THESIS

CONCEPTUALIZING TRANSNATIONAL DEMOCRATIC NETWORKS: A CASE
STUDY OF WORLD WIDE VIEWS ON BIODIVERSITY

Submitted by

Desirée Fiske

Department of Political Science

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer 2015

Master's Committee:

    Advisor: Michele Betsill

    Dimitris Stevis
    David McIvor
    Peter Taylor

ABSTRACT

CONCEPTUALIZING TRANSNATIONAL DEMOCRATIC NETWORK: A CASE

STUDY OF WORLD WIDE VIEWS ON BIODIVERSITY

Democratic theory has most recently found itself in a 'deliberative

turn.' Extending beyond the capacity maintained by state institutions, the deliberative

turn may be understood as necessary for conditions of democracy to move beyond the

bounds of the nation-state and to incorporate conditions of a globalizing world. As

global governance literature recognizes nuanced abilities to regulate through private

and public interactions, the democratic voice of citizen input is in a shift. Deliberative

democratic theory has found its way into International Relations discussions, as it

proposes methods for transnational democracy. World Wide Views on Biodiversity

(WWVB) is the second transnational citizen deliberation to be held on a global scale,

allowing a window of opportunity to bridge the normative theories with empirical

observation. Identifying WWVB as a *transnational democratic network*, this analysis

simultaneously seeks to inform the project of its pragmatic successes and limitations

while placing WWVB within theories of transnational democracy. Results find

Transnational Discursive Democracy best explains and understands the phenomena of

WWVB. Furthermore, the theoretical findings inform practical implications for the

WWViews Alliance to support network expansion through inclusion and dissemination

practices. Specific recommendations are made to the network based on the analysis of theory and praxis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION: THE DEMOCRATIC DEFICIT

> The frontier between the social and the political is essentially unstable and requires constant displacements and renegotiations between social agents… It is in that sense that it can be called 'political' since it is the expression of a particular structure of power relations. Power is constitutive of the social because the social could not exist without the power relations through which it is given shape.
>
> Chantal Mouffe,
> *On the Political*, 18

Communicative societies have rapidly developed complex ways to organize and identify. Because societies have advanced our capacities to communicate, the coalition of knowledge and power opens an opportunity for global change more than ever before. Increased interactions with political reach have moved beyond the bounds of citizen accountability creating a gap known in literature as the *democratic deficit*. As regulatory and policy outcomes are increasingly made beyond the reach of citizen measures for accountability, literature has begun to address the question of the democratic deficit in the global public sphere (Dryzek 2010). Facing an Anthropocene that requires reconfiguration of the 'political,' my thesis presents an analysis of World Wide Views on Biodiversity, a transnational democratic network hosting global citizen deliberations on biological diversity issues and policies around the world on a single day. [1]

---

[1] For the purposes of this paper, the concepts of (1) Anthropocene and (2) global ecological crises will be accepted as a frame accepted by the Earth Systems Governance report (Biermann et al. 2012).

The Case: World Wide Views on Biodiversity

On September 15, 2012, World Wide Views on Biodiversity (WWVB) conducted the second global citizen deliberation event.[2] The launch of the project was orchestrated by the Danish Board of Technology Foundation (DBTF)[3] and garnered support through transnational connections and networking. With 34 sites spanning across six continents, the event gathered approximately 3,000 citizens from around the world to advise biological diversity negotiations during a global "Day of Deliberation." Lay citizens were chosen to reflect the demographics within each hosting region. Citizens were considered upon age, gender, geographic zone of residence, education level, occupation, and environmental organization affiliation. With a goal to obtain at least 100 citizens for participation per region, the ideal was to have a representative demographic of the region present at the Day of Deliberation. For each site, deliberations were held at tables of 5-8 citizens over the course of eight hours. Citizens voted on the four thematic sessions on topics around biodiversity issues and policies, of two to four questions each, with the option of a national or local session as a fifth. Anonymous votes were cast and uploaded to the WWVB website live. As a transnational network, WWVB collected and presented the results of the citizen deliberations at the Eleventh Conference of Parties (COP11) of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The World Wide Views Alliance

---

[2] The first transnational democratic event occurred in 2009: World Wide Views on Global Warming. See Rask and Worthington, 2012. "The Project," World Wide Views on Biodiversity, accessed May 10, 2014.
[3] During the World Wide Views on Biodiversity project and this analysis, the Danish Board of Technology was defunded by the Danish Parliament. The Danish Board of Technology (DBT) then became the Danish Board of Technology Foundation (DBTF). Both names are used in the report according to appropriateness with the timeliness of the shift.

(WWViews)[4] enhanced global citizen knowledge on biodiversity issues and provided a representative report of the *global citizen voice* in global negotiations.

