneurial citizens, businesses and civil society organisations often working strategically in coalitions. Finally, for still others, with a networked, deliberative
governance mentality, regional planning provides an opportunity for broad-based participation by state, market and civil society actors deliberating discursively in a reflexive and dispersed form of rule and of regionalism. In practice therefore, CQANM conformed to mixed discursive perspectives straddling traditional hierarchical, competitive market and more deliberative, networked approaches.

Regional governance as discursive competition

Having dissected these three mentalities and their constituent discourses, this final section of the chapter examines further how the elements that the preceding analysis has profiled separately, were, in practice, bound together as a complex mosaic of discourses. It is important to explore the interplay of governmentalities since Dryzek (2000a: 123, 124) argues that the balance and interplay of various discursive constructions is quite crucial, particularly in situations where institutional ‘hardware’ is weak. This is precisely the situation in systems of governance rather than government – especially for regional governance in Australia where no formal institutions of government exist at a regional scale.

The divergences and inconsistencies between these various discursive practices did not constitute an evolution from a phase of pure liberalism, nor a kind of cyclic reversion to a phase of welfarism (Dean 1999a: 49). When many ways of posing and answering governmental questions coexist and compete with one another, Gordon (1991: 36) suggests that both discrepancies and continuities will be evident. He gives the example of the coexistence of welfarist discourses with neoliberal ambitions to implicate citizens as partners in the ‘market game’. His diagnosis allows us to appreciate two of the rationalities operating in Central Queensland, and effects such as the mobilisation of the corporate and voluntary sectors in planning and service provision, and the increasing use of inter-agency agreements to coordinate linked functions. However it is only a partial explanation and does not comprehensively portray the complex mix in the region. Particularly, it underestimates the discourses of sustainability, deliberative democracy and collaborative planning and the effects of these – such as multiparty dialogue between the state and other players in institutions outside the formal apparatus of government.
Other writers have suggested the fusion of elements of different governmentalities results in a form of hybrid governance (Higgins and Lockie 2002; Stenson and Watt 1999). Their analysis, similarly, identifies the hybridity between the mentalities of hierarchical and market governance, but is largely silent about the incorporation of some ‘alien and contradictory’ (O’Malley 1998: 159) elements of networked, deliberative governance. Instead of conceiving of the relationship between discourses in Central Queensland as successive stages or as fusion and hybridity of two modes of governance, we can consider further possibilities. Rose (1999: 24) has argued that ‘the discovery of new problems for government – and the invention of new forms of government – embraces, recodes, reshapes, those that pre-exist them’. The practices of CQANM – while embracing, recoding and reshaping some practices of hierarchical governance and of market governance – cannot be fully understood without also recognising the discursive practices of the networked governance mentality profiled in Chapter Six. Distinctive elements of this third mentality were also introduced or modified, so that there was persistence and revision of elements of all three modes of governance.

A more satisfactory characterization of the CQANM case is therefore a dynamic situation of perpetual tension between, and interweaving of, these co-existing mentalities so that the effects of all are evident. As has been suggested of such situations, this involves extension and mutation of various discourses, and adjustments between discourses (McHoul and Grace 1993: 45-46). The notion that discourses and mentalities interact and undergo transformations without one consistently prevailing, also concurs with Dryzek’s (2000a: 163) contention that interchange across discourses is increasingly facilitated by contemporary conditions. This understanding would regard the regional planning process as a further manifestation of the ‘inventive’ and ‘eclectic’ array of technologies employed by an extremely adaptive phenomenon – liberal govermentality (O’Malley 1996: 159). It also recognizes that various kinds of liberalism have each informed and influenced the others as they were posed as a critique of potential, actual and previous forms of government and governmental rationality in the pursuit of better governance (Dean 1999a: 52). So, for instance, the official doctrine of CQANM constitutes, in part, a critique of the mentality characterised by economic rationalism, market governance and liberal democracy. It also shares some of its rejection of aspects of welfarism,
hierarchical governance and social democracy. The previous chapter suggested that a networked governance view, a rationality not previously articulated in the political vision of the wider society, became the ideal of many in the specific Central Queensland context of the late 1990s. This, like each of the other governmentalities is still operating both as a rhetorical ideal for some and as a source of controversy. In other words, regional governance is multiple and fractured with conflicting governmentalities dynamically coexisting and possessing both continuities and inconsistencies with each other.

Understanding the coexistence of these continually contested mentalities in this way heeds the advice from Flyvbjerg (2001: 123) that:

One ought not to view the universe of discourses as divided into accepted and excluded discourses, into dominant and dominated discourses, or into successful and fallacious discourses. Rather one should operate with a multiplicity of discursive elements which can be put into operation in various strategies.

It is this ‘multiplicity of discursive elements’ that the case of CQANM illuminates. Each of the discourses, and the tensions between them was embedded in practices of government and comprised a repertoire of actions and rationalities (Dean 1999a: 81). These inventories of practices conditioned the way people thought, communicated and acted – normalising certain practices and routines while excluding others (Layder 1994: 95).

An example of the effect on processes, mentioned above, is the way people subscribing to hierarchical and market governance rationalities modified some of their behaviours to align with the practices adopted for the regional planning process. Discursive practices of lobbying and voting were modified to some extent by fostering practices of reasoned argument. So rather than companies, industries or councils individually lobbying State government ministers in the State capital to build Nathan Dam for example, some environmentally-minded pastoralists talked to local irrigators; unions talked to mining companies; and Indigenous interests and catchment management groups became involved. This extensive dialogue within
CQANM arenas (the RPAC and the Action Groups), and more broadly, demonstrated a clash over how the business of decision-making should be conducted. The deliberative practices of listening, willingness to modify views, and taking time to consult with constituencies, proved challenging for all. Market governance rationalities judged this process as too slow and indecisive, while in the terms of hierarchical governance rationalities it unjustifiably expanded the influence of both the market and community sectors in political decision-making.

The democratic aspirations of the networked governance rhetoric were themselves constrained by the possibilities prescribed and proscribed by these alternative discourses. Direct use of tactics like intimidation, debating from entrenched positions, majority votes, pulling strings and relying on ‘who you know’ were circumscribed and somewhat limited by the discourse of deliberative democracy. Nevertheless, these techniques are familiar practices in other discourses of democracy and were used, to some effect, during the process. For instance, the environmental representative was confronted with a ballot that did not vote Greenhouse as an important issue to include in the policy framework. He responded with what he called ‘intellectual intimidation’ – requesting the committee members to pose for an ‘historical’ photo recording the people who voted that greenhouse was not a significant issue for the region. This strategy succeeded where reasoned argument had failed and the section was included. Such examples illustrate that people deployed the diverse resources made available by the multiplicity of discourses. The Working Action Groups had a structural bias towards collaborative practices. Participants claim these practices tended to counter or defuse some of the local empire building and rivalries that prevailed previously, and to foster results like the greater coherence of local governments and formation of the four sub-regional ROCs. However, there is evidence of some continuing parochialism, embedded in practices of competitive lobbying and bargaining. As well, the residual practices of adversarial debate reinforced some divisions and polarisations and compromised achievement of the consensual, collaborative ideal of deliberative democracy.

Besides this expanded repertoire of available practices and strategies, the plurality of discourses also influenced the range of resources available to actors. The state and private sectors were traditionally able to mobilise more discursive and financial
resources than civil society actors. As a result, political agendas served political or economic elites and theirs were the knowledge resources, skills and capacities respected and utilized, as well as the financial and material resources available for regional collaboration. The persisting effect of the state’s near-monopoly of information (Somerville 2005: 118) was particularly evident in the Technical Action Groups where some power asymmetries and privileging of certain forms of knowledge were reproduced by the predominance of state actors, mentioned earlier. Nevertheless, the other actors present, and the divisions between various state actors, meant that knowledge was contested in ways Allen (1996: 342) suggests are facilitated by participatory technologies. One example was the struggle over whether to include data emission levels and targets in the deliberations on Greenhouse mentioned above, and how to weigh sometimes-conflicting data from environmentalists, government departments, university researchers and industry bodies. Another factor that limited the degree of expansion facilitated by the conflicting rationalities was the difference in levels of commitment and priorities various actors brought to the regional planning project. This meant that the extent their resources were available to the project was sometimes limited. Industries, for instance, had little interest in sharing commercially valuable information, and few actors were prepared to divert resources from other activities to the new-found priorities agreed through CQANM where these ran counter to internally-determined priorities. 

