



**Elstub, Stephen and Drury, Sara and Escobar, Oliver and Roberts, Jennifer (2018) Deliberative quality and expertise : uses of evidence in citizens' juries on wind farms. In: The Deliberative Quality of Communication Conference 2018, 2018-11-08 - 2018-11-09. ,**

This version is available at <https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/66989/>

**Strathprints** is designed to allow users to access the research output of the University of Strathclyde. Unless otherwise explicitly stated on the manuscript, Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Please check the manuscript for details of any other licences that may have been applied. You may not engage in further distribution of the material for any profitmaking activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute both the url (<https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/>) and the content of this paper for research or private study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge.

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to the Strathprints administrator: [strathprints@strath.ac.uk](mailto:strathprints@strath.ac.uk)

## Deliberative Quality and Expertise: Uses of Evidence in Citizens' Juries on Wind Farm

Stephen Elstub, Sara Drury, Oliver Escobar, Jennifer Robert

Today the global political environment increasingly faces issues that spark tensions between expertise and lived experience. Scientific public problems draw attention towards this tension, as they require negotiation across and through multiple modes of claims and evidence, from technical and scientific to personal and moral (Gastil, 2017; Goodnight, 2005). Forms of democratic innovations, including deliberative approaches such as citizens' juries, have been proposed as a means of managing these tensions and to inform more representative and fairer decision making. But there are questions around participatory processes, scientific public problems, and deliberative quality. Two prominent forms of argumentation in public deliberation processes are derived from expertise and experience. Deliberative quality does not necessarily mean a reliance on either over the other, but rather a more flexible negotiation of different forms of argumentation. Arguments from expertise are referred to as argumentum ad verecundiam, or appeals to authority (Walton, 2010; Woods & Walton, 1974). Yet appeals to expert opinion are not absolute, and may marginalize or ignore the perspectives of citizens. A localized deliberative context invites arguments from experiences, which Frank Fischer (2000: 194-195) labels "local knowledge". These arguments are slightly harder to define as they draw from a number of evidentiary sources, including personal experiences, interests, and local culture and contexts. Questions have been raised around the use and interaction of different forms of argument in public deliberation over scientific issues and the effect on deliberative quality. How, for example, might a public contextualize scientific evidence within localized values and culture? Or how might a public shift away from previously held values when confronted with compelling scientific claims? The 2013-2014 ClimateXChange project "Citizens' juries on wind farm development in Scotland" offers an opportunity to examine how different types of evidence impact deliberative quality in participatory public deliberations. This project organized and held three citizens' juries in three locations in Scotland (Roberts & Escobar, 2015), where the locations varied in proximity to active or proposed windfarms. Each jury comprised 15-18 local citizens who spent two days considering the question: What should be the key principles for deciding about wind farm development, and why? The juries had an information phase when witnesses gave evidence and advocacy on energy, climate change, and wind farms. This was followed by a deliberation phase where the group considered, discussed, and decided their recommendations for key principles to guide onshore wind farm development in Scotland. Using transcripts from the ClimateXChange project, this paper analyses arguments from expertise and arguments from experiences by adopting an interpretative research methodology (Ercan, Hendriks, & Boswell, 2017) and utilizing theories of argumentation (Goodnight, 1982). The analysis identifies prominent forms of argument and considers how they interact and function in decision-making, including when arguments function to positively or negatively impact the deliberative quality. As the juries' experiences and deliberations differed across the locations, the findings here offer insights on discursive contours of the relationship between expertise, evidence, and deliberative quality.

Keywords: experts; deliberation; democracy; citizen jury

Accepted manuscript of the following research output: Elstub, S., Drury, S., Escobar, O., & Roberts, J. (2018). *Deliberative quality and expertise: uses of evidence in citizens' juries on wind farms*. Paper presented at The Deliberative Quality of Communication Conference 2018, Manheim, Germany.