The Danish Board of Technology and its ambition to host a global citizen deliberation on global warming in 2009 initiated the formation of WWViews. Hosting Danish and European citizen engagement projects (under a similar model of deliberation executed in WWViews), DBT aspired to capitalize on the opportunity of Copenhagen hosting COP15. Scaling up an instituted national and regional project, DBT organized WWViews on Global Warming in 2009 by building regional partnerships and credibility around the COP community. With 50 partners and 38 countries participating, the WWViews on Global Warming network included institutions such as the Museum of Science Boston (United States), Friends of the Baltic (Russia), UNEP-Tongji Institute of Environment for Sustainable Development (China), and Ikhwezi Community College of Education (South Africa). While the establishment of the network surrounds the initial WWViews event, the network has sustained itself through former partners retreating with new partners emerging and committed partners participating for three global deliberations to date.

The DBT continue to occupy the role of global coordinator in the network. The Board was established in 1995 by the Danish Parliament to organize discussions around technology and provide insight for governmental bodies. The DBT became an instrumental tool as a liaison throughout Denmark and Europe hosting citizen

---

[4] Throughout the analysis, World Wide Views on Biodiversity (WWVB) and World Wide Views Alliance/network (WWViews) are used in reference to two different entities: WWVB is the specific network and event around Biodiversity held in September 2012. WWViews refers to the network partners who have been involved with the project either before or since the Biodiversity event.

deliberations frequently. In late 2011, though, the Danish government defunded the Danish Board of Technology. As result, the DBT transformed into the Danish Board of Technology Foundation and carried out the remainder of WWVB organizing as its new entity.

Vast arrays of affiliates make up the network. For instance, WWVB sites included universities, non-profits, non-governmental organizations, government-affiliated agencies, and museums, each with different interests in engaging the project. Review of each sites' history and mission statements (as available) show interests ranging from poverty reduction and addressing environmental crises/vulnerabilities to initiatives for citizen participatory engagement in science and technology topics. Close examination of the network reveals not particularly selective target venues within different regions but rather self-selecting agencies and organizations willing to host the event. Repeat partners such as the Museum of Science Boston and Saint Lucia National Trust participated but new partners also emerged. For example, the Department of Education and the Department of Agriculture, Environmental Affairs and Rural Development now hosted the South African site. Other sites, such as Russia, did not participate at all. Moving from site nodes to individuals constituting these sites, we further see a breakdown of volunteers, financial and in-kind donors, and participants self-selecting to contribute to the project. At the center, though, the Danish Board of Technology operates as the main node and global coordinator. DBT sends frequent email updates to partners, answers specific site questions, and provides the official "okay" to affiliate with the network and host WWViews events.

Introduction to the Project

Democratic theory has most recently found itself in a 'deliberative turn.' Extending beyond the capacity maintained by state institutions, the deliberative turn of democratic theory may be understood as necessary for conditions of democracy to move beyond the bounds of the nation-state and incorporate conditions of a globalizing world. As global governance literature recognizes nuanced abilities to govern through private and public interactions, the democratic voice of citizen input is in a shift. In response to the changing climate, democratic theorists suggest the need for greater deliberative involvement of citizen input in important and pressing global policy issues (Dryzek 2000; Held 2003; Eckersley 2004; Dryzek and Stevenson 2011). Deliberative democratic theory has found its way into International Relations discussions, as it proposes methods for transnational democracy. Theoretically grounded in democratic theory, global governance, and transnational network literature, my thesis informs theoretical discussions of transnational democracy with an analysis of WWVB. Simultaneously, my analysis provides feedback to the WWViews Alliance for future projects based on results from theoretical and empirical analysis of the network. As an active member of WWViews, I propose a phronetic case study of the World Wide Views on Biodiversity event to inform both theory and praxis.

I respond to the integrative call from World Wide Views' proponents to assess practical implications of global deliberation while contributing to the reflective process of the network. "Realizing the potential of global deliberation requires not only continued research efforts but also calls for self-reflection by political actors on how

WWViews-type activity fits into the extant institutional landscape, and what is required to make it fit there" (Worthington, Rask, and Jœger 2012, 284). Academic based goals of the research project intend to advance the initiative as the network continues to organize globally. The project is phronetic in the interest of contributing to the processes of the network, theories of deliberative systems, and transnational democracy. My analysis offers a bridge of theory and praxis to steer theory and method while pragmatically appealing to the application of global citizen deliberation. Moreover, the WWVB study informs my role as site host organizer for the upcoming World Wide Views on Climate and Energy (WWVCE).

Creating a theoretical typology of transnational democracy, I used content analysis and interview coding to identify WWVB within the literature. I collected data from WWViews' documents, press releases, manuals, and websites as well as information on the affiliated organizations of the network. Results from the content analysis were extrapolated to inform interview platforms with six transnational site host managers, integrating firsthand accounts and experiences of network organizing. Maintaining reflexivity was key throughout the process, as the project balances data from interviews and content analyses while remaining mindful to its intended contribution to the WWViews network and theoretical framework. The discussion to follow identifies three core concepts of transnational democracy present in International Relations literature: *Cosmopolitan Nationalism, (Liberal) Global Cosmopolitan Democracy*, and *Transnational Discursive Democracy*. Recognizing disjunction between theory and practice, I intend to balance the two perspectives - empirically as a case study of a

transnational democratic network and theoretically to address transnational democratic theory.