As well as influencing processes and resources, each of the discourses presupposed, and to some extent became inscribed in, particular structures and relationships. For instance, they assumed, and helped create, particular arenas where governance decisions were made. Each discourse also positioned certain actors as able to exercise power in the region, and marginalized others in the process. The relationships crystallised in each of the discourses were power relations and exhibited asymmetries. As earlier examples have shown, one discourse positioned environmentalists as a noisy minority, but these actors were able to exert influence on the process because the discourses of networked governance recognized them as stakeholders. The social dynamics and shifting relationships constructed by the plurality of discourses are evident in the negotiations over water supplies for the region. There were pro-developers with a discourse of economic development. Their
priority was a secure water supply for productive enterprises. Key concerns for them were pipeline infrastructure, pricing schedules and the availability of licenses or contracts. This discourse circulated among private interest groups, (miners, industries, and irrigators), who had considerable financial clout. They were backed by the political power of some local governments (with local industries, or booming populations) and some powerful State ministers and their departments (notably Department of State Development). Confronting them, on one side, were the environmentalists and Indigenous interests backed by the lesser executive power of the Environmental Protection Agency. They prioritized the maintenance of environmental flows and avoidance of pollution and degradation of waterways. On the other side, there were those who wanted to build more dams to ensure inputs for the economy as well as plentiful supplies of good quality water for domestic, recreational and aesthetic uses. They were led by the Department of Natural Resources and Mines, backed by less affluent local governments and those in expanding population centres. As outlined above, there was much dialogue and the formation of multilateral alliances among these groups. Some exercises of power reproduced and reinforced the tensions over who were legitimate stakeholders, bases of leadership and collegiality, while others transferred and obstructed them (Delanty 1999: 104-5; Flyvbjerg 2001: 124). The result was that the power of erstwhile dominant actors was obstructed in ways that would not have occurred if the hierarchical governance or market mentalities were uncontested. Specifically, the CQRGMF did not give unconditional endorsement for construction of the Nathan Dam, but adopted a more precautionary approach to water infrastructure options (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2002: 75).

The coexistence of the different discourses meant power was dispersed with many sectors, organisations and groups able to exert power over some aspects (Huxham and Vangen 2005: 183). Those privileged by one discourse could not dominate when other discourses deployed what has been described as ‘countervailing collaborative power’ (Fung and Wright 2003a: 282). By this is meant forms of collaboration that challenge actors with privileged access to decision-making venues and other resources. The techniques employed are different to familiar adversarial challenges like litigation, threats and mobilization (Fung and Wright 2003a: 260). Despite the fact that there was such fragmentation and dispersal of power, the CQANM process
could only moderate entrenched power relationships to a limited degree. As well, results such as the vague wording of the eventual strategy for water infrastructure, was interpreted by some elite actors as a successful silencing of otherwise intractable opposition. Fears of cooption have caused reticence about participating in collaborative efforts (Whelan and Lyons 2004), and Fung and Wright (2003b: 33) recognize ‘disarming’ of the opposition as a potential vulnerability of their participatory governance model. Nevertheless, this instance illustrates some of the shifting relationships, alliances and strategies that were produced by these cross-cutting discourses.

Beyond these impacts as sometimes-contradictory discourses influenced specific situations, their interweaving also facilitated broad engagement with CQANM. This was perhaps the most general effect of the coexistence of discourses: that it provided sufficient common ground for the diverse positions to engage in the regional planning project. The discursive environment contained a number of normative ideals – any and all of which could, to some extent, be harnessed or enlisted to the rhetoric of regional planning. For instance, all agreed that organisational complexity posed a governance challenge. The proliferation of a ‘maze of organisations’ (Hirst 2000: 26) within and beyond formal institutions of government was profiled in Chapter Five. All three mentalities shared a quest for better governance, in this respect, that would resolve the challenges of an array of very different bodies, that, even in combination, could not be considered to be a ‘political community’ (Hirst 2000: 25). In line with this, one of the aims of the regional planning process, which all actors subscribed to, was:

To provide a decision-making framework which ensures complementary actions by Federal, State and local governments and the private and community sectors, to realize desirable long-term growth and development objectives and to avoid duplication and inefficient use of resources (Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee 2000: 4).

The similarities end there, though, as the conception of such a framework was shaped differently by each mentality of regional governance, and this chapter has outlined the diverse discursive practices endorsed by the three mentalities as responses to
organisational congestion. The networked governance response took a form that Hirst (2000: 30) associates with societies where state-civil society or public-private sector dualisms are no longer appropriate and where we can regard the state as one of the many components of an ‘organisational society’ (Hirst 2000: 20). In practice, CQANM’s version of this recognised multi-centred sites of governance, but gained coherence by linking them in a network of networks. It was able to recruit people subscribing to other mentalities, for instance, those who construed CQANM as a modified form of hierarchical governance. They viewed the state sector as the leading actor and other sectors as effectively nested hierarchies of groups with peak bodies as representative spokespeople. Consequently, they emphasised vertical links from local to sub-regional to regional (and beyond to State and federal levels). There was also enough flexibility in the practices for forming networks and including stakeholders for market governance stalwarts to interpret the networks as strategic coalitions of leaders from interest and lobby groups. This suggests that new forms of thought about coordination and new practices of collaboration became available because of the pluralising of discourses (McHoul and Grace 1993: 32-33). It further suggests that CQANM provided an institutional form that involved leaders and experts without allowing them total control of public argumentation (Bogason and Musso 2006: 15).

The examples cited above demonstrate the tensions, mutations, extensions and extrapolations that characterise the interaction of these multiple discursive elements. The plurality of discourses and resultant social dynamics, practices, resources and relationships did not necessarily result in optimal collaboration and integration. Rather than identifying one dominant discourse, the analysis has teased out the complex group of interacting forces maintaining a dispersed form of control through the social technologies adopted such as network meetings, the norms of deliberation and the drafting of a broad regional plan. This demonstrates that the capillaries of power were intertwined such that some established imbalances (such as the dominance of State government actors) were perpetuated while others were modified. The environment sector, for instance, was able to use its position, information it had access to (including leaked information from State officials), and alliances it forged, to political advantage on a number of issues including
Greenhouse and Water Supplies. Power relations were not fixed, but mobile and shifting as Foucauldian scholars have argued (McHoul and Grace 1993: 86).

Two particular dynamics appear to have enhanced the interactivity of the disparate discourses explicit or implicit in Central Queensland’s regional planning process. One is the flexible operation of practices such as the stakeholder strategy, allowing diverse possibilities to remain open rather than closing down specific options. This maintained the free play of confrontation rather than the stable victory of one group, practice or viewpoint over the other. Because the particular choice of stakeholders included a number of local government mayors and some elected representatives of peak groups, it adapted technologies of the social democracy discourse. Because it included some leadership figures, interest groups representation and private sector actors, it could be interpreted as a mutation of liberal democratic strategies, and because it included different sectors, different disciplines within each sector, different scales of operation, different geographical locations and different social groups, it conformed to the inclusive practices of participatory democracy.

The second dynamic enhancing the interactivity of the discourses was the ambiguity of key terms, practices and formulas that were (re)deployed from one mentality to another. Before giving examples of this, it is worth quoting a caution about placing too much emphasis on the lexicon of governance in analysing inherent discourses:

The very flexibility of this language, …which allows it to be adopted across significant ideological divides, urges caution, along with the frequent and interchangeable use of different terms as a ‘spray-on’ solution to cover the faultlines of economic decline and social fragmentation. ‘Community’ and the terms that surround it are terms that have been invested with a variety of meanings, depending on the perspectives of the people and institutions that have espoused them (Taylor 2003: 2).

‘Community’ is not the only flexible term that can be used in ways that mask the disparity of assumptions and the fundamentally different objectives of good governance inherent in these discourses. Earlier chapters have indicated that terms such as network, partnership and stakeholder are equally versatile. This versatility of
various rhetorical concepts allowed those with opposing governmentalities to engage in the regional process but in different ways and to achieve different ends (Deetz 1992: 250). For example, people could endorse sustainable development in their quest for economic growth or for social equity as much as for a balance between social, economic and ecological goals. They could also construe the RPAC as a place for adversarial debate or strategic bargaining or reasoned argument. As well, they could variously interpret the information on which decisions were based as expert science, or as practical, grass roots knowledge or as a combination of these with ethical considerations as well. These various discursive possibilities meant CQANM incorporated and put into operation a range of competing discourses and induced adherents of various governmentalities to engage with the regional planning process, rather than just those with a networked, deliberative governance mentality. Rather than the pressures and contradictions between these packages of discourses resulting in the triumph of one at the expense of the others, the effect was a multi-discursive approach where competition, accommodation and flexibility characterised CQANM as a form of regional governance.

Chapter Six profiled a mentality of government that had its genesis in a context of concern about the democratic deficit of representative government and disillusionment with both hierarchical and market governance. Both those modes of governing were seen as inadequate to address the complex task of contemporary governance in a coordinated and integrated way. Rather than proceed to predictable findings about the gap between rhetoric and reality in the regional planning process, this chapter adopted an ‘analytics of government’ approach. It suggested this enhanced understanding of trends in regional governance and how governmental practices worked. It showed that, in the Central Queensland case study, regional governance is best conceived of as discursive competition (Dryzek 2000a: 4). Three contrasting constellations of discourses – about development, democracy and informed planning – were profiled. These are broadly consistent with the hierarchical, market and networked forms of governance (Rhodes 1996) or the authority, steering and democracy distinctions made by Pierre (2000). Although the regional planning process undertaken by CQANM was a cluster of mechanisms to realise a certain conception of good governance, not everyone subscribed to the ideals inherent in the rhetoric. This chapter gave some examples of the collision of
this official doctrine with other narratives circulating in Central Queensland about the means and ends of good governance. It also considered the interplay of these discourses and their associated premises and practices, highlighting the plural and fractured nature of contemporary governance as not only multi-level, multi-sector, and multi-disciplinary but also multi-discursive.
Chapter 8: Conclusion – Regional Planning as Good Governance in Central Queensland

Regional programs have been a sporadic feature of Australian public life from the mid twentieth century and provide examples of attempts to implement good governance by action at a sub-national scale to achieve objectives of government. However there has been dissatisfaction with the reforms and experimentation involved in various regional programs. Many initiatives have not worked effectively; have been piecemeal and unsystematic; and have involved contrary and counter-productive elements. It has been suggested that the reason for this is that,

…governments have often selected ‘off the shelf’ reforms derived from one set of assumptions (implicit or explicit) at the same time as they selected other reforms based upon quite different, or even directly contradictory premises (Peters 1996: 16).

