



**3rd International Conference
on Public Policy (ICPP3)**

June 28-30, 2017 – Singapore

Panel T08P04 Session 1

Theory and Practice of Deliberative Policy Analysis

Title of the paper

*Unpacking forms of knowledge in policy deliberation: Analytical
insights from policies coping with disasters in Thailand*

Author

*Piyapong Boossabong, College of Politics and Governance,
Mahasarakham University, Thailand, email: piyapong@msu.ac.th*

Date of presentation

Friday, June 30th

Unpacking forms of knowledge in policy deliberation: Analytical insights from policies coping with disasters in Thailand

Piyapong Boossabong¹

Abstract

The meaningful deliberation should not be expected without the condition that various forms of knowledge are welcome. The deliberative policy analysis approach, thus, pays special attention on the role of different modes of rationality in policy deliberation as it determines the critical perspective of the approach toward technocratic policy analysis. However, it is challenged elsewhere that experts and their scientific knowledge hegimonise the policy deliberative forums. Laypeople and their local knowledge, on the other hand, are usually excluded from the considerations. Regarding this problematic deliberative practice, deliberative policy scholars and practitioners seek to learn from the deliberative forums that different forms of knowledge are recognised. This paper attempts to contribute to this by unpacking forms of knowledge in policy deliberation in the contexts of the Global South. It argues that policy deliberation by which both expert and local knowledge are considered can be found in this setting by illustrating the case of Thailand, where the modern and pre-modern conditions are co-existed. The analysis is on policies coping with disasters. It was found that different forms of knowledge were included in policy deliberation under the situations that were complex and uncertain.

Keywords: Forms of Knowledge, Deliberative Policy Analysis, Policies Coping With Disasters, Thailand

¹ Assistant Professor in policy analysis and planning, College of Politics and Governance, Mahasarakham University, Thailand

Introduction

Deliberative policy analysis approach emerges as a progressive participatory approach. It sheds light on a quality aspect of participation that different forms of policy knowledge are included in analysing a policy. As influenced by Habermas, the approach challenges traditional policy analysis approach by which laypeople and their ordinary knowledge are excluded from policy world as it requires well-trained professional policy makers and planners as well as their expert knowledge. The deliberation approach proposes democratic oriented policy making by recognising that societies are changing to be more pluralistic. Hence, policy analysts transform their role from experts to be deliberative facilitators that create public spheres for various policy actors to deliberate for making policy together by proposing their various forms of knowledge and rationality.

This process is not always formalised under well-developed forum setting. Policy deliberation can also emerge from the situation at hands in which discussion is needed particularly during unusual situations. This deliberative practice might be informal and face time constraint. Insufficient information leads to the problem of the validity of technical analysis, while multi-policy actors and involved citizen are more active. This situation can be expected that the meaningful deliberation can be found as various forms of knowledge from different modes of rationality are welcome. To widen the critical perspective of the deliberative policy analysis approach toward technocratic policy analysis, this paper attempts to unpack forms of knowledge in policy deliberation through the case of policies coping with disasters in Thailand. It is challenged elsewhere that experts and their scientific knowledge hegimonise the policy deliberative forums. Laypeople and their local knowledge, on the other hand, are

usually excluded from the considerations. Regarding this problematic deliberative practice, deliberative policy scholars and practitioners seek to learn from the deliberative forums that different forms of knowledge are recognised. This paper contributes to this by arguing that policy deliberation by which both expert and local knowledge are considered can be found and there are particular reasons. By illustrating the case of Thailand, it is because the modern and pre-modern conditions are co-existed in this country. This case from the Global South, thus, reflects the fact that Western technical policy knowledge and technocratic policy experts are not the only one that contributes to activating public policy. Real-world policy phenomena in this country depend on contestation among policy discourse coalitions that perceive different forms of knowledge. To analyse policies coping with disasters as it was found that under the situations that were complex and uncertain different forms of knowledge were included in policy deliberation and played an active role in influencing policy decisions.

To distinguish main different forms of knowledge, this paper separates expert knowledge from local knowledge. By adopting Rydin's definition, expert knowledge is perceived here as the outcome of a scientific process of understanding, which is based on an instrumental rationality (Rydin 2007, p.52). According to Fischer (1995, p.197), instrumental rationality is a mind-set that puts faith in empirical evidence (a clear fact) and scientific method (empirical proof), appeals to experts justify decisions, logical consistency and universality of findings. On the other hand, local knowledge is recognised as ordinary knowledge even though it might not be based on scientific inquiry such as objective observation and valid experiments or testing (Ibid, pp.52-3). This form of knowledge tends to emphasise (or at least give equal weight to) the opinions of traditional and peer groups over those of experts. This type of knowledge focuses on personal and familiar experiences rather than depersonalised calculations, holding unanticipated consequences to be fully relevant to near-term decision-

making, and trusts process rather than evidence (Fischer 2003, p.136). Also, it might involve superficial beliefs, unprovable legends, traditional practices, ceremony and myth (Yanow 2003, p.234). Apart from that, local knowledge might have developed from common sense without causal empiricism. In addition, this form of knowledge is often not written down as it is preserved in oral traditions rather than texts (Fischer 2000, p.193).

This paper claims that local knowledge is not always ignored or recognised as the second class knowledge. In contrast, it can play a dominant role over expert knowledge in policy making especially in the policy context of the developing country and during shock. To build up and support the arguments, this paper starts with the theoretical backgrounds in relation to understanding deliberative policy analysis and its focus on the role of knowledge. Then, the paper provides analytical framework and key information indicating policy deliberation practices in Thailand under political dynamics and turbulent time as a consequence of facing disasters. After that, this paper analyses the role played by different forms of knowledge and their agents by answering how and why questions before ending up with concluding remarks.