Analysis of documents and interviews present a comparison of transnational democratic theories to the practical implications of network organizing. In results, I present the ways in which praxis aligns with determined theoretical indicators. While I find evidence of all three theories of transnational democracy in the case study of WWVB, indicators of Transnational Discursive Democracy were most frequently coded in the analysis, and therefore, best explains and understands the network. These results are used to provide four recommendations to WWViews for future projects:

(1) S*caling back on the DBTF guidelines* for network participation may invite the opportunity for more partners to join.

(2) *Structures of deliberations* could also be deviated from to incorporate more voices and opportunities for contesting discourses to interact.

(3) The DBTF should also strongly *encourage and support post-deliberation processes* for individual sites, including engaging the grander community with educational materials and results of deliberations.

(4) DBTF could *better facilitate inter-network communication* amongst regional partners and encourage *stronger network ties outside of day-off events*.

With these recommendations, I turn to the network and its unique role in hosting global citizen deliberations.

Where are we going?

I began this research project by asking, *"Where did WWVB stand in global governance literature?"* With interest in the particular design of the WWVB project, the onset of my research began with a curiosity to understand the network within the context of my academic discipline. Through the development of this project, and a process of refining methodology, I realized it was necessary for my role as a social scientist to ask the question, *"Where are we going?"* (Flyvbjerg 2001) Could WWViews be experimenting with a new form of global democracy? Are we participating in the formation of new global democratic governance? Even questions of *"Why do citizen views matter in global negotiations?"* are asked in the undertaking a project with these ideals. I knew early in the research project, my role in the network was active; therefore the design of my research must adequately reflect such nuance. Beginning from a forward-looking question, I followed a path theoretically and empirically guided to present my analytical findings on WWVB and transnational democratic theory.

The following discussion serves as a road map for the grounding of theoretical with empirical studies to provide a bridge for analysis of the network. My analysis of WWVB begins with a literature review that introduces theories of transnational democracy and situates each standpoint. Conversations of transnationalism are introduced in lieu of globalization. Transnational democratic theories are introduced and presented in a typology to highlight differences between the theories and build launching points for the methodological approach. Methods and research design are comprehensively discussed as data was coded in frames of analysis with relations to the

theoretical chart. Drawing from interviews and archival materials, I display the overlap

of theoretical assumptions of transnational democracy and its correlation to coded

results. In the final sections of the thesis, I provide recommendations to expand the

discursive power of WWViews. In the conclusion, I use Bent Flyvbjerg's questions for a

phronetic researcher (2001) to pave a road for future research projects as result of the

analysis's findings. I offer a critical approach to bridging theory and praxis in

transnational democracy.

O, sing to all those who vowed to put down
their nets and spears and hooks whenever
your brilliance slipped through cold waters.
O, may we hear your suffocation song
as the forests fall and the rivers ignite,
as nighthawks swoop and flickers cry.
- Chloé Leisure,
"*Salvelinus fontinalis*: Trout Song" from
A Poetic Inventory of Rocky Mountain National Park 2013, 115

As a rather unique phenomenon for International Relations, World Wide Views on Biodiversity must first be situated within global governance discussions. I identify WWVB as a particular response to the *democratic deficit*, or the absence of citizen input in global policy decisions. Because I illustrate WWVB as a *transnational democratic network* (as opposed to a transnational *advocacy* network or previously identified phenomenon), this chapter begins by outlining what is meant by terms such as 'transnationalism,' 'transnational actors,' and 'transnational networks' and places them within relevant discussions of global environmental governance. Furthermore, the chapter ends with outlining three theories of transnational democracy, as described by Robyn Eckersley, David Held, and John Dryzek. The schools of thought presented are best suited for addressing and placing WWVB within relevant discussions due to its intentions as a transnational democratic network.

Transnationalism

Global interactions have reshaped the directions of International Relations literature, prompting increased discussions of *transnationalism*. Scholars attribute the concept to the increasingly complex movements beyond and between nation-state boundaries. The global economy and accessibility of communication between global citizens has rapidly enhanced the process of globalization (Cox 1983; Rosenau 1995; Risse-Kappen 1995; Held and McGrew 2002; O'Brien and Williams 2010; Viotti and Kauppi 2010; Hay 2013). Globalization offers avenues for communication, accessibility, and flow not previously known in global interactions (Kütting and Rose 2006). Recognizing the increased influence of these interactions under preconceived notions of the state, scholars became interested in globalization as an altering force on state behavior (Haas 1964; Keohane and Nye 1977; Ruggie 2004). Michele Betsill (2006) traces the theoretical shift of transnationalism in three waves: functionalism (Haas 1964), transnational relations (Keohane and Nye 1977), and global governance (Keohane 2003). The progression of academic discussion reflects the pragmatic observation of increased global connectivity and dependency as influence on governance. Global governance had become recognized as a new avenue for formal and informal social, political, and economic governance.