To test Peters’ assertion that attaches such importance to inherent sets of assumptions, it is particularly valuable to consider new governance arrangements in terms of their mentalities. Hence this research focused on one specific example of contemporary governance – the regional planning process in Central Queensland known as CQANM – and asked:

How can we understand the mentalities of rule – or clusters of discourses about good governance – embodied in the specific arrangements and practices of CQANM?

This thesis has not simply described the field of institutions that constituted CQANM. Nor has it articulated an ideal form of regional governance carefully tailored to changed conditions. Instead it challenged the usefulness of such aims and sought to ‘diagnose an array of lines of thought’ (Rose 1999: 21) about governing the region. In doing so, it analysed new manifestations in terms of mentalities – as defined in Chapter Three.
Reviewing the research framework

The overview in Chapter Two showed that there is a vast and diverse literature about recent governance trends, and widespread agreement on some dimensions of recent changes. Nevertheless, much of the scholarship focuses on institutional analysis of relatively new phenomena, and a coherent linking of the disparate insights, is lacking. There has been very little consideration in the literature of such contemporary forms of governance from an analytics of government perspective, with its focus on the mentality of rule. The concept of a mentality of rule considers governance in terms of three key dimensions – the problematic of government, the technologies of government, and the rationalities inherent in both of these. These elements were defined in Chapter Three and form the main diagnostic framework for this thesis. That Chapter argued that the analytical tradition of governmentality, initiated by Foucault (1991a), is most promising for redirecting analysis of contemporary governance and progressing recognition of the influential discourses of good government. Further, Chapter Three also identified two other theoretical traditions for studying governance that have been sources of significant concepts for this research. This thesis therefore drew on descriptive typologies of three modes of governance - hierarchical, market and networked - as useful tools for the analysis. As well, recent writings in the participatory democracy vein – about deliberative democracy, empowered participatory governance and collaborative planning – provide related, normative, conceptualisations of dimensions of modes of governance. While the transformations in governance have been subject to scrutiny in regard to their institutional arrangements, less attention has been paid to their democratic characteristics and quality. So the inclusion of this perspective relates bodies of work that were essentially separate until the recent writings of Sorensen and Torfing (2005).

This thesis provides a qualitative case study of a recent example of governance arrangements designed to implement a conception of improved governance in the form of more coordinated, integrated and participatory regional planning. Shifts in governance arrangements are reflected in language – for instance in the 1980s and early 1990s it was common to hear talk of user-pays systems for clients to maximise productivity and efficiency (Queensland Government 1990: 33) and of empowerment of local communities to undertake entrepreneurial initiatives ‘by their own efforts
and ideas’ (Keating 1994: 159). A decade or so later, despite the persistence of some individualistic market language such as ‘responsible citizenship’ (Higgins and Lockie 2002; Marinetto 2003), quite different expressions also circulate. The new language of network governance relates to civil society, public participation, networks, collaboration, stakeholders and engaged government (Queensland Department of the Premier and Cabinet 2003). Revealing the role of language in political conduct is claimed to be one of the strengths of analysing discourses (Hajer and Versteeg 2005: 175). However, this thesis has shown – particularly in Chapter Seven – the limitations of concentrating on language given the flexible and interchangeable use of many terms. Rather, it notes that changes in language and in other practices relate to a more fundamental change of discourses – about development, democracy, planning and good governance – and that each cluster of discourses constitutes a distinct but inter-related mentality of rule.

Reflections on the findings

By considering the case study from an analytics of government perspective, this thesis has contributed to the current imperative:

[T]o rethink many of our established notions and images of the state, of the articulation and pursuit of the collective interests, and of democratic and accountable government (Pierre 2000: 6).

It enhances understanding of recent changes in governance of regions in Australia as exemplified by such exercises as the CQANM regional planning process. The practical contribution of this thesis lies in identifying trends, and the challenges and potential of alternative forms of governance at the start of the twenty-first century as evidenced in recent developments in regional planning. Chapter Five noted some of the historically and socially specific sets of ideas and statements shaping the regional governance landscape, including developments in legislation and local government responsibilities. Transformed thinking about, and practices of, governance and planning were manifested in Regional Planning Advisory Committees and attendant bodies, like those of CQANM, with their implied promise of governing the region ‘better’. The chances of introducing effective changes are increased if they are based
on a fuller appreciation of the implications and practical consequences of both previous and emerging rationalities of governance.

As well as such practical insights, this thesis extended existing theory to account for all the contours of contemporary regional governance evident in the case study in terms of mentalities and hence in discourses. In the latter respect, the thesis has answered a significant theoretical challenge presented by Colebatch (2002: 432) when he said:

It is not clear whether it would be possible for an analysis in the governmentality school to identify a regime of practice with multiple conflicting logics.

The data and analysis in Chapters Six and Seven identified CQANM as having such multiple, conflicting logics. It suggested that mentalities can be mobile, multiple and contesting rather than monolithic and hegemonic (see Dryzek 1997 for a similar argument about discourses). This study concentrated on practitioners’ accounts of an attempt to develop an alternative form of governance that confronted the perceived weaknesses of both hierarchical government (with centralised, top-down decision-making by governments), and the market alternative (and associated local, self-help initiatives). However, there was not a single, ‘true’ account of how CQANM governed the region. Instead, the overlapping, but often conflicting, accounts of various actors were analysed to determine key discourses embedded in them about optimal forms of development, democracy and planning, and the way those discourses articulated with each other to constitute mentalities of rule.

Chapter Six analysed the mentality of rule that animated the official doctrine of CQANM, labelling it ‘networked governance’. Of course, no empirical example conforms entirely to the static construct of an ideal-type. As well, a rhetorical, idealised version of networked governance is unlikely to be any more capable of meeting the new governance challenges than other, one-dimensional, forms of governance have been and is unlikely to be shared by all actors. Chapter Seven therefore elucidated two other forms of governance – hierarchical and market governance – that were circulating within Central Queensland, and analysed their
associated governmentalities. These chapters provided the primary conclusion that, rather than a single mentality, the Central Queensland region was characterised by multiple, interacting mentalities of rule. This recognition of the circulation of alternative discourses of development, democracy and planning increases understanding of a multi-dimensional, multi-scalar response to the complex problematics of contemporary governance, and of the profound changes in rationalities and technologies associated with emerging modes of governance. The effects of this multiplicity are evident in the data in Chapter Seven. They provide two further findings about the pluralising of contemporary governance that contrast with more rigid conceptions based, it is suggested, on dualistic conceptions of the rulers and the ruled.

The first of these implications of interacting mentalities is that there is no single locus of power in recent modes of governance. The multiple mentalities led to, and were conditioned by, specific power relations and strategies for exercising power as manifested, for instance, in the ‘recasting of the interface between state and society’ (Gordon 1991: 36). The insights this research gave into the dynamic and diffused nature of power are summarised in the second section below. They particularly challenge dualistic conceptions of a state-dominated society. The final proposition is that the dialectic between multiple governmentalities was not confined to interactions across sectoral divisions in society such as state versus civil society or state versus the market sector. Specifically the tensions between, and interweaving of, mentalities are evident within the state sector. The finding that the state is not a unified and homogenous actor is elaborated in the third section below. Previously, there has been little unpacking of the diversity within the state and of how this is associated with multiple coexisting mentalities of rule.