Theoretical debates on the roles of different forms of knowledge in policy deliberation

To understand the use of knowledge is at the heart of understanding policy analysis in any setting, as is agreed by most leading policy scholars (e.g. Lindblom, 1959; Lasswell, 1970; Hogwood & Gunn, 1984; Dunn, 1994). One important role of contesting policy actors is to put their knowledge into the policy-making process (Fischer, 2003; Plehwe, 2015). The role of knowledge in policy making is paid special attention by the approach known as deliberative policy analysis. This approach has its origins more generally in the argumentative turn in policy analysis (Fischer and Forester, 1993; Fischer and Gottweis, 2012), while

Habermas' ideas on public sphere and communicative action influence as its theoretical backgrounds (Habermas, 2002, 1987).

What deliberative policy analysis is about? The contributors of the book edited by Hajer and Wagenaar (2003) complement each other in addressing that this mode of policy analysis is a challenge and an alternative to the technocratic policy analysis by which laypeople are excluded from policy world as it requires well-trained professional policy analysts. Deliberative policy analysis, on the other hand, sheds light on the changing role of policy analysts from experts to be deliberative facilitators that create public spheres for various policy actors to deliberate for making policy together by proposing their various modes of knowledge and rationality. Hajer and Wagenaar (Ibid, p.30) address that the expected role of policy analysts should be not to suggest effective or efficient solutions, but instead should be to facilitate the citizen's capacity for deliberation and collective learning about value, preferences, assumptions of self and others, mutual dependencies, power differentials, opportunities, constraints, and the desirability of solutions and outcomes. Policy then should be a result of the deliberation which can be a consensus, an agreement, mutual understanding, or even the recognition of the differences.

To go beyond empiricism, this mode of analysis is interpretive, pragmatic and linguistically oriented approaches attuned to the continuous give and take in networks of actors that have sprung up around concrete issues (Fischer, 2003, 2007; Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003). Firstly, an interpretive aspect of deliberative policy analysis is that it attempts to understand new reality of the network society by articulating different meanings (Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003, p.4). Wagenaar (2011) adds later that it aims to understand different faces of meaning including hermeneutic, discursive and dialogical meanings. In the chapter of Yanow, she

explains more how interpretive policy analysis becomes a root of deliberative policy analysis by saying that policy deliberation allows different communities of meaning to share and contest through the process of interaction where local knowledge is not excluded (Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003, pp.228-46). Secondly, policy deliberation is practice-oriented as it seeks for practical judgment in relation to practical reason. The chapter of Wagenaar and his colleague mention that deliberative policy analysis reveals the hidden ambiguity and uncertainty in everyday situations (Ibid, p.139). They add that moral and emotional dimensions of practice are the point of interest for policy deliberation. Lastly, by highlighting the role of language, discourse analysis is common used as a tool for deliberative policy analysis. Hajer's chapter proposes that this mode of analysis highlights the importance of language in the form of policy discourses that are created from vocabularies, story lines and generative metaphors (Ibid, p.88). Deliberation among different coalitions of actors that supported different policy discourses - discourse coalitions - can make meaningful policy.

Why do we need deliberative policy analysis? By recognising value pluralism, this mode of analysis is able to cope with value conflict under the real-world as well through consensus building processes, collective learning and deliberative judgement (Ibid, p.21). Besides, we need it as it provides the ways that are more inclusive of interests, more open to new options and opportunities, more broadly discursive and more personally and publicly satisfying. It also makes possible for participants to make choices based on their local knowledge and to seek mutually satisfactory or cooperative solutions (Ibid, pp.34-43). Apart from that, deliberative policy analysis is sensitive to decision making in daily life by recognising the contribution of new sites, new actors and new themes (Ibid, p.3). This mode focuses policy argument in the context of practice or concrete everyday situation at hand by assuming that practical world is abundant with dialogue. In the same time, it is sensitive to democracy in

practice as well by promoting deliberative democratic values that can propose effective or legitimate solutions (Ibid, pp.19-20). Under the situation that interdependence should be enhanced, deliberative policy analysis can create mutual trust and social capital in wider sense among interdependent people, restructure policy networks, enhance collaboration, generate their shared identities and formulate their political will, even while continuing to be different (Ibid, pp.33-59).

To focus the perspective of deliberative policy analysis on knowledge brings us to engage in policy epistemological debates, which are at the root of the study of policy analysis. By challenging technocratic policy analysis, deliberative policy inquiry argues that it is not sufficient to analyse public policy with technical or expert knowledge, such as cost-benefit analysis, pay-off matrix, decision trees, econometrics, time-series analysis, modelling, game analysis, system analysis, stages analysis, strategic thinking, scenario mapping etc. It is a mistake to perceive that the study of policy analysis in degree programmes is to learn only policy toolbox to be a professional policy analyst, who is specialised by international and modern knowledge. Apart from the role of expert knowledge in policy analysis, the deliberative policy scholars propose us to consider the role of local knowledge in analysing a policy as well (e.g. Fischer, 2000; Yanow, 2003; Rydin, 2007). They depart from the epistemological assumption that knowledge is socially constructed, multiple and constituted in the form of claims, open to contestation and recognition (Rydin, 2007, pp.52-68). They start with criticism that expert knowledge is developed from technical control over objectified processes and generated within the framework of instrumental rationality which takes on an external existence as a productive force (Habermas, 2007, p.36). This form of knowledge is also mainly based on economic and scientific modes of rationality which tend to ignore socio-cultural contexts, while local knowledge is more sensitive to them (Yanow, 2003, p.234).

