

The differentiation of issues and stakes: framing and reframing in an interactive water area planning process

Greet François¹, Art Dewulf² and Tharsi Taillieu¹

¹ K.U.Leuven – Research Group for Work, Organisational and Personnel Psychology

² Wageningen University – Public Administration and Policy Group

ABSTRACT

In this paper authors analyzed how changes appear in the way stakeholders frame and reframe the issues and their stake in a water area planning process. They took on a discursive perspective and focused on what happens in the interaction between stakeholders. Three aspects of change were observed: the differentiation of issue framing and stake of the process initiator, the internal differentiation of issue framing and stake of one interest party, and changes in the mode of interaction. With regard to the modes of interaction three different processes were distinguished: frame selling, frame filling and frame negotiation. It was concluded that the differentiation of issues and stakes is an important kind of change in decision-making processes and that multidirectional frame negotiation is helpful to achieve an integrated agreement.

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

This paper is an analysis of a participatory process to define a water area plan for the area between the river Kromme Rijn and the Amsterdam-Rijn canal in The Netherlands. We will analyze how changes occur in how the actors frame issues and stakes.

Correspondence to: G. François, Research Group for Work, Organisational and Personnel Psychology, K.U.Leuven, Tiensestraat 102, 3000 Leuven, Belgium. E-mail: greet.francois@psy.kuleuven.be

The Kromme Rijn, a tributary of the river Neder-Rijn, flows from Wijk-bij-Duurstede to the city of Utrecht. The water management in this area is under the authority of the waterboard Hoogheemraadschap De Stichtse Rijnlanden. The planning process involves the area between the Kromme Rijn, the Neder-Rijn, the Amsterdam-Rijn canal and the City of Utrecht.

Through processes of erosion and sedimentation the windings of the river Kromme Rijn moved with time and formed the natural landscape in the basin. It is a mix of wetlands in the low-lying parts and dryer lands along the (earlier) river embankments. On the wetlands cattle farming takes place while on the dryer parts you find fruit farming. The main land use in the area is agriculture. Fishery, recreation and nature concerns are present to a much lesser extent.

All this land was brought into cultivation thanks to a system of ditches and dikes. They were dug from the 10th century on. Small groups of farmers worked together “to keep someone else’s water out of their land”. This type of collaboration developed later into a system of numerous small waterboards (Donkersloot-de Vrij et al. 1993). Through the centuries technical as well as organisational changes took place resulting in the following situation at present. An area of 60 km² is under the authority of one waterboard since 1994. However in this area are still 91 water levels to be maintained. On a distance of 140 km of ditches and watercourses many pieces of technical equipment have been installed in the field: 400 culverts, 90 weirs and 25 pumping-engines.

Water area plans have to be delivered by the waterboard under the national governmental regulation directed at a sustainable water system in The Netherlands by 2015. The plans consist of 2 outcomes: a water level decision and a water infrastructure plan. Objectives of the water area plans are to avoid excess water, to balance the interests of different parties in the area and to improve the ecological quality of the surface water. The waterboard has initiated an interactive decision-making process, in order to analyze problems, devise solutions and develop the plan in a concerted way with the stakeholders involved. It is the formal responsibility of the waterboard to deliver the water area plans in time to the province and to coordinate them with the water plans of the municipalities.

At the start of the planning process a broad stakeholder analysis has been made. At the kick-off meeting people were invited and asked to what extent they wanted to be involved in the planning process. On the basis of these answers 3 groups were formed. The core group was formed by repre-

representatives of the province, 3 municipalities and the waterboard itself. They were responsible for the process. The core group members together with the representatives of several organised stakeholders (see further) formed the advisory group. These people wanted to be consulted about the water area plan, its challenges and the measures to be selected. Several stakeholder representatives only wanted to be kept informed well. In the course of the planning process also evening meetings for the public were organised. They were directed to the inhabitants in general or to landowners more specifically and aimed at informing and consulting them.