**CQANM exhibited multiple interacting mentalities of rule**

As mentioned briefly in the previous section, this thesis has analysed the governmentalities of various modern forms of governance. This entailed an examination of multiple discourses that, together, constituted each mentality. The mentality inherent in the rhetoric of the Central Queensland regional planning process was analysed in Chapter Six. This mentality of networked governance
blended discourses and practices of sustainable development, deliberative democracy and participatory planning. For instance, it was found to echo the ideals of deliberative democracy in envisaging a diversity of people engaging in a reflexive, impartial, reasoned exchange with the force of the better argument prevailing (Dahlberg 2005: 113). The emergence of an ideal of networked governance illustrates not only that new technologies and rationalities of rule have become thinkable, but also that governing authorities are conceiving of the problems of governing differently in terms of appropriate objectives of government, people to involve and scale of operations. Chapter Seven, however, presented data to show other discourses circulated simultaneously in the region. That chapter profiled two further mentalities that coexisted with the mentality of networked governance. The first of these was hierarchical governance with discourses of equitable development, social democracy and modern planning based on technocratic expertise. Second, there was the mentality of market governance involving discourses of economic prosperity, liberal democracy and neo-liberal planning with a pragmatic basis. The mentalities of hierarchical governance and market governance have been scrutinised in many Foucauldian studies (Cheshire 2006; Dean and Hindess 1998; Rose 1993; Rose and Miller 1992). However, the kind of governmentality associated with the contemporary quest for collaboration and sustainability has not been examined. In total, this thesis profiled three mentalities. These were themselves heterogeneous, containing contradictions and ambiguities, and there were both complementarities and tensions within and across the mentalities. People in Central Queensland evidenced many of the possible permutations, combinations and appropriations from the various discourses. Although the categorisation of three mentalities is a heuristic device, the mentality approach allowed disaggregation of the constituent discursive elements subsumed within each mentality. As well, each mentality offered a reasonably distinguishable orientation to regional governance. This research did not detect a clear trajectory towards a mentality of networked, deliberative governance as a cluster of discourses about democracy, development and planning. Supporting Dryzek (1997: 20) the research concludes that variety of discourses is as likely as hegemony, with the Central Queensland experience suggesting the expansion of alternative discourses and the fluid coexistence of these discourses. The value of understanding this mix of mentalities, and hence of discourses, is greater if, as Dryzek (1997: 20) suggests, discourses are conscious value-oriented strategies so
that the individuals subject to discourses are not totally constrained by them but are able to make choices across different discourses.

In Central Queensland, these multiple, socially constructed accounts of good governance coexisted and interacted in a dynamic state of continual tension with some contradictions and inconsistencies. It was found that the various practices employed, and the interplay among multiple mentalities, could most usefully be understood in terms of discursive competition (Foucault 1991b), thus highlighting further the heterogeneity of discourses underpinning governmental action. Chapter Seven suggested that a conceptualisation of a dialectic relationship between three mentalities accorded best with the full range of (often contradictory) effects evident in the case study material. Rather than the pressures and contradictions between these packages of discourses resulting in the triumph of one at the expense of the others, the effect was a multi-discursive situation where competition and conflict, but also accommodation and flexibility, characterised CQANM as a form of regional governance.

**Fractured and dispersed power because of the interplay of discourses**

This thesis examined mentalities through discourse. Flyvbjerg (2001) has argued that this allowed exploration of the operation of power in ways that go beyond examining the loci of power as in many traditional studies of power (for example, Dahl 1998). This approach considers the productive and facilitative nature of power (Delanty 1999; Layder 1994) and the close relationship between power, discourse and knowledge. Discourse shapes and defines practices, and is, at the very least, strongly interconnected with the exercise of power (though Foucault [1980b] argues discourse is the operation of power and hence indistinguishable from it). As shown in this thesis, discourse analysis serves to highlight the distribution of power in society. Certainly discourse analysis allows, indeed demands, consideration of factors such as power, strategic behaviour and interest. Given this, it is not surprising that many of the consequences of the discourses and their interaction evident in this case study were no different to those that would be revealed by more conventional, pluralist power analyses. Indeed, there are writers who remark on the similarity between Foucault’s work and a pluralist view of power (see, for example, Clegg 1989). The
discussion of the strategies, tactics and power relations manifested in the regional planning process in preceding chapters, found limitations on the diffusion of power beyond state players. It also showed that the state was by no means alone in exercising power as various other stakeholders simultaneously exercised power. The dialectic interplay of multiple discourses prevented political or economic elites from entirely capturing the process or making all decisions behind closed doors. Subtle exercises of power and informal alliances were evident in discourses that were not evident in more formal structures.

It is common for analyses of power to treat group and individual identity as fixed and unitary, to examine relatively formal political behaviour such as elections, and to reveal entrenched relations of asymmetry and domination (Clegg 1989; Foucault 1990). Such analyses would have been unlikely to direct attention to the fluid and mobile relations and processes involved in drafting the CQRGMF that the discourse approach highlighted. This research sought more than analyses of relations of subordination and domination with singular notions of the primary actors in regional governance and the bodies of knowledge they accepted as authoritative. It was not so much interested in who manipulated the planning process, as in how they did so and how these interactions were manifestations of ongoing disputes about the nature of good governance between people thinking in different ways and interpreting issues differently. Consequently it showed not only the various interests manoeuvring for power but also the way they problematised and rationalised their actions, the concrete arrangements through which they sought to govern conduct and how they attempted to accord them authority. It suggested that there was not a stable and neutral socio-political environment in which specific outcomes prevailed according to the balance of powerful interests. Rather, discursive practices of representation of interests and of knowledge were articulated in such a way that certain outcomes were more likely than others.

Rather than concentrating on whose interests were served and identifying a dominant sector with a dominant discourse, the analysis teased out the complex group of interacting forces maintaining a dispersed form of control through the technologies adopted, including network meetings, the norms of deliberation and the drafting of the CQRGMF. One of the substantial effects of the interaction of multiple coexisting
mentalities of rule in Central Queensland was to counter the concentration of power and enhance the decentralised way it operates and the diverse strategies employed. By dissecting how various practices, relationships and resources (especially knowledge) operated or were deployed during the regional planning process, this thesis demonstrates the dispersal of power in the region. This, in turn, challenges notions of the state being the locus of political activity. While there were asymmetries on many issues, state actors were not consistently the most influential or most central actors.

Indeed, power was dispersed among a wide array of actors with conflicting discourses of development and democracy because the coexistence of contradictory rationalities disrupted any consensus on unitary governmental authority and privileging of one set of capacities, and one source and form of knowledge. For instance, the multi-stakeholder discourse, with its more participatory notions of democracy facilitated broad involvement. It thereby opened opportunities of influence for a greater range of power-wielders than the hierarchical or market governance discourses, also present, would, in isolation, have allowed. As well, the disparate discourses constructed a repertoire of capacities, activities and conditions of possibility. They invested certain resources with value or privileged certain strategies and made them more likely to succeed. These productive operations of discourse are not a central focus of conventional power analyses that tend to reveal much about what happened (including whose discourse became dominant), but not so much about the mechanisms and how it happened. The capacity to answer such ‘how’ questions is cited as another strength of discourse analysis (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Hajer and Versteeg 2005: 175).

This thesis has argued that institutional and political power, money and strategising were not the only determinants of power in this case and it was important to explore the negotiation and contestation of social value, authority and knowledge that occurred. Rather than determining which discourse prevailed, the analysis emphasised the rationales that justified the distribution of power and the reproduction of social practices that supported that distribution. It showed the degree to which collective decisions and widespread practices were consistent with the constellation of discourses. Each discourse endorsed particular forms of knowledge and reinforced
certain power relations while discounting or undermining others. These inextricable links between discourse, knowledge and power have been compellingly argued by Foucault (2000b) as summarized in Chapter Three. Therefore, an appreciation of the interplay of coexisting discourses profiled above also advances understanding of the power relations at play in Central Queensland. Deetz and Mumby (1990: 32) have argued that power is most successfully exercised when a group has the ability to frame discursive and non-discursive practices within a system rather than in the struggle for allocation of material resources and decision-making capabilities. Dryzek (1996) argues that discourse is the ‘informal logic’ of institutional design, and its ‘taken for granted’ nature means that those interested in analysing institutional and political power have frequently ignored its significance. The task of this analysis was to explicate the discourses that were embedded in institutions and practices and that provide a medium of power (Skelcher, Mathur and Smith 2005: 578). Hence the analysis differed from many pluralist accounts in focussing on discourses and the deployment of discursive resources – interpreted as more than simply rhetorical strategies. It considered not only people’s institutional position (as a form of codified power) but also how they positioned themselves and rationalised their actions discursively. Indeed, it found power was dispersed as much among practices and discourses as among interest groups. It suggested that the configuration of power in Central Queensland was as much the product of the discursive struggle over the nature of good governance as the result of struggles by various interest groups to control resources, direct collective decisions and achieved desired objectives. The discourse approach therefore facilitated an examination of the discursive struggle in addition to the sort of interest group struggle examined in other traditions of power analyses such as pluralist theories (Dahl 1998), Marxist theories (Poulantzas 1973) or Lukes’ (1974) three-dimensional power concept..

It was also considered likely that focussing on actors and interest groups (as in many approaches to analysing power) would ignore the complexity of the situation since interests do not exist in a vacuum and participants in CQANM held a range of positional and individual interests – not just the ones that accounted for their involvement in the regional planning process. Therefore this study – while identifying different interests being articulated and struggles between interest groups, like more conventional analyses – identified discourses and the socio-historical
context from which they emerged. Examining discourse requires us to attend to not only strategic behaviours and distribution of power but also the ensemble of ideas inherent in policy directions and in people’s discussion, practices and power relationships that produce and reproduce their discourse of good governance. That is, consideration of mentalities requires us to examine ideas and meanings and the historical conditions and social formations that produced them (hence, for example, the attention to policy context in this thesis). Also, discourse does not reflect objective interests, but constructs categories of participants who, in the case of CQANM, would not have been presumed to have common interests or act in concert. Exploring the boundaries of what is discursively defined as ‘given’ or within the range of possibilities lies at the heart of this approach to investigations of contemporary reform programs. Reviewing three competing discourses that all establish ‘rules’, criteria and boundaries for behaviour enhanced understanding of the forces shaping the design of new institutions for regional governance and particularly forces additional to the competition between different interest groups. It allowed examination of the range of discourses (rather than interests) that were represented and how they were represented even though this was not a conscious and formal process since CQANM was not constituted as a separate body in the legislative arrangements or organisations of government such as the ‘Chamber of Discourses’ mooted by Dryzek and Niemeyer (2006: 6).