The study of local knowledge (including sacred knowledge) is common found in anthropologist researches. Geertz (1983, pp.12-14), for example, defines local knowledge as a cultural system which becomes common sense for people who share a communal sensibility. Local knowledge is pluralistic in its nature as each community has its various knowledge. In the field of policy analysis, an approach of interpretive policy analysis is outstanding in recognising local knowledge as a valuable source of knowledge in analysing policy. For example, Yanow (2003, pp.234-245) mentions about local knowledge as modes of expression by which value, beliefs, and feelings are included in it. She explains that local knowledge is context-specific, and a knowledge in sense making. It is a spirit of passionate humility which combines the logics of description and prescription. In her view, local knowledge, which is based on lived-experience-based expertise, usually becomes usable knowledge that drives the real-world rather than the technical-rational-university-based expertise (Ibid, pp.244-245).

It does not mean that deliberative policy scholars ignore expert knowledge and promote local knowledge. Instead, they think that the different forms of knowledge should be brought to the table to discuss for finding out a better argument. Habermas (1991, p.25) addresses the importance of honesty, sincerity and openness to people's views and to available knowledge. In his work entitled 'Knowledge and Human Interests', he argues that apart from professional and reliable knowledge (including natural-scientific or empirical knowledge), we can also distinguish hermeneutic knowledge, practically effective, pragmatic and everyday knowledge (Habermas, 2007), which can be referred to as local knowledge in more general terms. Later, Habermas and the others (2010, pp.15-23) expands on this by discussing the role of sacred knowledge, which rest on normative foundations and faith seeking understanding, in deliberative process. He mentions that 'mythos' and 'logos' should not be ignored in seeking

for a practical reason. A naïve faith in science on its monopolised production of knowledge is many times misleading, while recognition of laypeople's reason makes us sensitive to cultural differences and prevents us from over-generalising context-dependent judgments (Habermas et. al., 2010, pp.17, 23).

Among deliberative policy scholars, Fischer (2009, 2003, 2000, 1995) pays special and explicit attention in advocating for the integration or articulation of expert and local knowledge in analysing policy as the way to justify rational and normative assumptions. Fischer (2000, p.193) defines local knowledge by referring to Lindblom and Cohen (1979, p.12) as “ordinary knowledge which does not own its origin, testing, degree of verification, truth, status, or currency to distinctive ... professional techniques, but rather to common sense, causal empiricism, or thoughtful speculation and analysis.” He mentions that local knowledge is the systematic information that remains in the informal sector, usually unwritten and preserved in oral traditions rather than texts. Such knowledge was commonly described in the past as traditional or indigenous knowledge in the particular contexts. It remains inherently associated with, and interpreted within, the specific culture in which it is produced (Fischer, 2000, p.195).

The critical point made by Fischer is to recognise local knowledge no less than the expert knowledge is to go beyond positivist tradition. He explains that local knowledge offers a different epistemology to make a claim. Fischer puts local knowledge in referring to cultural rationality, which contrasts with the technical (scientific) rationality. According to Fischer (1995, p.197), "the technical rationality is a mind-set that puts its faith in empirical evidence and scientific method, appeals to experts for justifying policy decisions, values logical consistency and universality of findings, and just non-quantifiable impacts to be irrelevant to

political decision making. Cultural rationality, in contrast, tends to emphasise (or at least give equal weight to) the opinions of traditional and peer groups over those of experts, focus on personal and familiar experiences rather than depersonalised calculations, holds unanticipated consequences to be fully relevant to near-term decision making, and trusts process rather than evidence." The legitimisation to cultural rationality is an inherent part of a postpositivist epistemology.

Participatory inquiry departs from this mind-set as well (Fischer, 2003, p.136). The meaningful participation in the viewpoint of postpositivist scholars is presented when we can claim that not only the large number of participants, but also their knowledge are engaged in. So, it can be seen that to recognise local knowledge is to recognise democracy values. The quality aspect of participation, where the different forms of knowledge are recognised, is usually defined by the notion of 'deliberation'. According to Fischer (2009, p.164), deliberation implies the exchange of expert and local knowledge, which can deliver transformative learning and develops an emancipatory knowledge. Fischer claims that knowledge exchange can also deliver practical knowledge, which is required for collective decision-making and action. The challenge left behind is, however, how to integrate or articulate these different forms of knowledge.

This paper attempts to contribute to aforementioned theoretical proposition by examining the way in which the different forms of knowledge are brought to deliberative forums. This paper argues that it is true that expert knowledge transferred internationally makes an impact to policy decision, but at the same time it could not deny that local knowledge still influences policy making particular in developing countries, which should not be ignored such impacts. Also, we need to call for more collaborative policy analysts to bridge different knowledge by

bringing them to deliberative forums to seek for the possibilities in integrating or articulating their differences.

Analytical framework

To analyse the roles of different form of knowledge in policy deliberation, Fischer, again, provides a useful model called 'logic of policy deliberation'. According to Fischer (1995, p.231), the model, in short, tests the reasons given concerning a technical efficiency, its relevance to the circumstances of the situations, its instrumental implications for the social system as a whole, and its relation to the ideological principles that justify the societal system. At the first place, Fischer (1995) proposes this model for evaluating policy in comprehensive way by considering programme verification, situational validation, societal vindication, and social choice. However, this model is adopted by other scholars in many ways including by merging with other models; such as Fairclough (2013). Fischer himself later also refers to this model in other ways apart from in evaluating policy. For example, he refers to his model as a way to consider a good reason, a force of a better argument and a legitimacy of a decision (Fischer, 2003, pp.189-98, 202). He also points that the model helps to understand a practical reason which is a result of a searching for integrating empirical and normative arguments (Fischer, 2007, pp.223-36). So, as the recognition of different forms of knowledge might be a result of their provision of a practical reason and legitimacy, Fischer's model is adopted for this analysis.