Research in global governance has sought ways to identify the phenomena and its facets. Sol Picciotto recognizes the transition of global governance as once embedded in classical liberalism transformed into a neo-liberal state of (institutionalized) governance and into what is now *post-liberal* governance (Picciotto 2008, 317). Post-

11

liberal governance breaks down the traditional institutionalized boundaries of accountability and legitimacy, reflecting the increasing sphere for public and private regulation and interactions (Picciotto 2008). Scholars identify the concept of *international relations* in association to understanding *increased relations amongst one or more states*, particularly through institutional influence (Viotti and Kauppi 2010). Transnational governance, on the other hand, is trans-boundary, beyond the state.[5] Relations may vary with institutions and citizens but run with greater flexibility, beyond identities bounded to national institutions. Therefore, transnationalism is a more networked than institutionalized concept, causing disruption to institutionalized (state-based) forms of accountability (Picciotto 2008). The influence of transnationalism is felt not only through its disruption of institutionalized accountability but also as a challenge for the global public to scale legitimacy. While nation-states previously constituted public accountability, the global public domain has found it necessary to respond and assert influence by new means.

John Ruggie (2003) cites the emergence of globalization as closely linked to the subsequent emergence of the *new global public domain*. The new global public domain is "an increasingly institutionalized transnational arena of discourse, contestation, and action concerning the production of global public goods, involving private as well as public actors" and moves beyond traditional decision-making bound-ness of the nation-state (Ruggie 2003, 504-505). "It 'exists' in transnational non-territorial spatial formations, and is anchored in norms and expectations as well as institutional networks

---

[5] "Trans-" is defined as "on or to the other side of: across: beyond" by Merriam-Webster online.

and circuits within, across, and beyond states" (Ruggie 2003, 519). Moreover, states become increasingly embedded in frameworks of sociality rather than acting as a system of powers (Ruggie 2003). In other words, as the process of globalization snowballed throughout the 20th century, an increasing amount of private decisions were made with public implications, prompting responses from the *global public domain*, unbounded by spatial or temporal restrictions and with the flexibility to move beyond state-affiliations. The setting for WWViews is found within this non-bounded space as described by Ruggie. While state-affiliations may be present throughout the WWVB network, there is malleability in state influence or identity association between the various sites and participants.

Interjecting in theories of globalization, Compagnon et al. (2012) emphasize the unequal impact on states by process of globalization in historical and social conditions that have affected development and (unequal) resource accessibility and control. Ripple effects of globalization reverberate throughout the global public domain, antagonizing differences. Remaining mindful of the complexity encompassed in concepts of "globalization" and "global governance," I present the study of WWVB with acknowledgements of the dynamics of inherent inequality between nation-states and host sites (Koenig-Archibugi 2003; Ruggie 2003). The evolution of transnationalism understood within the globalization process has triggered rethinking governance and the role of citizens within new governance frames. Within these discussions, means of accountability and legitimacy are being drawn in new forms of macro governance

(networks and sociality) and micro identity (conception of citizenship) (Biermann and Pattberg 2012, 274-275).

The sentiment for accountability raised by Picciotto (2008) responds to a multitude of globally-raised concerns, including questions of humanitarianism, poverty, and ecological crises. As private interests extend beyond and between states, platforms for public debate and opportunities for democratic accountability fall to decisions made beyond the scope of civil society. Concerns about accountability subsequently raise questions about the legitimacy of transnational interactions (Biermann and Pattberg 2012). With private interests finding ways to move beyond regulations of states and out of the hands of formal democratic processes of legitimation, citizen representation becomes bypassed. Global governance literature, therefore, has begun to explore theories of increased demands for citizen participation as complementary systems to transnational interactions (Dryzek 2000; Eckersley 2004; Picciotto 2008, 327; Baker 2009; Bexel et al. 2010). Although transnational relations may be to an extent informal, these relations often impact citizens' lives. Theories of democratic deliberation have been proposed as response to globalization. Transnational democratic deliberations offer a window for debates of accountability, new forums for norm and agenda-setting, and opportunities to legitimize new forms of global governance (Baker 2009).

While the sphere of conceptualizing global interactions shifts, this also means there is a shift in individual identity recognition. National identities have been a formative foundation for individual orientation to the self and others (Anderson 1983;

Haas 2000). While perceptions of a nation can be affiliated with a nation-state, a

national identity is not necessarily bounded to the state but may be bounded to a

common community seeking political power. In building national communities,

individuals develop and respond to society under notions of citizenship, and

particularly as members of nations. Discussions of *transnational citizenship* have

emerged in the literature, creating a space for the conceptualization of, what Jonathan

Fox calls, the *multi-layered citizen* (Fox 2005, 175). The concept of multi-layered

citizenship finds footing in cosmopolitanism and the individual's relation to and

function within the state (Fox 2005; Eckersley 2007). Multi-layered citizenship may take

on two forms of meaning: rights-based and membership-centered (Fox 2005). Rights-

based citizenship refers to the idea of citizenship embedded in a liberal foundation of

rights and accountability by nation-states as citizens engage a social contract. As

national boundaries have blurred, identities have become multicultural and of multiple

relations (Fox 2005). The liberal frame of basic human rights, observable cross- and

trans-boundary, may be observed as a "cosmopolitan citizenship" (Fox 2005, 177). In a

more traditional, neo-liberal sense, individuals may have maintained transnational

citizenship through memberships with two or more states, observing access to

legitimacy and accountability through national accreditation (Fox 2005).