Between the different levels of participation there was a systematic interaction. The core group prepared the meetings and workshops with the advisory group. The advisory group served as a sounding board to prepare the area evening meetings. They not only discussed the content of the water area plan, but also gave advice about the participatory process and how to communicate to the public.

The participatory planning process started at the beginning of 2006. But important changes in the formulation of issues and stakes were only observed at the third meeting of the advisory group. This was at the beginning of 2007.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK & RESEARCH QUESTION

We analyze this process from the theoretical perspective of multi-stakeholder negotiation. The different actors of the area differ in important aspects. They have different interests, different ways of organizing themselves, different kinds of knowledge and also different perspectives on what the central issues are. We focus on the latter aspect by analyzing how different stakeholders (including the waterboard) frame the issues in the problem domain. By highlighting certain aspects of the situation at the expense of others, by drawing different boundaries around the issue and by putting different elements at the core of the issue, people from different backgrounds construct frames about the situation that sometimes differ considerably from how others frame the issues (Dewulf 2006). At the same time, people also position themselves (and others) in the problem domain thus constructed – issue and stake are often framed at the same time. The stakes of actors emerge from the same discourse in which issues are framed and a need for action is generated. The impact a certain action has with respect to an actor constitutes his interest in the problem domain. As

such the actor's stake and position are linked to how he frames the issue (Lawrence et al., 1999). Social relations and language use are important elements that constitute the discursive process of issue framing. For reaching a negotiated agreement, changes in how the issues and stakes are framed are often necessary (Putnam and Holmer 1992). When and how these framings of issues and stakes actually change in an interactive decision-making process remains an important question in the literature. From an interactional approach to framing, it is important to not only consider when and how individual persons change their minds, but also when and how changes of issue framings occur in the interactions - because it is in this interactional context that an agreement has to be forged. Therefore, the central question we address in this paper is at what points and how changes appear in the way stakeholders in this interactive planning process frame and reframe the issues and their stake in it.

METHOD

This water area planning process has been investigated by us as part of the research project NeWater ('New Approaches to Adaptive Water Management under Uncertainty'). Some NeWater researchers, including ourselves, contributed to the design, facilitation and evaluation of the process. During the actual multi-stakeholder meetings, our own position was limited to that of observer, though invited by the waterboard. We were present at all meetings, most of which were also video or audio recorded. We also disposed of the documents produced by the waterboard for this process. For the analysis presented here, we overviewed the process for important changes and selected the 3rd advisory group meeting for closer analysis of how these changes emerged during the interaction process. A full transcription of the recording of this meeting was made and interaction analysis was applied to it.

The meeting had a duration of 2 hours and 16 minutes. The whole transcript comprises 640 paragraphs. When using citations from the transcript in this paper we will refer to the corresponding paragraph number with '§'.

Participants at this meeting were representatives of the waterboard, the province, two municipalities, the national farmers' organisation (with a local and a national representative), the national fruit farmers' organisation (with a local and a national representative), the agricultural nature and

landscape association, the natural-historical association and a public service administering land reclamation.

RESULTS

Hereafter we document three changes over the course of the process and analyze how these emerged in the third advisory group meeting:

- 1) the differentiation of issue framing and stake of the waterboard,
- 2) the differentiation of issue framing and stake of the farmers,
- 3) changes in the mode of interaction among stakeholders.

The differentiation of issue framing and stake of the waterboard

Having the formal responsibility to deliver the water area plan, the waterboard initiated the planning process and acted as the convenor and the organizer of the process. They decided on which steps in the participatory process to take, they invited the stakeholders, they led the meetings and wrote the minutes, and they communicated the challenges and potential measures to the public. They cared for constructive conversations and wanted input from all parties to draw a water area plan with their consent. In the first two meetings the waterboard tried to make an inventory of all the local water problems. They framed the problem domain as unambiguous, as if it didn't matter who reported on which water problem, and gave the impression that their technical expertise was going to provide an overall solution.