However, the reason why different forms of knowledge are recognised in policy making is, of course, not only its logic, but also the role of the promoters and how they are expressed. So, Fischer's logic of policy deliberation is just a good starting point as it helps to structure a more

comprehensive conception of rationality or reason (Fischer, 1995, p.237). By using the term of Aristotle and his idea of rhetorical analysis, Fischer's model helps to make a comprehensive understanding of 'logos', but we still need to understand 'ethos' and 'pathos' by which rhetorical approach could provide an analytical framework to explore such areas. This Aristotle's approach pays attention in the art of persuasion. It is about strategies of argumentation. Gottweis (2006, 2007) explains that the logos refers to the logic or reason by which is usually based on the different modes of rationality, fact, evidence, or proofs. For social constructivists, logos can be understood as a narrative or a discourse. As raised earlier, Fischer's logic of policy deliberation could provide a comprehensive way of understanding logos. For the ethos, it refers to the morality of speakers by which are usually based on trust, respect, authority, honesty, credibility, and considerations of desirable. The last one is pathos which refers to the passions by which are usually based on empathy, sympathy, and sensibilities. The example of expressing pathos is to express the suffering, fear, anger, disgust, excitement, and jealousy. Gottweis (2007, p.245) mentions that argumentative strategies might be the logo-centric, etho-centric, or patho-centric performances or they might be the mixed between them; such as, etho-logical, etho-pathetic, or logo-pathetic performances. Later, Gottweis (2012, pp.211-35) adds that scenographies are also important to analysing a rhetoric. Scenographies refer to a place, a moment, a given use of language, a speaker and an address. So, to consider scenographies is to consider proliferation of sites, which affect the way in which logos and pathos are expressed, and ethos is presented. However, the notion of scenographies is so close to the second level of Fischer's logic of policy deliberation which concerns on the particular context. To sum up, while this study agrees to add an analysis of ethos and pathos as a complement of the analysis of logic of policy deliberation (logos), the study puts an analysis of scenographies as a part of the analysis of logos framed by Fischer.

At this stage, the merging of Fischer's logic of policy deliberation in rhetorical approach seems to provide a clear analytical framework. Nevertheless, the developed approach would not be completed, if a historical aspect is ignored. So, the historical analysis of discourses; genealogy, is also adopted and integrated in rhetorical analysis. In doing so, the role of history in constructing and characterising discourses is brought into consider logos, ethos and pathos. The notion of discourse used by this study is defined by Howarth (2002, p.9) that it is historically specific systems of meaning which form the identities of subjects and objects. Fischer (2003, pp.74-6) offers two levels of understanding discourse which are useful for this study; the broad socio-cultural level and the everyday level of communicative interaction. He mentions that the socio-cultural discourse transmits basic values and gives cohesion to shared beliefs, whereas the everyday interactive discourse is about daily life exchanges of completing and sometimes contradictory arguments to make sense of social reality by each person.

All in all, this paper develops an integrated approach which puts a historical aspect of discourse analysis recognised by Foucauldians in analysing argumentation, which based mainly upon Habermasian daily-life communicative action theory. The integrated approach would help to frame an analysis for understanding the influence of different forms of knowledge along a deliberative spectrum. On the one hand, rhetorical analysis could provide an explanation that the recognition of knowledge is about an ability to convince through public debates. On the other hand, to analyse specific setting is not enough by which to explore the history of society and its culture is needed. Because, such history shapes discourse communities which define practical reasoning behind what people believe and practice. The rest of the paper will illustrate how the integrated approach works through the case study of policies coping with disasters in Thailand.

Policies coping with disasters in Thailand

To cope with disasters in Thailand through policy mechanisms in general can be a lesson learned for us to see a role played by different forms of knowledge and their agents. Of course, expert knowledge is there to set plans, goals and standards as well as pushing forward technical efficiency of policy inputs, processes and outcomes. However, local knowledge also operates and has particular function. For example, the government arranged the sacred ceremony to pay respect to the god of the climate, which aimed to ask the god to stop the heavy rain and protect them. This cultural policy was agreed among policy makers and analysts as it could make a positive psychological effect to laypeople thought about physical and mental security. Aside from that, local herbal healthcare knowledge was promoted to co-function with modern healthcare services, whereas in the post-disaster period local seed collection methods were supported to help farmers whose agricultural products were damaged as an impact of the floods.

By deliberating the participatory warning system, the deliberative facilitators gathered and made available different forms of knowledge pertaining to flood levels from the City Water Draining Agency and local communities. The agency claimed that it opened the floodgate for two meters, but different local communities felt that the water level might be higher or lower than that. They could not provide a specific number, but prepared comparison related body height and housing dimensions. Some said that it was the same level of their shoulders and some said it was higher than their first floor window. This demonstrated that to open the floodgate by two meters led to different water levels in different areas. The translation of different forms of knowledge from one target to another, then, led to the creation of the warning system based on mutual understanding and cooperation.

During floods, policy makers also supported a make and use of locally made effective microorganisms (EM), which is a traditional farming technique, to enhance soil quality for growing short-term vegetables and reduce wastewater after relevant actors engaged in intensive debates of its usefulness. To take this into account, this paper goes deeper into an analysis of this particular case with the setting of 2011. At that time, many areas within Bangkok, the capital and the biggest city of Thailand, had faced the most terrible flood of roughly 70 years. Although floods usually happen in some areas in the city, more than half of the city was flooded this time— 36 districts from the total 50 districts - by which water level for some areas was higher than 2 meters (Bangkok Metropolitan Administration, 2012). Many problems occurred related to the disaster including household's waste water, which is normally found everywhere when there is a flood. Apart from such common problem, another serious problem is food shortage, although Thailand is well-known as one of the world kitchens. Because, Bangkok dwellers are depended highly on food transportation from outside the city by monopoly food corporations. So, after the flood changed the main road to be a new river, many food industries could not either produce or transport their products to local shops. Besides, the volume of food from the chain of centralised food distribution was not enough for demands of customers. Some shops were closed, and the food price was too high. As a consequence, it had affected to food accessibility of many communities. There was also the problem of poor nutrition as many people accessed to dry foodstuff; such as, accessing to fish-can and instant noodle, but could not access to fresh vegetable (Boossabong, 2012a).