Encountering new understandings of citizenship, therefore, highlights the

evolving role of citizens and brings to light the *evolving role of democracy*. The evolution of

transnationalism then leads us to ask what may be the most effective ways providing

means for accountability as governance scales up transnationally and identities become

less concrete in national bounded-ness? In practice, WWViews acts as a vessel for citizen voice in the global arena. To understand the existence of a global arena, we acknowledge the existence of transnational actors operating within and as a part of global civil society (O'Brien 2005). Within this framework, and building upon understandings of transnational relations, we can understand WWVB as a network of organizations, scientists, universities, governmental institutions, and non-profits working together to exercise democratic principles. As literature on transnationalism welcomes the place for WWVB, I identify the project as a transnational network.

Transnational Actors and Networks

Observations of transnational interactions have propelled further inquiry into *transnational actors* and their collectivity via *transnational networks* within International Relations literature (Betsill 2006; Bexell et al. 2010). Broadly speaking, transnational actors are often accounted for as non-state affiliated actors (Ruggie 2003). The account of WWVB considers the roles of state-affiliated actors as vital to the project, though not acting particularly as representative or on behalf of a national government (Risse-Kappen 1995). The WWVB project will be explained throughout this study as a transnational network as result of observation and testimony in reflection of the network identity.

In theory, at least three forms of transnational actors appear in global civil society: non-governmental organizations (NGOs), transnational networks, and multi-national corporations (MNCs) (Betsill 2006; O'Brien and Williams 2010). A distinction

between players asserting influence transnationally exposes the extent actors operate at various levels, with particular interests inter- and cross-boundary of states. These distinctions, though, expose differences in organization at the global level and help identify exogenous influences. NGOs and MNCs, while complex in their own right, are likely to have a solidified identity, bounded to a state through process of registration and licensing. Transnational networks create identities but may not necessarily have state affiliation, adding to the complexity for researchers to understand the dynamics of a network and conduct empirical studies (Betsill 2006). Because the WWViews Alliance is not an NGO nor MNC, the fluidity of actors involved in organizing better resemble networks. For example, in the study of Cities for Climate Protection (CCP), Betsill and Bulkeley (2006) identify the significance of CCP through its recognition as a transnational network and its ability to remain simultaneously state and non-state, operating at levels of governance from local to global. The authors frame the network within a scale of multileveled governance to fully encapsulate the dynamics and conditions of the network (Betsill and Bulkeley 2006).

Furthermore, studies of transnational networks have identified three forms of organization: epistemic communities (Haas 1989), transnational advocacy networks (Keck and Sikkink 1999), and social movements (O'Brien 2000; Betsill 2006). As International Relations literature adapts new ways of understanding global governance so does the ability to empirically describe and explain network organization and capacity of influence. I suggest WWViews operates similarly to a transnational advocacy network (Keck and Sikkink 1999) encompassing affiliates of epistemic

communities and social movements. Transnational advocacy networks may be understood as the entity scholars use to describe affiliates of actors operating under shared interests in norms or policy influence. Keck and Sikkink (1999) see value in the role of transnational advocacy networks as *communicative structures*. While the networks may seek to influence policy changes, there is intrinsic value in the ability to enter into larger policy communities to open dialogue and initiate political space for debates about change amongst varying stakeholders and perspectives (Keck and Sikkink 1999). In other words, advocacy networks have interest in discursive means as method for organization. The WWViews Alliance seeks to broaden the scope of advocacy by opening dialogue and influencing global negotiations through empowering citizen voice.

Although the focus of WWVB may be studied as a transnational advocacy network framed around concerns for international biodiversity policy, it may also be understood, as it is in this study, as an advocate of transnational democracy. While one may assess the network in its capacity as an entity seeking to influence international biodiversity agreements (through studies of citizen opinion; organization/stakeholder interests; or in continuation of dialogue surrounding biodiversity policy), the rotation of topics by the WWViews Alliance to coordinate with UN COPs suggests a grander concept of organizing for democratic purposes. To more accurately describe the transnational actions of WWVB, I suggest linguistically moving away from the word *advocacy* and suggest highlighting the distinct action of the democratic processes in practice by the network. With two World Wide Views events completed and a third

being organized, consistency of the network is found in its ideological principle of scaling up democratic accountability through recognition (and consideration) of citizen opinion in international agreements. Furthermore, I present the study of WWVB as a *transnational democratic network*. In its nuance, the network's organizing is viewed as an experiment in transnational democracy and not only a political space to discuss possibilities of hypothetical design. To highlight the democratic action of the network, three subfields of literature – transnational networks, global ecological governance, and democratic theory – overlap to provide insight to theories of transnational democratic networks.