In the opening of the third meeting of the advisory group the chairman, a waterboard representative, announced the differentiation of *roles*. An external facilitator was engaged to lead the discussion they wanted to participate in. The project leader and another employee from the waterboard planning department presented the objectives and required outcomes of the water area plan, the bottlenecks for regional water management and the measures to be taken. They formulated two extreme scenarios and the dilemma resulting from them.

For the first time they formulated a specific interest by putting a specific mission frame on the table ("we are water level managers, we are not water suppliers"). As a consequence they limited the actions that could be ex-

pected from them to what they termed their ‘legal tasks’ and rejected responsibility to solve the problem of water supply. *“We are obliged to solve water damage, because that’s in the national water policy directive and we also must take care for sufficient water drainage. But the waterboard may choose, or must be willing to solve, the water problems in summer for agriculture, the water problems through night frost for the fruit sector in the actual situation, and the water problems through night frost for the actual and the future fruit sector.”* (§181 - §183)

At the same time they framed certain aspects of the situation as given and as such reduced the solution space. E.g. taxes among farmers cannot be differentiated: *“And the last thing is that in fact, juridically speaking, you can’t have a different tax for e.g. fruit farmers and cattle farmers. Of course all landholders in this area pay the same tax. So, speaking about the costs of these measures, you will have to distribute it evenly over the area, this tax”* (§248). Also people must be willing to sell stretches of their land along the watercourses: *“Yes, we assume voluntariness when talking about buying land to enlarge the watercourses. People have to be willing to cooperate, and if they don’t want to cooperate, then we can only try to enforce the measures and that’s a difficult discussion.”* (§242) From this meeting on they stressed the need for cooperation and sharing responsibility to solve the problem.

Simultaneously with the differentiation of their stake changes occurred in the waterboard’s issue framing. A very crucial one is the curtailing of the problem domain in which water level management is given a very central place while water supply has been excluded. Other changes in the waterboard’s issue framing are described in the next paragraph as they go together with the differentiation of issue framing and stakes among different groups of farmers.

The differentiation of issue framing and stake of the farmers

In the first two meetings the waterboard described the water problems of the area mainly in physical and technical terms identifying problems of water level, water quantity and quality. In their initial issue framing they named the problem of water shortage but didn’t point to specific actors.

Fruit farming practices such as irrigation during summer and sprinkling to avoid frost damage in spring were leading to peak demands of water. For cattle farmers, irrigation is not economically feasible. In the course of

the 3 meetings the technical problem solving by the waterboard pointed more and more towards the enlargement of several main watercourses. In the third meeting the waterboard added to this some “problems at a high level”. They worried about the increasing water demand as the fruit sector in the area is growing. They also made explicit the different water needs of fruit and cattle farmers and called it an imbalance between parties. And finally they raised the question of who had to pay for what they framed as an “extra-ordinary” water supply. But putting a dilemma on the table about whether water for fruit farming is a public interest, a water supply issue was reframed to a fruit sector issue.

Although the conflicting interests of fruit and cattle farmers were expressed earlier by individual farmers in more informal circumstances, meeting 3 was the first formal setting where this was brought on the table. A confirmation of the opposing interests was given only twice from the side of the farmers, more precisely by the local representative. About the non-differentiated tax he expressed a feeling of injustice. *“In the end they must find it unjust, because as we. The agriculture, that is growing, but hardly used more water than the years before, it’s too expensive. Look, they can have it! Water is necessary for them, but then you should make the distinction and that’s very easy to do”* (§256). At another point in the discussion the same representative pointed to the implications of watercourse enlargement for the cattle farmers. *“I don’t know what you mean by voluntarily. Is this about giving away your land? But yes, agriculture is mainly situated in the middle of this area. And well, land is scarce. And I think, most of them, well if watercourses are going to be enlarged, that will be mostly about cattle farm land, I think, because that is where the watercourses are. So, what does voluntarily mean ?”* (§528)

Accompanying changes in interaction modes

The differentiation of issues and stakes discussed above went together with changes in interaction. Evolving over time we saw a change from unidirectional to bi- and multidirectional communication.