In his own work, Foucault (1979, 1990) emphasised the productive capacity of discourse, showing how nineteenth century social reforms of prisons, education and medicine accompanied by a rhetoric of reason and humanism were linked to the exercise of power in society. This used particular forms of knowledge and technologies to regulate and control people and to organise the way power operated in society. Similarly, this case study has shown how different knowledge and truth claims, as well as different practices shaped the way power operated. We cannot fully appreciate the relative effectiveness of various planning or decision-making practices, for instance, without recognising how they are discursively defined. This thesis sought to understand the changes taking place in the techniques of governing, not in terms of those on whom they conferred dominance, but in terms of the changing conditions of possibility and understandings of good governance they embodied. State actors were among the many both exercising and experiencing
power in the regional planning process (Sorensen and Torfing 2004: 7). This does not mean that power was exercised unilaterally, with the invisible, diffused and ‘polymorphous’ forms of power (Foucault 1979) all directed to achieving state objectives. Rather, many actors exercised power and the interplay of discourses facilitated reciprocal lines of influence among diverse state, market and civil society actors so that power operated bilaterally and multilaterally (Kooiman 2000).

This research suggests that regional governance in Central Queensland was not exclusively top-down or the preserve of the state, nor was it the unregulated operation of market forces. Rather, it was ‘a pervasive and heterogeneous activity undertaken at a multiplicity of sites’ (Dean and Hindess 1998: 12). The state was only one element in a network of autonomous institutions and organisations both within and beyond the domain of formal political authority. Within these varied complex assemblages the diverse elements, authorities and forces were connected by multiple circuits of power to govern all aspects of economic and social life (Rose 1999: 5). The consistent pattern of influence by specific sectors or specific actors – familiar in hierarchical and market governance situations – was tempered in a dynamic milieu of shifting influence depending on the particular issue and other variables.

While these claims problematise notions of the concentration of power familiar in Marxist (Clegg 1989) or power elite analyses (Mills 1959), they are not new claims. Other approaches to power analysis such as pluralist accounts (Dahl 1998) or late modern models such as Third Way politics (Giddens 1998) recognise power as dispersed among various actors. However their frame of reference is the competing interest groups or sectors rather than the competing discourses. As well, it is still the case that much of the empirical work on governance has remained state-centric in not fully recognising the dispersed forms of rule implied in the concept of governance. Some analysts, though, have identified a number of actors beyond the state engaged in governing, and have advanced the understanding of a context of plural governance in which the governmental role of the state is located as part of a dynamic and comprehensive system of societal management that is discursively defined (Dean and Hindess 1998: 17; Rose and Miller 1992: 174). Consequently, Pierre (2000: 5) and Rose and Miller (1992: 176) have argued the inadequacy of state-centric conceptions
of politics to account for contemporary patterns of power. This case study supports the arguments of such scholars and reveals the inaccuracy of notions of the state’s ‘purported monopoly of competence in determining who shall govern what and how’ (Hirst 2000: 33). It rejects dualistic conceptions of a state-dominated society. Instead, it identifies articulation between multiple, diverse networks – in the state, the market sector and in civil society – that are themselves linked in a network rather than being impermeable sectors in fixed relations of dominant-dominated. A dualistic conception accepts the state as the locus of decision-making; and society (or the public sphere) as dominated by the state. A corollary of this binary notion is a monolithic view of the state that is equally contrary to the evidence from Central Queensland as will be discussed in the following section.

**Deconstructing the monolithic state**

The previous section claimed that power was fragmentary and dispersed, in Foucault’s terms (2003a), it was neither absent nor located with one actor. It showed how assumptions of state-versus-society or public-versus-private dichotomies can lead to underestimating the dispersal of the conduct of conduct throughout society. This research extends that analysis to challenge a second widely held misconception that has resulted from the tendency to think in terms of dominant and dominated discourses and actors. This conception regards the state as a ‘centralised, uniform body of formal political authority’ (Dean and Hindess 1998: 4). In contrast, this study found that the state is neither centralised nor uniform. In addition, the previous section argued that the state is not the sole locus of political action. The analysis suggests that the role and nature of the state in Central Queensland was produced by, and evidence of, a mentality of networked governance – with its associated discourses of sustainable development, deliberative democracy and participatory planning – coexisting with other conflicting mentalities of governing. These mentalities, profiled in Chapter Seven, were found throughout the state and also both the private sector and civil society. All of them intersected, penetrating and in some respects permeating the practice of regional governance.

Much of the literature on networked governance treats networks as an alternative steering mechanism to hierarchies or markets – in other words, essentially as a ‘tool’
of central steering and coordination by the state (Rhodes 2000: 84). This perspective recognises networks as institutional forms that harness the ‘self-governing’ abilities of citizens, firms and organisations. However, it retains a privileged position for the state among those who govern and hence is premised on dichotomies of state versus civil society and public versus private. Such studies retain ideas of government, with the state – a distinct, homogenous and dominant sector – either in charge, or steering and facilitating. In doing so, they imply a unity of intentions among state actors. This is a major tension in accounts of regional governance. This research into CQANM, however, countered dualistic representations of a homogeneous state sector. It found that the state is a plural and complex actor in the governance network, thereby challenging the conception of the state as a uniform actor that also results from dualistic thinking about the state as a unitary actor as well as the locus of decision-making.

In Central Queensland there were contesting discourses of regional development, democracy and planning that together constituted conflicting ideas about the nature of good governance. If we try to reconstruct the distribution of the multiple discursive elements, we cannot say the state was the site of only one of these – or the sole site of the mentality of networked governance and its associated discourses. Nor was the contestation of discourses confined to the public sphere if viewed as distinct from the state – for example occurring only between sectors such as environmentalists and industrialists. Rather, these different rationalities also circulated within each sector including among state actors. Internal state differences were evident along some predictable divisions – for example between federal, State and local government; between politicians and bureaucrats; between people in departments or agencies with a primary focus on economic growth and increased productivity (like the Department of State Development), those with a service or welfare mission (like the Queensland Health) and those with a compliance (or regulatory) function such as the Environment Protection Agency. This is not to suggest that the range of practices evident within any part of the state can be neatly characterized as matching any of the three mentalities profiled in Chapter Seven. As noted there, these were not discrete and consistent positions and there were certainly divergences, discrepancies and contradictions. As well, the many internal differences sometimes resulted in unexpected oppositions or alignments within these identifiable
segments of the state, so it would be inaccurate to portray these as divisions between homogenous entities. Most evident were the divisions within State government (and even within one agency of State government), for instance between street level bureaucrats, regional managers and what was colloquially referred to as ‘George Street’, meaning the head office in the State capital. Such differences confirm Dryzek’s observation that,

Discourses and their contests do not stop at the edge of the public sphere; they can also permeate the understandings and assumptions of state actors (2000a: 79, italics added).

Adopting a discourse approach was therefore a particularly beneficial way to resist associating discourses with particular interest groups or sectors, as participants frequently drew on contradictory discourses giving the same words different meanings, or using them with different intent. Dryzek (1997) has argued that powerful actors, who see their interests threatened by established or emerging discourses, will try to override developments at the level of discourse. Hence an effective tactic of resistance is to strategically adopt the new language and selected discursive elements (Dryzek 1997). This was seen to occur in Central Queensland. For instance, the terms according to which an issue such as water supply was discussed, defined the way in which the topic was experienced and thereby also the perceived possibilities for action.

The dispersal of power noted in the previous section was facilitated by these divisions within the state’s networks of power, which other actors were able to exploit (Allen 1996: 342). The conflicts and diversity evident between and within the three levels of the state challenge the monolithic conception of the state. The data indicate the state is, in fact, a much more complex and heterogeneous actor than it is frequently portrayed as being. Although not elaborated in this thesis, a similar dissection of other sectors (the market and civil society) would be possible and would show that they are equally heterogeneous. These findings are consistent with Foucauldian writings in stressing that the state is not unified (Dean 1999a: 26). In dissecting this heterogeneity of government and presenting the state as a site for the contestation of discourses, this research goes further than those analysts whose
empirical applications of Foucauldian concepts have presented the state as a singular political actor (Cheshire 2006; Henman 1997; Higgins and Lockie 2002; Ward and McNicholas 1998).