In dealing with such problems during such period, local farming practitioners including farmers' leaders, trainers and Buddhist monks who were active in engaging social development succeeded in promoting the make and use of a locally made EM ball - a traditional agricultural practice, to enhance soil quality for growing short-term vegetables as

emergency food and reduce wastewater. An EM ball as local knowledge was recognised, legitimised and supported by policy-makers, although there were some challenges by experts that they might need a longer period of time than flooding period to enhance soil quality for growing food, and they could not reduce but increase waste. Roughly 75,000 EM balls were made and provided for city dwellers every day, and roughly 2,000 people came to join a make and allocation of EM balls each day as volunteers. The media was also interested by broadcasting and reporting a lot of events. Many super stars as such the famous singles and actresses and actors of many well-known television dramas came to join. When the prime minister had visited flood victims by boat, she threw EM balls along the river to legitimise the using of this method. The regional and local governments supported this idea widely. They had organised many centres for EM balls making, and provided staffs, trucks and boats to allocate EM balls to city dwellers and to throw them to the waste water. It could be said that making and using EM balls became one of outstanding regional and local policies in responding to the flood.

This case brings about a dialogue between expert and local knowledge through policy deliberation. To understand this trajectory is to unpack the roles played by different forms of knowledge. This paper analyses that different forms of knowledge were recognised as they were able to comb the empirical data and normative assumptions along a deliberative spectrum. As aforementioned, the merging of Fischer's logic of policy deliberation in rhetorical analysis plus by a historical analysis of discourses is used to frame to understand this. The next section will provide an analysis of the case based on fieldwork observations and interviews conducted during flooding period, a review of relevant literature including policy and historical documents, and a review of 14 recorded communicative forums opened for a

debate between local practitioners and university environmental scientists in relation to beneficial of EM balls before the policy and practice were emerged and wider spread.

Recognition, legitimation and promotion of different forms of knowledge in policy deliberation: an analysis

Different knowledge as different logics of policy deliberation: analysing logos

To begin with, an argument of scientists as conventional think tanks succeeded in verifying their argument by providing strong generalised scientific evidence by referring to international experiences and researches (the first level of Fischer's logic of policy deliberation). For example, Japan experience was referred to that during flooding as a result of the Tsunami disaster on March, 2011, the Japanese government did not use EM balls to deal with waste water and food crisis, although they also get use to a make and use of EM balls in the normal situation. The experiment results cited from many good standard international journals were also illustrated. The scientists presented clearly key relevant findings of such laboratory studies that it needs time for improving soil by EM balls and such farming technique can rather increase waste. On the other hand, local practitioners proposed EM balls as they believed that it should work as it has ever worked. They normally use the EM product for growing food in their farm and for water treatment in their house. So, they just assumed without illustrating an empirical evidence that it should work.

However, the scientists failed to place their argument in the context (the second level of Fischer's logic of policy deliberation), while the local practitioners as spiritual think tanks could do so. The local practitioners could illustrate that many laypeople could experience and feel that locally made EM balls work by themselves. They critiqued the scientific evidences proposed by the scientists that such evidences had derived from other contexts which might

not relevant in this context as such by saying that: "This is Thailand not Japan". At the same time, to prove by the feeling of the users was mainly made, which was really subjective. The historical analysis helps to understand that Thai people in general tend to feel that the EM product is always good. The discourse of usefulness of a locally made EM ball in the context of Thai society has been produced and reproduced throughout the agricultural history until it is embedded in the belief system as a valuable local knowledge and people usually practise it in household scale without asking a question as an axiom. So, to propose that an EM ball is useful could convince lay people in the way in which it comes along with their previous direct experiences or even their common sense which does not have to prove scientifically. As mentioned by a flood victim: "We know it works. We can see many clear changes. We could grow basil. The water is cleaner. Scholars (scientists) should come to see what we do rather than to say something they've really never done."

Apart from a failure to place the argument in the context, scientific knowledge was categorised as a Western knowledge, which faced a legitimacy crisis during such disaster as a scenography. Because, such knowledge was blamed being a cause of the crisis or being fail in dealing with it. For example, many people blamed that experts failed in predicting and controlling the flood. In relation to agriculture, many people blamed that Western knowledge shaped the priority regime by which commercial and industrial areas were protected the first, while farming area became the floodway, which, in turn, led to the severe food shortage. The distrust of Western knowledge in the context partly brought about a distrust of scientific argument as such a challenge of using EM balls. Consequently, the crisis of experts and their technical rationality opened the window of opportunities for local knowledge and its cultural rationality.

The historical review found that the legitimacy crisis of Western knowledge had often taken place during a context of crisis. Many previous crises share a common that the creditability of modern knowledge had been shortly dropped, because Thailand has been modernised by depending highly on Western knowledge. The city has also been shaped and controlled by a high educated governor plus with few hegemonic technocrats. The external and modern knowledge, so, was blamed when the city mechanisms had failed to function. At the same time, the history could tell that the local knowledge preference discourse has become a shared lifeworld of the people when they faced a terrible crisis. The discourse involves with a recall of the old day and a recover of the traditional wisdom rooted mainly in Thai agricultural culture, which this also sheds a light to a locally-made EM ball.

Moving on, scientists also failed in claiming instrumental implications of their argument for the social system as a whole (the third level of Fischer's logic of policy deliberation), while local practitioners succeeded in doing so. To promote a make and use of locally made EM balls by people themselves to enhance their climate change adaptive capacity become a practical reason which comes along well with self-reliant tradition included in an existed functional system constructed by the Buddhist principles. The discourse of self-reliance has been promoted strongly since the former crisis; the economic crisis called 'Tom Yum Kung crisis' in 1997. The 9th King played an important role in promoting this tradition until it has been put in a lot of development policies and plans. So, to enhance people self-reliance is usually found as one objective of many policies and plans as a tradition.