Frame selling

In the beginning of the planning process much of the meeting time was taken by the waterboard to present their view on the situation to the other stakeholders (frame selling), without much time for reactions of the “public”. The sheer amount of information presented (including a large number

of maps and tables) also made it difficult for the participants to meaningfully react or oppose. This interaction mode consists mainly of persuasive communication (cf. sales model of innovation, Bouwen and Fry 1991).

Frame filling

In the course of the planning process more and more opportunities were created for bidirectional exchange during the meetings. (e.g. discussion in break-out groups). These conversations were aimed at collecting information from the stakeholders to be integrated in the problem as framed by the waterboard, which will refer to here as *frame filling*.

The first two advisory group meetings as well as the first area evening meeting aimed at making an inventory of the water bottlenecks in the region. People were asked to identify sites on the map having problems of the following types: “too dry/too wet” (groundwater and precipitation problems), “too much/too little water” (problems with surface water level fluctuations) and “too much/too little water life” (ecological problems). These are very specific questions leading the answers of the participants in the sense that they do not allow for questioning the technical problem frame in itself. As such the conversation in the groups remained highly structured while producing lists of problem sites to fill the information gaps in an overall issue frame developed by the waterboard.

Frame negotiation

At the beginning of meeting 3 frame selling and frame filling were still present but in the course of the meeting a third interaction mode could be distinguished.

As the waterboard brings to the table a more complete analysis of the situation and new ideas about the problem and the actions needed, they benefit from a situation in which their representative is given the floor and where moments of questioning and discussion are controlled. But in comparison to previous meetings less time was spent on presenting their case and convincing the other stakeholders.

The third meeting opened with pointing to the advising function of the group. “*We don’t take decisions in this group. In the end our committee will have to make a comparative assessment and take the final decisions.*” (§44) The discussion of the dilemma was organised as an exercise to collect on the one hand arguments in favour of each side of the dilemma (to

support the same discussion in the waterboard committee later) and on the other hand to receive feedback on how to organise the discussion of this dilemma with the landowners, fruit and cattle farmers at the next area evening meeting. The members of the advisory group were invited more than once to give arguments for their view on the dilemma.

For the first time however an important part of the time was spent on a more open discussion with multidirectional exchange. There the formulation of the dilemma and how the dilemma would be brought to the public was negotiated. Two stretches of talk from the beginning of the dilemma discussion are given below as an example of frame negotiation.

The waterboard proposed the dilemma – Is fruit farming representing a public interest rather than a separate economic sector ? – to the advisory group and asked whether they recognised this as an important dilemma about the area. This initiated a conversation on the mission of the waterboard. The following group members participated in this conversation: the national representative of the farmers’ organisation (A), the facilitator (B), a waterboard employee of the planning department (C) and the chairman (D).

Extract 1. §366 - §372

(§366) A: *“If you put it that way, because if that is how you put it I don’t think it is a good statement. Because the waterboard should act according to the collective principle, they have a number of collective tasks. And on top of that you have to put what is generic and what is above the generic, what is extra in relation to a particular sector or industry or whatever. And how are you going to (---).”*

(§367) B: *“You can say that the waterboard has a collectivity interest in view, and that is what the waterboard is for. Is that what you are saying ?”*

(§368) A: *“Yes, until now, unless (---).”*

(§369) C: *“I would like to react. We have been sorting this out and that was what I tried to show in my slide. The waterboard has a task in water drainage and the waterboard will have to supply as much water as to avoid emptying of the ditches but the waterboard has no supply duty meaning not having to deliver water.”*

(§370) B: *“So a collectivity interest and task yes, but there are limits to that.”*

(§371) A: *“Maintenance of the water level, because it is your duty to maintain a certain water level.”*