It is suggested that we can conceive of the state (or any other sector), not as a clearly bounded, consensual and homogenous social entity, but rather as a constellation of social interactions. In each constellation, people exchange ideas, information and other resources; they also negotiate or critique processes, authority and responsibilities. Many of the exchanges, interactions and negotiations lack mutual consistency. While the actions and interactions are shaped by the actors’ mentalities of rule, the coexistence of three different rationalities within each sector in the Central Queensland case meant there was no uniformity and each sector was plural and heterogeneous.

**Summary of theoretical contribution**

This thesis has developed an appreciation of the state of regional planning in Central Queensland. It showed how actors there sought to change from an uncoordinated top-down system – with little capacity for integration, coordination or reconciliation of conflicts – to a more decentralised system. This bottom-up approach was rooted in regional conflicts but sought coordination and regional participation to deliver holistic policies and programs. The previous chapter identified multiple mentalities of rule embodied in the regional governance arrangements that contributed to, or sought to remedy, the costly, frustrating and sometimes embarrassing results of complex and uncoordinated governance arrangements. While one set of rationalities and practices has been identified as the official doctrine (or rhetoric) of CQANM, what we could call the ‘vernacular’ of the regional planning process, a full understanding of this example of regional governance also requires recognition of the other mentalities that determined people’s preferred actions, reactions and interactions and of how these mentalities interacted. Dryzek (1997: 8) postulates that the more complex a situation, the larger is the number of plausible perspectives upon it. It is not surprising therefore, that there were multiple competing perspectives on good governance of a region like Central Queensland. He also argues that interchange across discourses is increasingly prevalent in today’s world (Dryzek
This thesis asserts that the interchange between plural rationalities and repertoires of actions was characteristic of regional governance in Central Queensland.

This thesis advances three currents in the previously under-theorised sociological understandings of governance. The first strand of theory supplemented by this thesis is that proposed by many writers (including Jessop 1997; Pierre and Peters 2000; Rhodes 1996) identifying three modes of governance – hierarchical, market and network. It does this by identifying the distinct technologies associated with these modes of governance and their associated discourses of democracy and planning.

The second contribution this thesis makes is in extending recent analyses of deliberative democratic practice. In particular, it has built on the work on empowered participatory governance (Fung and Wright 2003b), deliberative democracy (Dryzek 2000a), and collaborative planning (Healey 1997). It does this by problematising the application of ideals of communicative practices and values advocated by many radical democrats (much of it derived from the work of Habermas 1984); and of civic engagement (evident in the work of Hirst 1994; and popularised by Putnam 1995); of multi-stakeholder involvement (espoused by Hemmati 2002; Huxham and Vangen 2005); and of empowerment and participatory democracy (following the work of Barber 1984; Lovan et al. 2004). The analysis in previous chapters confronts governance-induced problems of democracy by scrutinising two major aspects: the actors whose voices are included and the decision-making arenas and processes used.

The third point of theoretical departure is recent analyses of governmental power. Particularly relevant to this area of scholarship is the work of Rose (1996a; Rose and Miller 1992), Dean (1996; 1999a), Hillier (2002b) and Flyvbjerg (1998b), much of it heavily influenced by Foucauldian notions of power and governmentality. By analysing the mentalities of rule that animate various modes of governance and forms of democracy, the thesis has characterised three constellations of competing discourses of regional governance. It reveals the empirical case analysed as a conglomerate with multiple conflicting logics (Colebatch 2002) occurring as a result of the coexistence of mentalities of hierarchical, market and networked governance. It also extends Foucault’s insights into the importance of discourse for political
practices by examining the effects of various discourses of democracy – an aspect that he did not specifically analyse (Dean 1999b).

This thesis has shown significant consequences of these discursive contests for policies and governance practices. For instance, the idea that there is such a thing as a ‘region’ to be controlled, regulated and managed as a unit is a relatively recent concept in Australia. Likewise the discursive construction of ‘conservationists’, ‘pastoralists’ and ‘industrialists’ as interest groups, but the simultaneous discursive obliteration of other interests such as those of trade unionists, might have gone unremarked in conventional power analyses that examine interactions as instrumental and goal-directed. Certainly the appreciation of a discourse of sustainability as something other than an expression of the interests of one particular sector would be an unlikely finding of such approaches.

Understanding of regional governance has been furthered in three significant ways by the focus on mentalities. First, it has rendered visible a number of coexisting and interacting mentalities and particularly the relatively unexamined mentality associated with network governance. Second, the research challenged notions of the state being the locus of political activity and supported findings of more dispersed operation of governmental power. The mentalities approach allowed power to be recognised as de-centred, in a multitude of sites, discourses and social relations. Third, the study highlighted the heterogeneity within the state. This contrasts with much of the governance research to date that has remained state-centric, largely because of a residual state-versus-civil-society or public-versus-private dualism. Almost a decade ago, Amin and Hausner (1997: 4), noted the trend in social sciences to trans-disciplinary ‘explorations’ that move beyond dualistic oppositions. This thesis has contributed to such a process of innovation in research by challenging some dichotomies.

The focus on mentalities, or clusters of discourses, not only led to identification of three coexisting conceptions of good governance, but also allowed disaggregation of the discursive elements of them. This facilitated a particular approach to the examination of power relations. As many power analyses would, it highlighted the distribution of power and strategic behaviour. It went further, though, and directed
attention to the discursive struggle rather than conflicts of interest. As well, it showed how some practices came about and functioned as a broad social discourse rather than identifying the prevalence of certain practices (see Hajer and Versteeg 2005: 180 for a similar argument about the value of applying the concept of governmentality in the study of environmental politics).

While examining mentalities adds to our appreciation of contemporary reconfigurations of governance, no single approach can answer all questions and the discourse approach has its own limitations. One challenge in this research has been to consider discourses as both practices reflecting and reproducing particular conceptions of good governance, as well as more conventionally as rhetorical resources in the struggle among interest groups. An additional limitation of discourse analysis in this study has been that while this method profiled the different discourses interacting in Central Queensland and the conditions for their emergence or persistence, it did not predict the likely balance and effect of these competing discourses in more general governance situations.

**Implications and challenges for the practice of regional governance**

The research offers insights into one of the key challenges of our times: What alternatives are there for expressing and pursuing public welfare and collective interests in an era of economic globalization, a perceived ‘hollowing out of the state’ (Rhodes 1996), decreasing legitimacy for collective solutions, marketisation of governance (Pierre 2000: 2) and the multiplication of decentralised networks (Rhodes 2000)? By focusing on a particular case of regional governance, this research provides an informative basis for broader understanding of the loosely defined political processes and institutions of governance. While CQANM is an example of the ambitious promise held by a particular mentality of rule, what was achieved in Central Queensland was not a reinvention of regional governance, but one of the modest, specific and ‘partial transformations’ (Foucault 2003d: 54), that Foucault regards as realistic aspirations. By making explicit the forms of rationality and thought inherent in this case of regional planning, this research has removed some of the ‘taken-for-granted’ character of particular practices. In doing so, it opens a space for thinking about ways of transforming the practices and the difficulties...
likely to be encountered (Dean 1999a: 36). It provides clarity about an empirical case and its ramifications rather than an evaluation or a blueprint for reinvention. While the invention of new and improved forms of regional governance may hold attractions, there are already many systems for governing regions with the prospect of considerable confusion and dysfunctionality, without proposing a new normative ideal. The challenge this thesis undertook was to articulate the multiple systems, to order them and to detect how one case incorporated different rationalities with different purposes and different practices into a coherent system at multiple levels.

The regional planning process that was examined in this case study harnessed practices and ideas of all three mentalities, attenuating some and intensifying others, sometimes blending them and sometimes modifying them. Although, with the contemporaneous application of diverse practices, it was not a ‘pure’ form of networked governance, the result indicates how new modes of governance have become ‘thinkable’ (Gordon 1991) and gave an example of what deliberative democracy might look like at a regional scale. It also highlights some of the practical problems with it – such as ensuring broad interest representation, resolving conflicts, avoiding cooption and avoiding tokenism. These are remarkably similar to the problems associated with other forms of democracy such as social and liberal democracies.

Some participants from all sectors were genuinely committed to changing practices so as to open up governance, ensure coordination and balance economic, social and environmental values to achieve sustainable development. Others went through the motions superficially while remaining unconvinced that they epitomised good governance. Still others engaged in the regional planning process in an opportunistic spirit of grasping any chance to further their agenda, while not, in fact, abandoning old practices. This highlights the difficulty of achieving more than a surface appearance of change because players from all sectors and all levels lack the skills and capacity for networked governance and because norms are so deeply socially embedded (Cleaver 2004). New practices cannot be imposed when people contest the implicit ideas they entail. They need to be internalised and accepted as within the range of the ‘preferable’. While this research has not demonstrated the feasibility (or otherwise) of networked governance, it has shown the fundamental importance of the
capacity to be wholly inclusive, to adopt the norms of deliberation, and to accept and act on the outcomes of deliberation.

Besides identifying such practical challenges, some advances in practice can also result. The toolkits of various governance actors have been expanded by the newly favoured communicative technologies. There are now professional associations for people with such expertise, notably the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) with over 1000 members in 22 countries across the globe that, since 1999, has offered professional development through its Certificate Training Course in Public Participation. New principles guide these practices including: interdisciplinarity, integration, participation, coordination, sustainability and collaboration. This research did not produce these, but has provided a coherent framework for understanding the practices and their underlying principles, as well as their applicability for various tasks.