Transnational Networks, Global Ecological Governance, & the Democratic Deficit

Transnational networks have begun to organize in response to the complexity of ecological crises. While Peter Haas (1989) observes the formation of an epistemic community and its influence on Mediterranean pollution policies, Betsill and Bulkeley (2004) provide an analysis of a multi-city climate change advocacy network. The empirical studies observe the network under observation for their abilities to influence environmental policy. Though WWVB appealed to policy initiatives of COP11, citizen representation remained the primary target for the network. The network did not establish expectations for policy influence; rather, formal recognition by the UN Secretariats and COP were set as target goals. WWVB sought democratic legitimacy as a network. It was a strategic decision by the network to focus on environmental initiatives due to the perceived imminent need for citizen representation within

international debates. Nonetheless, the focus of the project, biodiversity, speaks to the prominence and appeal of connecting globally on ecological crises. Studies, such as those aforementioned by Haas (1989) and Betsill and Bulkeley (2004), further support the increased accounts of transnational networks forming under pretense of ecological issues.

Speth and Haas (2006) describe three ways of understanding biological diversity loss: "the genetic variety within a given species; the millions of individual species of plants, animals, and microorganisms; and the diversity of different types of ecosystems such as alpine tundra, southern hardwood bottomlands, or tropical rainforests" (Speth and Haas 2006, 39-40).   Because we understand the intense interconnectedness of ecological crises, losses in these areas are often attributed to the unequal process of globalization, particularly as species loss is predominantly felt in the 'less developed' states. The multi-scalar level of influence of biodiversity loss carries additional weight in the complexity of understanding, mitigating, or adapting to the issue. The complexities of ecological issues are reflected not only in the nature of ecosystems but also in the human systems and decision-making procedures intertwined (Dryzek 2013). Hence, research in global ecological governance has emphasized the need to understand the multi-dimensional phenomena.

Scholars have begun to examine the ways governance may react in institutional design to cope with problems of the environment (Bocking 2004; Bulkeley 2005; Speth and Haas 2006; Biermann and Pattberg 2012; Bulkeley et al. 2012). Moreover, as globalization transforms the ways in which the global public domain understands its

relationship with the nation-state, there have been increased discussions exploring deliberative democratic responses to ecological crises and issues of resources (Eckersley 2004; Baber and Bartlett 2005; Bäckstrand et al. 2010; Dryzek 2013). Ideals of deliberative democratic perspectives on ecological governance are in part due to the *deliberative turn* in democratic and critical theory (Dryzek 1990; Habermas 1992; Rawls 1997; Mouffe 2000). Within the scope of global environmental governance, therefore, the deliberative turn represents "…increased attention in environmental politics to procedural qualities such as participation, dialogue, transparency and accountability" (Bäckstrand et al. 2010, 3). Moreover, as supplemental forms of citizen representation and participation are sought to increase citizen input on matters beyond the state, global ecological scholarship calls for citizen participation as necessary feedback into the complexity of eco-socio-political debates.

Theoretical starting points of empirical investigation into the deliberative turn in environmental governance include such conversations about legitimacy, representation and participation but under assumptions of ecological rationality (Lövbrand and Khan 2010). Bexell et al. (2010) also emphasize participation and accountability as recurrent values within democratic theory. Measures created based on input and output data help pinpoint areas of increased legitimacy, representation, and participation and explore questions of environmental governance and increased democratic processes. Baber and Bartlett (2005) propose a typology consisting of three concepts to understanding environmental democracy based on foundations of rationale: liberal rights; public reason; and discourse. The study of WWVB, in a way, merges the tasks of

these conversations, placing it back in International Relations and without preconceived notions of ecological thought. Outcomes of WWVB are not to necessarily persuade decision-makers on prioritizing biodiversity but to create a space for citizen input on topics elite politicians and stakeholders make on behalf of the public at-large. As discussed above, this gap in international decision-making is referred to as the *democratic deficit* (Aart Scholte 2002; Bray 2009; Held 2009; Bexell, Tallberg, and Uhlin 2010). WWVB was a transnational experiment of deliberative democracy using the catapulting appeal of biodiversity as grounds for legitimizing formal global citizen response.

The project enters into these discussions through its interest in the global democratic deficit. Simply stated, the WWViews Alliance believes that citizen input is missing from global decision-making processes. In fact, many scholars begin from this axiological standpoint, including the transnational democratic theorists discussed Robyn Eckersley, David Held, and John Dryzek. In relation to the scale of climate change, Dryzek and Stevenson (2011) state, "The rise of political pre-eminence of the climate change issue creates new challenges because the issue is so clearly global, and so clearly one that has eluded existing governments of all sorts, as well as existing transnational and global political processes" (Dryzek and Stevenson 2011, 1865). Issues of this scale permeate through international affairs - from economic transactions to effects of climate change into questions of humanitarianism. Decisions on these scales are largely made beyond scope of citizen input. Furthermore, discussions of transnational democratic theory have begun to serve as ideological response to the

global dilemmas presented. As a pragmatic attempt at global citizen input, or bridging the democratic deficit, World Wide Views on Biodiversity must be appropriately situated amongst prominent theories and debates of transnational democratic theory.