(§372) C: *“Yes.”*

The representative of the farmers’ organisation says the proposed dilemma isn’t a good statement. First of all he points to the collective tasks the waterboard has to carry out and so shifts the responsibility into the direction of the waterboard (who then has to argue why fruit farming is not part of the collective tasks of the waterboard). In the initial formulation of the dilemma however the responsibility is shifted to the fruit sector who then would have to argue that they indeed are representing a public interest. After that the farmers’ organisation makes a distinction between generic and above generic tasks that is picked up by the waterboard employee. She names the duty-bound tasks and delimits them by naming what is not part of it. The facilitator summarizes but interestingly reformulates “collective principle” to “collective interest” which is much closer to the expression “public interest” in the initial dilemma. Shifting the onus of proof to the waterboard by the intervention of the farmers’ organisation seems to succeed as the waterboard indeed starts to explain why water supply does not belong to their duties. (“meaning not having to deliver water”) The representative of the farmers’ organisation reacts by naming the duty-bound tasks “maintenance of the water level”. This formulation is a much more far-reaching formulation of the waterboard task than the one used by the waterboard employee (“avoiding emptying of ditches”). Moreover a far-reaching but possible implication of this statement could be that the water level has to be maintained also at moments of huge water use.

Extract 2. §377 - §385

(§377) A: *“Of course the problem is, if you suddenly start the discussion haphazardly so to say, that you will have to intervene even more because then, otherwise you will get too much empty talk. That’s the problem I have with this discussion. Because everybody understands reasonably well that there is a collectivity principle somewhere that should not be (--) in favour of a particular industry or enterprise, a particular city or village etc., because then you will mess it up. And everyone can feel whether you are excessively working for a particular industry or village, or for a sector, exceeding the mandatory task, that you have to think it over, how you are going to deal with that and solve it. Well everyone understands that. The only thing is from how far, if that is how you put it, fruit farming public interest or separate industry sector, then you get this empty talk. While*

the discussion has to be approached making more subtle distinctions. That was the background of my remark.

(§378) B: “(--) *the underlying dilemma ?*”

(§379) A: “*Yes, that is clear, only you have to make the necessary differentiations for achieving a good discussion.*”

(§380) B: “*That’s important because with these dilemma’s we want to go and talk to the public. So then it is very important that we catch the right dilemma, well formulated. So, if you say, well this does not communicate*”

(§381) A: “*Yes indeed, this does not communicate.*”

(§382) B: “*then we have to search for another dilemma or another formulation of it.*”

(§383) A: “*Exactly.*”

(§385) D: “*Maybe the suggestion mr. A did already, about what are generic measures and what should be above generic, maybe that his suggestion is more on the right track.*”

The representative of the farmers’ organisation says that the proposed dilemma will mainly yield empty talk. He draws attention to people’s awareness of the collective principle and to the fact that they can easily recognise the unequal treatment of different parties. In this respect he admits that tasks directed to more specific target groups should be approached in a different way. It is concluded that another formulation of the dilemma is needed. An earlier suggestion of the farmers’ organisation is picked up by the chairman of the meeting.

The interaction sequences described above show how a fruit sector issue (fruit farming, public interest or separate economic sector) is reformulated into an issue about the waterboard’s duty. This reframing is the result of a discursive process with multidirectional communication among the actors.

DISCUSSION

We will discuss here the three aspects of differentiation of issues and stakes that have been described in the results section:

1) The framing of the waterboard moved from an overarching position in the domain and no specific stake to a differentiated position including

both (1) a delimited framing of the domain and a much more specific framing of their own stake, and at the same time (2) an overarching framing of the domain and a general stake.

At the start of the planning process the problem domain was defined as a list of technical problems within pre-defined categories and for which one overall solution could be found. They framed the problem domain as unambiguous and did not take into account who reported on which problem. The general stake of the waterboard was reflected by the concern to deliver a water area plan in time (§44 “*At the end of this year we have to deliver a water area plan for approval*”) and with consent of all interest parties. Therefore they took up the role of convener.