Other than a failure in linking the argument to an existed functional system, scientists made two main mistakes. Firstly, they said that to use chemical fertiliser is more possible to grow an emergency food by people themselves. This offer is reasonable in the way that we might

need to ignore organic method when we need a quantity of food. This is what general people elsewhere need to trade off. But, to promote chemical use is what the Thai public sector usually implicit does but can never make it explicitly. To propose chemical use explicitly was also unacceptable and built negative feeling for city dwellers. The second mistake is to say that a lack of food could be rather fixed by reshaping food distribution of the existed food chains and systems than to try to depend on each oneself by growing own food. Although this idea might be true, local policy makers and many laypeople thought the scientists mean that to enhance food self-reliance is insignificant and they could not bear with that comment. The historical investigation found that the promotion of food self-reliance in the city through urban agriculture (where EM balls are taken part of it) has been widely accepted. The practice on it has been extended quickly for the decade. Many people were realised the capacity of food growing in the city in enhancing city dwellers livelihood. The Thai city farm programme could develop more than 150 community gardens scattering within the inner city. At least 6 local government offices have developed vegetable garden in the rooftop of the office building. Such public agencies have opened the garden to the public as a learning centre and provided various training programmes on farming (Boossabong, 2013, 2012b). So, this could support to understand why local policy makers and many people disagreed with the comment that food self-reliance is impossible.

For the fourth level of Fischer's logic of policy deliberation, the scientists failed to link their argument to the ideological principles that justify the societal system as well. On the other hand, to promote local knowledge is also to promote a sense of Thai-ness (Thai way of life). The discourse of Thai-ness is an interactive discourse, which frames the way people propose the 'sound good' statement when they make a claim. Such discourse was not really existed and shaped the socio-cultural structure at the time. (It might have ever taken place in the past.) To

propose this discourse, it is hard for anybody to say that they disagree with it, although they might think it really flakes. For example, to mobilise massive people to make and allocate EM balls collaboratively could claim for a social norm of reciprocity and mutual aid during the difficult time, which is a norm of a 'good society' where the Thai people in general dream for. To come to join a make and allocation of EM balls by many people also reflects the strong senses of unity, kindness, power of the people, participation, collaboration etc. Whether EM balls are useful or not, to be able to build such senses made policy makers happy to support them.

Image, trust and emotion of knowledge using agents: analysing ethos and pathos

The debates between traditional and new think tanks; scientists and local practitioners, show that attributes of the speakers (ethos) affected whether the logic was convinced. The image of the scientist is a nerdy scholar who works either in the lab or in the library and produces an irrelevant knowledge to the practical world, while the practitioner is a person who has an experience and better understands the real world. Such images have been constructed throughout a long history based strongly on Buddhist principle, which advocates for paying respects to a practitioner. Most of Thai people believe in monks rather than university scholars as what they say is expected to come from what they have practised rather than what they have read. The story of Buddha himself has affected the way Thai people think widely. He is a practitioner who realises the truth by practising for self-actualisation. Thai people in general get use to with his story. His character has been socially constructed as the stereotype of the 'real' expert.

Apart from an effect of the image, trust in the speakers affected whether the logic was convinced as well. To begin with, a distrust of scientists and their knowledge by laypeople during the crisis as mentioned earlier also affected a higher trust in local practitioners and their knowledge. Besides, trust in local practitioners also derived from their outstanding role in dealing with urban food shortage during flooding. While food distribution mechanism from monopoly food corporations and their food chains which depend on food transportation from distant rural areas could not function properly because the transportation was affected by flooding, local practitioners as city farmers played outstanding role in developing alternative food sources in the city as a buffer for adapting to the extreme climate event. They could both allocate a lot of food mobilised from community gardens within the city to many poor and marginalised communities, and promote emergency food growing by city dwellers themselves (Boossabong, 2012a).

As for the importance of pathos, it was found that an emotional expression had an effect to raise the idea to be heard and to build up a shared feeling. For a better understanding of the significance of emotion in Thai society, historical consideration can help. Emotional sensitive of Thai people have partly developed from the media culture. It was found that Thai dramas and social news selection of the media has led the society to be a dramatic society, where people express their shared strong feeling easily when a sensitive story is made. To link back to the case study, the local practitioners were outstanding in expressing their emotion to stimulate laypeople to agree with and join them. For example, they used a lot of proverbs; such as, "to teach how to fish is more sustainable than to give fish" and "values of money and gold are built up, while food is real" to build shared strong feelings. Such feelings stimulate many people to want to go out of their home to do something for others to make a situation better. To join the collective making of EM balls became a choice. When a lot of people

agreed with them, policy makers later could not bear to not support as they thought they should respond what many citizens did. They supported as they realised that EM balls could deliver a beautiful process, although they were not sure that this method would deliver an effective outcome.

On the other hand, science language and scientist style could not stimulate general people to listen to and agree with them. By ignoring the importance of emotional expression in convincing people, the scientists presented in academic way and used a lot of technical terms. For example, the professor on environmental engineering from the most famous university of Thailand explained how 'lactic acid' made by 'Aerobic' and 'Anaerobic' bacteria in EM product works. He referred to 'Cellulase', 'Trichoderma', 'Penicillium spp.', 'BOD', 'pH', 'Eutropidication' etc. Aside from that, they did not try to mobilise a social support. While local practitioners gained a lot of social supports as they concerned on participatory process by mobilising a variety of collective actions, scientists concerned merely to present the solid result derived from valid methods or high credit sources. As ignoring the significance of emotion, scientists said a lot of sensitive sentences which make a negative feeling. For example, a scientist said that "You (EM balls supporters) are not only not solve the problem, you also make a damage to this city", and "We need to drive our society by knowledge not by belief". These sentences made EM balls supporters angry. They thought they were blamed that they did a stupid thing. A local practitioner responded to such sentences that: "They not only do not help to row a boat, they also lay their feet to the lake to make a rowing more difficult."