The circulation of discourses of alternatives with respect to development, democracy and planning meant a number of new options were made available through CQANM, such as involving elected mayors alongside State bureaucrats and the representatives of community and private sector groups. This mode of governance makes claims to greater efficiency through aggregation of resources, coordination of actors, mediation of conflict and generation of ownership. However, that is counterbalanced by the time and resources taken for the community conversations, series of working groups and iterations of the CQRMF. In addition, to the extent that it opened the process to genuine influence of wider interests, it was portrayed as more democratic and responsive planning. It also offered an alternative (or supplement) to the market or the state in dealing with complex challenges of coordination and integration. Some of these new options were circumscribed by the persistence of discourses associated with hierarchical or market governance. Consistent with other analyses of network governance, this study found that CQANM offered opportunities for effective and democratic regional governance, but no magic bullet (Sorensen and Torfing 2004: 2). In this respect the case study complements the work of writers like Sorensen and Torfing (2005) who focused on the potential and problems of network governance in terms of efficiency and democracy. This research supports their findings about the value of various kinds of democratic anchorages. However, it did not support the
need for elected politicians to be the pre-eminent or focal actors in meta-governance roles such as network design and the overall framing of policies.

Throughout, this thesis has emphasised the ambiguities and complexities that underlie regional governance and the resulting challenges that are intrinsic to governance of regions. There are no perfect solutions and there are a number of tensions between alternative possible courses of action and conceptions of good governance. Highlighting these resists the temptation to produce an over-simplistic prescription of best practice. It also provides a way of considering the entangled facets of governance alternatives evident in both the empirical example and the literature, and hence provides a foundation for understanding among both theorists and practitioners. While practitioners are often sceptical of academic research, regarding it as ‘irrelevant, ambiguous, or incomprehensible’ (Lynn et al. 2001: 154), this study has clear implications and insights for the practice of regional governance. For instance, it identifies a model of collaboration in multilevel, multistakeholder networks that are likely to inform the two regional planning projects commencing in Western Queensland. In part, these relevant insights are the result of enhanced understanding of the institutional context and the opportunities for influence and change the study affords as well as some of the constraints, as described below.

**Future directions and opportunities**

The absence of a regional level of government, and the need for cooperation between local, State and Federal governments, and other stakeholders, complicates implementation of an institutional structure to facilitate planning for coordinated regional sustainability. The task of this research was not to show that regional planning and governance has ‘improved’ – especially as there are no agreed criteria for making that judgement, nor data for such broad comparisons with past or current alternatives. Nevertheless, we cannot avoid the question ‘did it work?’ Future research will need to follow the evolution of regional bodies and particularly the specific institutional measures employed to articulate the multiple bodies at various scales within a specific regional space. Any judgement at this stage would be premature. Davis and Rhodes (2000: 86) suggest that at least five years should elapse before any meaningful evaluation. Much in this case study gives an interim
indication that multilevel, multi-stakeholder networks offer possibilities for solving complex problems that are unavailable through top-down or market methods. Previous empirical work has shown the effectiveness of such arrangements as discrete innovations designed to address bounded policy problems (see for example Fung and Wright 2003b; Healey 1997). In CQANM they were used for a much larger political project (in terms of scope, scale and actors) and demonstrated the potential of diversifying to deliver effective governance; democratically involving a range of appropriate actors from state and non-state sectors, at multiple scales; and addressing issues of sustainability as the integration of economic, social and environmental concerns. These findings are likely to prove useful to practitioners and robust to the scrutiny of other researchers. Further capacity building among practitioners will aid realisation of this potential. This could be complemented by research considering the optimal conditions for productive coexistence of hierarchical, market and networked governance and for state interaction with other governance actors to achieve coordinated and integrated outcomes. Another research strategy would compare the long-term impacts and outcomes of policies and plans devised through pluralistic and networked governance with those resulting from alternative modes of governing. This would provide a logical intellectual progression of the present study and a full appreciation of extent to which the visionary ideas of a small group of Central Queenslanders can withstand countervailing forces and become widely practiced as a better way of governing.
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Appendix A: Participant information sheet

The University of Queensland (UQ), is conducting research into the regional planning process and structures of CQ A New Millennium. The Australian Research Council, with the Department of Local Government and Planning (DLGP) as the industry partner, funds the research. This study has been cleared by one of the human ethics committees of the University of Queensland in accordance with the National Health and Medical Research Council's guidelines. You are, of course, free to discuss your participation in this study with project staff (contactable on 3365 3314). If you would like to speak to an officer of the university not involved in the study, you may contact the Ethics Officer on 3365 3924.

The purpose of this research is to:

- increase understanding of policy processes and institutional arrangements at a regional level as involved in this innovative, hybrid planning process;
- assess the potential of the integrated self-help approach used in the Central Queensland case and its relevance to other regional planning processes throughout the nation; and
- evaluate CQANM’s achievement of its objectives and any impediments to the regional planning process undertaken by CQANM.

Jo-Anne Everingham, a PhD candidate in the School of Social Science, will conduct the research. Professor Geoffrey Lawrence and Dr Lynda Herbert-Cheshire of UQ and Ms Kate Rose of DLGP will supervise the project.

Participation

It is hoped that a variety of the people involved in CQANM will be prepared to participate. This will include members of the groups that were part of the CQANM process. It is also intended to approach a small number of community-based stakeholders in the relevant cities or shires. Anyone with insights to share about the CQANM process is encouraged to contact the researcher about participating in the study.

Participation is voluntary and will involve an hour-long face-to-face interview at the person’s workplace or a convenient DLGP office. Interviews will cover topics such as:
- the problems and opportunities in approaching planning on a regional scale;
- the reasons and methods for achieving stakeholder involvement;
- the outcomes for various stakeholder groups; and
- the means and effectiveness of coordination throughout the region.
Any personal information given to the researcher is in confidence and participants can request specific information to be ‘off the record’, in which case the tape recorder will be switched off and no use made of the data. Participants may withdraw from the project at any time without penalty.

**Timing:**
The interviews will start during 2003, with further interviews and focus groups being held in 2004.

**Outcomes:**
The findings will hold benefits for all levels of government in the region, but also for other stakeholders in social, economic and environmental planning and development. The research will make a contribution to knowledge, policy and practices in relation to designing an economically productive, socially viable and ecologically sustainable future for all of regional Australia. Specifically, the study may identify for various agencies how community needs can be embraced in future government policy and ways of extending community ownership of regional planning processes and of improving regional coordination.

Participants will be informed of the results in presentations to CQANM, in the focus groups and in the regional media. Articles will be written for both academic journals and for regional media outlets. A research report will also be offered through the newsletters of stakeholder departments and organisations. On completion of the study, participants will be advised of available reports and be able to request copies of those that interest them.

**Contact Details:** For further information, please contact:
Jo-Anne Everingham
School of Social Science
The University of Queensland
St Lucia  Qld  4072
Tel: (07) 3365 3314
E-mail: j.everingham@uq.edu.au
Appendix B: Written confirmation of interview arrangements

[Letterhead]

[Date]

[Name]
[Address]

Dear …,

Re: Research into regional planning, governance and institutional capacity.
A Case Study of CQ A New Millennium (CQANM)

Thank you for agreeing to assist with the research into the regional planning process and structures of CQ A New Millennium being conducted by the University of Queensland (UQ). The Australian Research Council, with the Department of Local Government and Planning (DLGP) as the industry partner, funds the research. The purpose of this research is to:

- increase understanding of policy processes and institutional arrangements at a regional level as involved in this hybrid planning process;
- assess the potential of the integrated self-help approach used in the Central Queensland case and its relevance to other regional planning processes; and
- evaluate CQANM's achievement of its objectives and any impediments to the regional planning process undertaken by CQANM.

The study may identify for various agencies how community, workforce and industry needs can be embraced in future government policy.

I am a PhD candidate in the School of Social Science and part of the team conducting the research under the supervision of Professor Geoffrey Lawrence and Dr Lynda Cheshire of UQ and Ms Kate Rose of DLGP.

I will be speaking to a variety of the people who were involved in CQANM or closely involved in important aspects of regional life and I appreciate the opportunity to gain your perspective of the process given your involvement in [insert role]. As arranged per phone, I will speak with you on [day, date] around [time] at the [location]. If any other members of [the group or community] were involved or have strong views about regional planning processes I would be happy to talk to them as well. I hope to tape the interview for later transcription and will, of course, provide a copy of the transcript to you for your approval.

I will be happy to answer any queries you have on the day, or you could ring me in advance on the number below.

Thanks you very much for your willingness to contribute. I look forward to our conversation.

Yours sincerely,

Jo-Anne Everingham,
School of Social Science,
The University of Queensland, St Lucia. Qld. 4072
Phone:  07 3365 3314. Email: j.everingham@uq.edu.au
Appendix C: Consent form

Participant Consent Form

Research into regional planning, governance and institutional capacity
A Case Study of CQ A New Millennium (CQANM)

Participants’ roles in the research:
Participants are invited to become involved in the research on a purely voluntary basis. Participants are free at any time to withdraw consent to further participation without prejudice in any way. All tapes and transcripts will be held in a secure location.