Governmental organizations like waterboards derive convening power from their statutory authority (Gray 1989). However, being a stakeholder in the problem as well, the convener role may become a pitfall. If the convener is suspected of bias, other stakeholders may refuse to participate (Gray 1989). The required neutrality in the problem domain doesn't allow the convener to defend or express specific interests. Additionally, the overarching position of the convener often leads to a shift of responsibility from the other actors towards the convener. Once the convener is aware of his specific interests it is not easy to make the responsibility shared by all the stakeholders around the table.

From the third meeting on, the waterboard left this overarching position. In our opinion this was due to three coinciding events that occurred within the three months between the second and the third advisory group meeting. After the second meeting a reflection workshop had been organised with waterboard and province representatives. Different meanings of interactive planning were discussed. And the roles of waterboard, province and researchers were clarified. It was agreed to give more importance to the core group who started functioning from then on more actively.

In the same period the waterboard did a lot of work in the field measuring watercourses and inspecting technical installations. The measurements were used as input for modeling work about the amount of water that has to be drained and supplied. Inconsistencies in the modeling results showed them the inefficiency of their current models (water drainage models) to simulate water supply. Interestingly, this led them to reflect and conclude that an extra-ordinary water demand problem was not their responsibility.

As a third driver for change we would like to mention the appointment of a new project leader. He observed the situation in the area with fresh eyes and provided his employer new ideas. As an external expert he was less determined by internal routines or relations and therefore could get ideas introduced that were considered impossible before.

The waterboard representatives entered the third meeting with new insights and soon formulated a much more specific stake with the restriction of their mission and responsibility. They didn't position themselves anymore above the process of issue framing but participated in it and framed the domain in a more delimited way, excluding from it an extra-ordinary water demand by fruit sector.

In the course of the meeting the specific interest of the waterboard became more differentiated, gradually including more and more aspects of their stake in the planning process. Through the interaction that took place additional concerns emerged, such as creating imbalances between parties in the area, changing water law, having to enforce measures on people, coordinating policies with province and municipalities, estimating future water demand. Simultaneously the limitation of the problem domain became more and more clear by the aspects that were framed as given.

In addition to this differentiated position they continued acting as a convener. As such the overall commitment to reach an agreement was not lost. During the third meeting, the difficult combination of both roles, convener and interest party, was made feasible by separating the roles over different persons.

2) The farmers' organisation moved to a more specific and internally diversified framing of the problem domain and their stakes in it.

This change was initiated by the waterboard. Their concern not to create imbalances in the area led them to describe the gains and costs of water supply. The conflicting interests of fruit and cattle farmers were discursively constructed through the waterboard's statements and the subsequent discussion. This shows how an actor's interests can be framed by other actors and how interests emerge out of a discursive process of negotiation (Lawrence et al. 1999, pp. 490-493).

The diversified framing of the farmers' stake also led to further development of the issue framing. Pointing to the fruit sector as causing the wa-

ter level fluctuations generated new issue elements to be put on the table. Injustice of water law and scarcity of agricultural land in the area were added by the local farmers' representative and as such also led to a different framing of the issue by fruit and cattle farmers. This sequence of themes in the negotiation shows how interests link actors to issues (Lawrence et al. 1999, p. 492) and how the meaning of these elements develops over the course of the interactive planning process.

Interestingly the parties involved reacted in different ways to the waterboard's statements. The national representative of the farmer's organisation managed not to say anything that was more in favour of one of the two groups. After all the association counts fruit farmers as well as cattle farmers among its members. The fruit farmers' representatives didn't connect nor disconnect to the fruit sectors stake as formulated by the waterboard. The local representative of the farmer's organisation is the only one who confirms the waterboard's frame of the farmers' stake. He points to the disadvantages cattle farmers will be suffering when the watercourses would be enlarged, but only twice and in a moderate way.