Transnational Democratic Theory

In efforts to understand the possible path for democratic citizen response to globalization and to place the WWVB network within a theoretical scheme, it is first necessary to identify the literature's framing of conceptions and conditions for transnational democracy. Common threads throughout the literature include (1) acknowledgement of the democratic deficit in global politics, (2) an increased role of civil society in global political decisions, and (3) avenues for increased democratic roles for civil society. I have identified three transnational democratic theories within International Relations literature: (1) Cosmopolitan Nationalism, (2) (Liberal) Global Cosmopolitan Democracy, and (3) Transnational Discursive Democracy. These theories of transnational democracy are predominately developed from the work of Robyn Eckersley, David Held, and John Dryzek. While Cosmopolitan Nationalism (Eckersley) focuses on reforming current national institutions, Global Cosmopolitanism (Held) looks for global democratic reform through international institutions. Discursive Democracy (Dryzek) emphasizes ideas and discourse through global interactions.

Cosmopolitan Nationalism

The Cosmopolitan Nationalist approach to transnational democracy accepts the platform for cosmopolitan ideals but bounds them to the institutional frame of the

nation-state, albeit not exclusively (Eckersley 2007). Robyn Eckersley's account of

Cosmopolitan Nationalism extends itself beyond the boundaries of states but adopts a

global, cosmopolitan, ideal. The role of national institutions remains as a political

vessel to the international sphere. Citizens, though, reason through the deliberative

process in conditions of reciprocity, publicity, and accountability (to constituents and

other citizens, to citizens of other political systems, and to future generations) (Dryzek

2000, 17; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Eckersley 2007, 675). Eckersley's position for

civil society, therefore, influences foreign policy, legislation, and embeddness of

national institutions. Furthermore, Habermasian conditions for communicative

rationality and consensus are intended to appeal to national institutions (Habermas

1997; Rehg 1998; Dryzek 2000).

The concept behind Eckersley's *Green State* (2004) foremost lays out its priority

for instituting ecological ideals into the democratic state. The "green state" seeks to

assert ecological responsibility in the political realm through constitutional structures.

> By "green state" . . . I mean a democratic state whose regulatory ideals and
> democratic procedures are informed by *ecological* democracy rather than *liberal*
> democracy. Such a state may be understood as a *postliberal* state insofar as it
> emerges from an immanent (ecological) critique, rather than from an outright
> rejection, of liberal democracy. (Eckersley 2004, 2)

Establishing an ontological starting point, Eckersley approaches the theoretical design

with emphasis in theoretical traditions of critical, ecological thought (Eckersley 2004).

Building upon an immediate reaction to global ecological crises, Cosmopolitan

Nationalism rests upon national institutions, as established, based on reliability and

prioritization. Eckersley suggests capitalizing on institutions in place to address

immediate concerns of social and ecological justice and based off of citizen membership of nation-states.

Eckersley's adapts a Habermasian approach towards consensus-building within a specified territory, pivoting on the concept of *membership*, as it encompasses overlapping and contesting interests (Eckersley 2007). With a cosmopolitan ideal of citizenship, Eckersley adopts a conception of all-affected within the jurisdictions of national institutions and furthermore represented globally. Challenging the liberal scaling up of citizenry (or the 'we') in efforts to appeal to international institutions, Eckersley suggests, "The missing 'we' follows from the fact that the global identity associated with cosmopolitan global citizenship lacks two key elements that help to define a meaningful collective identity: collective continuity over time and collective differentiation from others" (Eckersley 2007, 682). As the public sphere is observed to be in consistent interaction with national institutions, Eckersley relies on national identity to bound citizens to one another for purposes of consensus and humanitarianism. While Cosmopolitan Nationalism is still bounded by national institutions, it is more open to debate within the public sphere than liberal democracy; civil society is understood to have a dialectical effect on legislative processes (Dryzek 2000). As citizens increasingly deliberate on and directly with constitutional processes, Cosmopolitan Nationalism assumes a greater influential process by citizens on national institutions.

The process of dialectical relations between the public and legislative may be explained in terms of Habermasian democratic theory and the relationship between

processes of communication and administrative powers (Habermas 1997; Dryzek 2000).

In other words, there is a duality of modern law in its procedural formation through a

deliberative public as it exhibits pressure on responsive democratic institutions (Rehg

1998). Deliberation on democratic evolution, therefore, occurs under conditions of

communication rationality or the consensus of the best argument (Dryzek 2000).

Democratic amendments and responses to transnationalism may encompass

cosmopolitan ideals but they are to be shared and deliberated upon within national

institutions. Eckersley acts as a proponent for these methods as means to (1)

acknowledge effectiveness of national democratic institutions already embraced and (2)

to work on institutions from the inside-out rather than developing anew (Eckersley

2004; Eckersley 2007). Ideally, fora for citizen deliberations would open in national

institutions.

    As a thoughtful extension and critique of liberal democracy, Eckersley's proposal

of Cosmopolitan Nationalism in response to transnationalism is criticized by John

Dryzek as conceding to a non-critical enough response to the problems of which liberal

democracy has effectively held in place – including the reliance on national institutions

that may appear to be failing in a post-liberal governing world (Dryzek 2000).

Eckersley's conception of Cosmopolitan Nationalism, though, is not static in design.