Confidentiality:
While most individuals will be identifiable in reports of the research, participants may elect to provide certain information ‘off the record’. Records of interview will only be accessible to the research team. Personal confidentiality is assured, but informants are asked to agree to the use of potentially identifying particulars (such as position or affiliation) in reports.

Role of the researcher:
The researcher agrees to explain the research in detail and answer any questions that participants may have about the process. The researcher agrees to maintain personal confidentiality at all times and to omit from all accounts any information that is given ‘off the record’. Ethical clearance from the university’s Behavioural and Social Sciences Ethical Review Committee has been granted for this research.

Contact addresses:
Researcher:    Ms Jo-Anne Everingham, School of Social Science,
              The University of Queensland St Lucia Qld 4072
              Ph (07) 3365 3314  E-mail j.everingham@uq.edu.au
Advisor:     Prof. Geoffrey Lawrence, Ph 07 3365 3152  E-mail g.lawrence@uq.edu.au

Agreement to participate in research as described on the information sheet and above
I, ……………………………………………………, have read the participant information sheet for this project and any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand the requirements of the research and agree to participate in this activity, realising that I may withdraw at any time without prejudice. I agree that the research data gathered for the study may be published. I agree to interviews being tape recorded and understand that all tapes will be erased on completion of this research.

Signed …………………………………………. (Participant)   Date ………………

Agreement to use of identifying particulars
I understand that personal information and any material provided ‘off-the-record’ will remain confidential and not be published. However I understand that other information I provide is not anonymous and identifying information may be used in reports and publications.
I agree to the use of the following (tick whichever is applicable):
  O only information which contains no identifying details and is not attributable
  O potentially identifying information (such as position or affiliation), but not my name
  O potentially identifying information and my name

A copy of this form is to be retained by the research participant.
Please contact the Ethics Officer in the Office of Research and Postgraduate Studies if you have any concerns about the nature and or conduct of this research project. The University of Qld. 4072 ph (07) 3365 3924
Appendix D: Historical approaches to regionalism

Historical approaches to regional planning by three levels of government in Queensland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Federal initiatives</th>
<th>State initiatives</th>
<th>Local initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late 1940s</td>
<td>Regional Development Committees (RDCs) for 97 regions nationally and State Planning Authorities</td>
<td>Coordinator General’s Department handled regional planning centrally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Department of Urban and Regional Development encouraged Regional Organisations of Councils (ROCs) for Grants Commission funding. 75 DURD regions recognized nationally. The Australian Assistance Plan established Regional Councils for Social Development (RCSDs).</td>
<td>State and Regional Planning and Development, Public Works Organisation and Environmental Control Act established 10 Regional Coordination Councils (RCCs) (including Fitzroy which was CQANM minus Taroom). RCCs abolished mid 1977.</td>
<td>After 1977 abolition of RCCs, some ROCs (e.g. in Moreton) continued a voluntary association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-2006</td>
<td>Sector-specific programs with relevant regional bodies eg NHT &amp; NAPSWQ; Regional Telecommunications Infrastructure Fund; ACCs; Regional Partnerships (DAFF) - funding projects of ‘community-based’ planning committees</td>
<td>Regional Planning Advisory Committees (RPACs); support for RDOs</td>
<td>Joint action with other levels of government on eg RPACs, RDOs, Regional Partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E: Structure of ROCs and Sub-ROCs before and after CQANM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DURD regions 1974</th>
<th>Before 1999</th>
<th>After 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 3 (of ten in Qld)</td>
<td>Central Queensland Local Government Association</td>
<td>Central Queensland Regional Organisation of Councils (Re-established 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana Bauhinia Calliope Duaringa Emerald Fitzroy Gladstone Livingstone Mt Morgan Peak Downs Rockhampton Jericho Plus: Miriam Vale Monto (Region 2) Broadsound (Region 4) and Taroom (Region 10)</td>
<td>Gladstone Calliope Mirani Banana Rockhampton Fitzroy Livingstone Mount Morgan Duaringa Emerald Peak Downs</td>
<td>Rockhampton Fitzroy Livingstone Mount Morgan Duaringa Emerald Peak Downs PCAC Established 2000 Gladstone Calliope Banana Jericho Monro Monto Miriamvale Broadsound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gladstone Calliope Mirian Vale Banana Taroom Monro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rockhampton Fitzroy Livingstone Mt Morgan Emerald Peak Downs Jericho Bauhinia Duaringa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CQANM file documents.
### Appendix F: Policy and program framework for regional planning processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Scale</th>
<th>National policy, programs, guidelines and Commonwealth Laws</th>
<th>Non Statutory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For example:</td>
<td>Regional Development Council’s <em>Framework of Cooperation</em>. This Council, formed in 2003, is chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister and includes state and territory ministers for regional development and ALGA representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International Treaties / Conventions (eg Agenda 21; World Heritage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regional Partnerships Program (including Sustainable Regions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Roads to Recovery Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (with Qld, 2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Native Title Act (1993) and Amendment (1998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Scale</th>
<th>Queensland Government policies, programs and legislation.</th>
<th>Non-Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For example:</td>
<td>Industry codes of practice and MOUs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Integrated Planning Act (1997)</td>
<td>For example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local Government Act (1993)</td>
<td>- AgForce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Queensland State Infrastructure Plan (2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Qld Gov and ATSI Ten Year Partnership (2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vegetation Management Act (1999)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Water Management Act (2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Queensland Heritage Act (1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Scale</th>
<th>Statutory</th>
<th>Non-statutory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Coastal Management Plans</td>
<td>Regional Plans or Growth Management Frameworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Forest Agreements</td>
<td>Regional NRM Plans or Sustainability Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated Regional Transport Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-regional Scale</th>
<th>For Example:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Water Allocation Management Plans</td>
<td>Dawson Valley Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Catchment Management Strategies.</td>
<td>Strategy for the Development and Management of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gladstone State Development Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Local Government Corporate, Strategic and Operational plans</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Government Planning Schemes for each shire and city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee (2002).
### Appendix G: Chronology

**Chronology of CQ A new millennium Regional Growth Management Framework Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Determining functions and processes; communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1999</td>
<td>Project concept approved, Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee (CQRPAC) first meeting held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1999</td>
<td>Audit of research and strategies in the region submitted to CQRPAC as <em>Who Has Studied What in the CQ A New Millennium Region - Summary Report</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1999</td>
<td>2 day CQRPAC meeting to refine the objectives and parameters of the planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2000</td>
<td>2 day Community Engagement Seminar for members of all working action groups to build capacity and ensure a degree of consistency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Information gathering, consultation and engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May-July 2000</td>
<td>Extensive community consultation on Key Issues Paper (Consolidation of issues from WAGs) - 27 communities visited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2000</td>
<td>Release of <em>Key Issues in Planning for Central Queensland’s Future</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2000</td>
<td>CQRPAC meeting - Presentation of first draft of Central Queensland Regional Growth Management Framework (CQRGMF) policy framework and technical papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2000-Feb 2001</td>
<td>Refinement of CQRGMF policy framework and technical papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2001</td>
<td>CQRPAC meeting - Revision of refined draft CQRGMF policy framework. Agreement for release to sectoral consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-June 2001</td>
<td>Sectoral consultation - Approximately 350 copies of document distributed; a number of small sector gatherings held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2001</td>
<td>CQRPAC meeting - Feedback on sectoral consultation and discussion on community consultation process. Draft regional structure plan maps tabled for members’ comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2001</td>
<td>CQRPAC two-day workshop to examine key regional drivers, regional structure plan mapping, and contextual framework of document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept-Nov 2001</td>
<td>Redraft of CQRGMF to incorporate community consultation feedback and CQRPAC workshop data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2001</td>
<td>Draft CQRGMF distributed to CQRPAC members for discussion at the December meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 3**

**Formulation of strategy and decision-making**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2001</td>
<td>CQRPAC Meeting – Discussion of feedback regarding draft CQRGMF including detailed submission from CQLGA and CQROC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December-February 2002</td>
<td>Revision of the draft CQRGMF to incorporate CQRPAC and local government feedback in preparation of final round of public comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2002</td>
<td>CQRPAC meeting - CQRPAC reviewed March 2002 revision of CQRGMF and agreed to release the document for final round of public comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2002</td>
<td>Final period of public comment – some 400 copies of draft distributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2002</td>
<td>CQRPAC meeting - considered feedback from final public comment. CQRPAC endorsed CQRGMF for submission to State Cabinet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 July 2002</td>
<td>Cabinet endorsed CQRGMF subject to stated amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2002</td>
<td>Launch of CQRGMF, signed by all mayors and final meeting of CQRPAC – foreshadowing formation of Central Queensland Regional Coordination Steering Committee (CQRCSC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 4**

**Implementation and monitoring**

Source: Adapted from Central Queensland Regional Planning Advisory Committee (2002).