As we know from oral communications later in the planning process the representatives of the farmers were concerned about polarisation. Fruit and cattle farmers have been living and working as neighbours in the same area for a long time. Good neighbourliness also is one of their interests. In these circumstances the differences among the two groups seem to be experienced as too difficult, too delicate to talk about. An unfortunate implication of this kind of conflict avoidance and not "doing differences" (Dewulf 2006) is the loss of information that otherwise could be helpful in the decision-making process. Moreover a water area plan that does not differentiate between these two groups will again be confronted with these differences in its implementation phase.

3) The differentiation of issues and stakes went together with changes in interaction. Our results allowed to draw a distinction between the following modes of interaction. *Frame selling* is the presentation of one's own view on the situation without much opportunity to react for the others. It can be characterized by its unidirectional communication and the aim to convince the other party. *Frame filling* is a process of information gathering to further develop or complete one's own view on the situation. It is characterized by bidirectional communication and the aim to consult other parties. *Frame negotiation* is an open communication process with multidirectional exchange. This mode of interaction is especially important in

situations where parties still have to define what has to be negotiated about, explore what the underlying interests are and search for innovative ways to integrate and meet these interests.

Our point of departure is that an agreement has to be forged in the interaction among stakeholders. According to Putnam & Holmer (1992), “Frames or the ways negotiators conceive of problems are co-constructed through interaction as both parties adjust and react to each other’s arguments”; and “Social interaction is the critical instigator of changes in frames”. Our findings from analyzing the interaction in the Kromme Rijn planning process show that different modes of interaction occur of which frame negotiation is the one that allows for the differentiation of issues and stakes.

Frame negotiation in the case described progressed through a variety of issue elements and stakes that were put on the table by different actors. Other actors may connect or disconnect their framing to certain elements. At the end of the meeting many elements were still on the table, this is without being disconnected or disqualified as irrelevant. The possibility to pick them up later in the planning process remains but has not been assured yet. Therefore it is difficult to estimate which level of agreement has been reached.

Frame negotiation is a demanding process. Multidirectional exchange alone is not sufficient for differentiation. In addition to the direction of communication its quality is highly important. In this sense it is remarkable that differentiation of issue framings and stakes occurred in a group of people who met only for the third time. From a group development perspective it is a real challenge to create the necessary safety and possibilities for contact.

CONCLUSIONS

We conclude that differentiation in how issues and stakes are framed is a potentially important kind of change in interactive decision-making processes. In this case, it allowed the waterboard to take up an interested stakeholder role apart from their overarching convening role. This in turn led to a differentiation within the farmers’ stakeholder group, which allowed the different stakes of cattle and fruit farmers to be included in the discussion and search for solutions. Finally it appears that a multidirectional frame

negotiation, which became possible at a certain point in the process, was helpful for the issue and stake differentiations to be discussed openly and developed further in the interactive decision-making process.

REFERENCES

- Bouwen R, Fry R (1991) Organizational innovation and learning. Four patterns of dialog between the dominant logic and the new logic. *Int Studies of Mgt & Org* vol 21, 4:37-51 ME Shaibe, Inc
- Dewulf A (2006) Issue framing in multi-actor contexts: how people make sense of issues through negotiating meaning, enacting discourse and doing differences. Ph.D. dissertation, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium
- Donkersloot-de Vrij M, Greive J, Hovenkamp H, Jonkers G, van der Lee P, Wammer G (1993) *De Stichtse Rijnlanden: geschiedenis van de zuidelijke Utrechtse waterschappen*. Uitgeverij Matrijs
- Gray B (1989) The collaborative process. In: *Collaborating. Finding common ground for multiparty problems*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp 55-94
- Lawrence TB, Phillips N, Hardy C (1999) Watching whale watching. Exploring the discursive foundations of collaborative relationships. *J Appl Behav Sci* vol 35, 4:479-502
- Putnam L, Holmer M (1992) Framing, reframing and issue development. In: Putnam L, Roloff M (eds) *Communication and negotiation*. London, Sage, pp 128-155