Regarding the end of the story, although there were clear different stands between expert and local knowledge as raised above, a window for knowledge articulation was opened throughout

the repeated argumentation. Each knowledge using agent had much more recognised the different modes of rationality of the oppositions and paid respects to them. The repeated discussions between them and social feedback played a significant role in facilitating their learning to develop a mutual understanding. Local practitioners had accepted that their practice could be best at household scale - not for the larger scale and not a solution of the whole city wastewater treatment system. On the other hand, scientists had begun to learn to keep a relation with local practitioners and to understand the social lifeworld, after they realised that a lot of people still agreed with using EM balls after they tried to give a reason and provide clear scientific evidence why they should stop it. Although a scientific claim might have never met a compromising point with a claim made by local practitioners, a scientist as an expert needs to find a way to live with local practitioners as representative of the laypeople in the new policy culture, which policy makers have been forced politically to think in a more democratic way by listening to people voices.

Concluding remarks

To sum up, the paper concludes that the reason why different forms of knowledge can be included in policy deliberation is that although the logic of expert knowledge convinces the technical efficiency, it does not always succeed to link its legacy to the context, existing system and social norms. Also, the role of expert knowledge can be limited when it is addressed by poor image and distrusted agents in addition to their weak in emotional expression as a result of both their performances in a specific setting and a historical social construction of their credibility. In contrast, local knowledge proposed by local practitioners can provide a practical reason and becomes a better argument as it probably fits into a situation at hand as well as coming along well with social system and norms.

It is illustrated by this paper that an analytical framework developed here is useful as it paves the way to understand policy epistemologies behind deliberative policy analysis. This framework derives from the merging of Fischer's logic of policy deliberation in rhetorical analysis of logos, ethos and pathos plus by a historical analysis of discourses; genealogy. The analysis comes to a conclusion that not only logic of scientific knowledge failed in linking to the context, existing system and social norms, it also failed in the way that it was addressed by poor image and distrusted agents in addition to their weak in emotional expression as a result of both their performances in a specific setting and a historical social construction of their creditability. In contrast, local knowledge proposed by local practitioners could provide a practical reason and became a better argument.

The phenomena of the rise of the role of local knowledge in policy making in a developing country can be seen as a shifting of the era to the post-secular age as mentioned by Habermas and his colleagues (2010). In Thailand context, the recovering of local traditional knowledge is a strategy for localisation to flight back the hegemony of Western knowledge and its role in modernisation. For example, there is a demand to re-use traditional wisdom of collecting and sharing seeds to avoid buying hybrid seeds developed and controlled by monopoly food corporations (Boossabong and Taylor, 2009). Many local people propose to recover the local irrigation management system instead of building a modern dam. To deal with energy crisis, many local governments promote using Buffalo to plough a paddy field instead of using the machine (Boossabong, 2009b). The government still supports a lot of traditional ceremonies such as the annual agricultural productivity forecast (Lag-na-khaun) and paying respects to the mother of the water (Boo-cha-pha-mae-kong-ka). Also, there was an offer to use hair to absorb oil which was spilled to the sea, and some local people offered to adopt Thai political

thought embedded in the traditional way of life' to deal with the political conflict derived from the legitimacy crisis of the Westernised political system (Boossabong, 2008).

In other contexts, some studies found that local knowledge is recognised especially in the field of local environmental, agricultural and health policies, although such knowledge is usually recognised under some structure framed by expert knowledge as such by technical tools and terms. Besides, to listen to people voices and their local knowledge in making policy seems to be a part of modern administrative fashion rather than the recognition of the real value of the local knowledge. The example of recent works is the six papers which were published in the journal of 'Policy and Society' in the specific theme on 'local knowledge in policy making' edited by Delvaux and Schoenaers (2012). Those papers recognise the importance of local knowledge in policy making, planning and governance. As such the study of Leino and Peltomaa in this volume in the case of lake restoration in Finland found that local knowledge not only frames the boundaries and possibilities of local policy, but also shapes the interpretations of policy legitimacy.

However, it should be noted that to consider the role of local knowledge we should not be too romantic. All papers in an issue edited by Delvaux and Schoenaers (Ibid) share the same concerns that there are structural and administrative constraints in pushing local knowledge in policy decision. Another recent example is a study of air quality management policy in Southampton by Carmichael (2009). He found that whereas local knowledge was recognised, expert knowledge was still a dominant form of knowledge. My own previous researches also claim in the same way. I found that public hearings in participatory process for making a local policy in Thailand were regulated by formal language use which includes technical terms and certain patterns of communication. It did not legitimise everyday informal language of

laypeople where local knowledge is embedded in (Boossabong, 2010a). In different setting, I also found that there was a distorted communication in policy deliberative process as some high social status persons had a loud voice over others and they carried out an expert knowledge with them. The distorted communication, in turn, was a cause of an exclusion of local knowledge. Many participants censored themselves as they had not a self-confidence to express their knowledge as there was a case that the loud voice persons made a sense of humour and a sense of non-sense for some ideas addressed by laypersons. The facilitators also played an important role in guiding the panel to the way that they want to. To sum up, the real role of local people and their local knowledge was just to legitimise an existed blue print (Boossabong, 2009a; Boossabong and Srisutham, 2010).

Thus, it is not a surprise to search finding the role of local knowledge as the second class knowledge as Fischer (2009, 2000) explains that the dominance of expert knowledge and the marginalization of local knowledge derive from the dominance of positivist tradition. This tradition recognises and legitimises scientific mode of rationality including Westernised technical one by ignoring local knowledge embedded in cultural rationality. Even though local knowledge can be an unacknowledged knowledge in many policy decisions, the increasing attention in this form of knowledge becomes a new challenge for old influence groups from the modernisation era including experts to reposition themselves. For the case illustrated here, policy makers stand in the difficult position where Western knowledge is challenged its relevance to the context, while democratic values of the modern thought demand them to hear the people voices by which such voices still shaped by the pre-modern way of thinking. The coexist of modern, post-modern and pre-modern in developing countries is really a challenge of the era which we are living in, while it is hard for the policy makers to bridge the different arguments made by different types of think tanks based on different

modes of rationality as an interpretive mediator and a facilitator of deliberative process proposed by Fischer (2003). This case study clearly illustrates that policy makers really were not familiar with such democratic role. They were rather puzzled with what they could and should do and ended up with conforming the more powerful discourse coalition. Thus, collaborative policy analysts would be called for to play the active role in bridging different forms of knowledge. We now need to move beyond whether expert and local knowledge should be more mattered toward an attempt to include such different forms of knowledge in interactive forums and facilitate the process of knowledge exchange through the process of policy deliberation.

References

- Bangkok Metropolitan Administration. 2012. *Summary of Bangkok Flooding 2011*, <http://www.bangkok.go.th/th/index.php>
- Boossabong, P. 2013. Agricultural policy and planning for tomorrow: Beyond urban-rural dichotomy. *Politics and Governance 10th Anniversary*, special edition, pp.34-53.
- 2012a. 'Collaborative governance on urban food agenda during flooding in Bangkok, Thailand in late-2011' presented in the panel 'Governance of urban environmental risk in the global south' at the RGS-IBG Annual International Conference 2012, University of Edinburgh, 3rd July.
- 2012b. *Growing Cities for Growing Life: Theories and Practices of Urban Agriculture*. Bangkok: Thai National Health Promotion Foundation and Sustainable Agriculture Thailand Foundation.
- 2010a. Local knowledge and agricultural policy development: The case of Mahasarakham province. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 29(3), pp.34-50.

- 2009a. Problems of participatory process in local public policy making. *Journal of Interdisciplinary*, 9(1), pp.28-57.
- 2009b. Social capital and local environmental policy: Concepts and best practices. King Prajadhipok's Institute Journal, 7(2), pp.84-115.
- 2008. Accessing democracy in the way of life: The first step for citizen political development, King Prajadhipok's Institute Journal, 6(2), pp. 59-86.
- Boossabong, P. and Srisutham, J. 2010. Thai regional development planning in transition: Changes and obstacles. *Journal of Politics and Governance*, 1(1), pp.129-51.
- Boossabong, P. and Taylor, M. 2009. Impact of trade liberalization on agricultural sector and adjustment policy: The case of shallot plantations in Northeastern Thailand, *Kasetsart Journal of Social Science*, 30 (2), pp.323-37.
- Carmichael, L. 2009. Integrating different forms of knowledge in local policy-making: The case of local air quality management in Southampton. *International Journal of Environmental, Cultural, Economic and Social Sustainability*, 5(1), pp.333-44.
- Delvaux, B. and Schoenaers, F., eds. 2012. Local knowledge in policy making. *Policy and Society*, 31(2), pp.105-182.
- Dunn, W. 1994. *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. 2nd edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Dye, T. 1969. *Understanding Public Policy*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Fairclough, I. 2013. 'A dialectical profile for evaluation of policy arguments: A contribution to the argumentative turn in policy analysis' presented at the 8th Interpretative Policy Analysis Conference, University of Vienna, 3rd July.

- Fischer, F. 2009. *Democracy and Expertise: Reorienting Policy Inquiry*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 2007. Deliberative policy analysis as practical reason: Integrating empirical and normative arguments. *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods*, pp.223-36, eds. F. Fischer, G. J. Miller and M.S. Sidney. Boca Raton, London and New York: CRC Press.
- 2003. *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- 2000. *Citizens, Experts, and the Environment: the Politics of Local Knowledge*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- 1995. *Evaluating Public Policy*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Geertz, C. 1983. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Knowledge*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gottweis, H. 2012. Political rhetoric and stem cell policy in the United States: Embodiment, scenographies, and emotions. *Argumentative Turn Revisited: Public Policy as Communicative Practice*, pp.211-235, eds., F. Fischer and H. Gottweis. Duke University Press, London and Durham.
- 2007. Rhetoric in policy making: Between logos, ethos and pathos. *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods*, pp.237-50, eds., F. Fischer, G. Miller, M. Sidney. Boca Raton, London and New York: CRC Press.
- 2006. Argumentative policy analysis. *Handbook of Public Policy*, eds. Peters, G., and J. Pierre. London: Sage.

- Habermas, J. 2010. *An Awareness of What is Missing: Faith and Reason in a Post-secular Age*. Malden: Polity Press.
- Hajer, M. and Wagenaar, H. 2003. *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hogwood, B.W. and Gunn, L. 1984. *Policy Analysis for the Real World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howarth, D. 2002. *Discourse*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Lasswell, H. 1970. The emerging conception of the policy sciences. *Policy Science*, 1, pp.3-14.
- Lindblom, C. 1959. The Science of Muddling Through. *Classics of Public Policy* (2005), eds., Shfritz, J., Layne, K., and Borick, C. New York: Pearson Education.
- Lindblom, C. and Cohen, D. 1979. *Usable Knowledge: Social Science and Social Problem Solving*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Plehwe, D. 2015. The Politics of Policy Think Tanks: Organising Expertise, Legitimacy and Counter-Expertise in Policy Networks. *Handbook of Critical Policy Studies*, pp.358-79, eds., Fischer, F., Torgerson, D., Durnova, A. and Orsini, M. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Wagenaar, H. 2011. *Meaning in Action: Interpretation and Dialogue in Policy Analysis*. New York and London: M.E. Sharpe.
- Yanow, D. 2003. Accessing local knowledge. *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*, pp.228-46, eds., Hajer, M. and H. Wagenaar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.