Rather, the theoretical position of Eckersley's Cosmopolitan Nationalism holds a

position of imminent global ecological crises, prescribing and interpreting democratic

response in lieu of this sense of urgency.

(Liberal) Global Cosmopolitan Democracy

(Liberal) Global Cosmopolitan Democracy emerges from the liberal-institutionalist approach to democracy observed in democratic nation-states but seeks to 'scale it up' to accommodate the international sphere. Proponent of Global Cosmopolitan Democracy, David Held supports the formation of democratic procedures to conform to a role within international institutions and institution-building (Held 2003; Held and Patomaki 2006). Similar to Eckersley, Held adopts a cosmopolitan ontology in that all those who are affected should be represented in the democratic process. Moreover, the theoretical tradition is strongly communitarian[6] and liberal in its pursuit of justice (Rawls 1997; Goodin 2003). Recognizing cosmopolitan elements embedded in global institutions, Held believes they have not served the purpose well to date and have ". . . by no means generated a new deep-rooted structure of cosmopolitan accountability and regulation" (Held 2003, 172). The primary actors within Held's theory are representative of public cosmopolitan liberal ideals, including concepts of liberty, prosperity, and individualism, devised from agreed upon notions of justice.

Liberal democracy is fundamentally based on the reasoning of rational decisions made by the public and entrusted in elected leadership. Institutions such as courts and legislative bodies that directly contribute to constitution-building are the main fora for democratic development and influence (Dryzek 2000). Institutions responsible for democratic evolution require and constitute liberal rights as means to influence the

---

[6] While a theory of communitarianism maintains factions and contestations within the theory at its own right, we may generally understand communitarianism as a relationship of mutual support of and for the "community" (Bronner 1999, 41-54).

democratic processes (Dryzek 2000; Held and Patomaki 2006). In building a foundation

for democracy on these agreed upon principles, higher-level institutional venues (and

officials) advise the democratic process with the rationale of common good in mind.

Citizen deliberation is, therefore, not a normal process of government arrangements but

may effectively contribute to the democratic process through mechanisms of voting and

prioritizing the pluralistic components of a democratic society (Rawls 1997; Dryzek

2000; Held and Patomaki 2006). Held offers the opportunity to increase legitimacy in

international institutions, such as forums and subdivisions of the United Nations and

international courts. Furthermore, legitimacy is given to particular populations affected

by events or phenomena, and accountability is provided through constitutions

supported by institutions and judicial processes.

Global Cosmopolitan Democracy, as adopted by Held, finds a process of

reasoning through Rawlsian ideals of public reason and ration (Rawls 1997). Rawls

highly emphasizes the concept of justice as means to verify democratic procedures, and

democratic institutions reciprocally verify justice through the belief and ability of the

public to establish and constitute reason (Baber and Bartlett 2005). In consideration of

the conditions of transnationalism, public reason would be demonstrated and reflected

in regional and international institutions in response to legal procedures founded by

public reasoning and shared ideals. "A cosmopolitan polity can only be satisfactorily

entrenched if a division of powers and competencies is recognized at different levels of

political action and interconnectedness – levels which correspond to the degrees to

which public issues stretch across borders and significantly affect diverse populations"

(Held 2003, 174). Bridging institutional structure and cosmopolitan ideals, Held (2003) recognizes international institutional fallacies, but at the same time, is optimistic of powers of deliberation, reason, and common good to reshape political space.

Global Cosmopolitan Democracy does not present itself without substantial critiques that have spurred other approaches to transnational democracy. In acceptance of liberal democracy, there is a simultaneous, inherent acceptation of the economic and social powers of concern to critical theory (Dryzek 2000). Moreover, it is also critiqued in its transfer of high politics from national to international appeal without demonstration of sufficiency in international institutions and law to adequately adopt and respond (Dryzek 2000; Held and Patomaki 2006). Remaining optimistic to the notions of cosmopolitanism and its demonstration (or strife) in law and justice, Held highlights the global humanitarian intentions in programs and divisions of international institutions as promising and forthcoming arenas to continue the multilateral, multilayered, cosmopolitan governance (Held and McGrew 2002), granting international institutions the appropriate arena for transnational democratic representation.

Transnational Discursive Democracy

Rather than embracing liberalist notions of democratic formation, including reliance on traditional liberal institutions, John Dryzek is a proponent for a bottom-up based response to transnationalism through methods of discursive democracy (Dryzek 2000). Transnational Discursive Democracy theoretically bridges the critical

components of Habermasian democracy, such as the relevance and significance of communicative action, with Chantal Mouffe's discussion of agnostic pluralism (or radical democracy) (Dryzek 1990; Habermas 1992; Mouffe 2000). He gives prominence to values of inclusion and pluralism within the ideal of democracy as people come together through experiences and interactions. Similar to Habermas, Dryzek suggests public spheres remain an important venue for democratic discussions (Dryzek 2000). Dryzek, though, establishes a much more flexible structure and expectation for democratic processes – unconstrained by institutional foundationalism and relevant in social and cultural life in forms of public action including protests to formal deliberations (Dryzek 2000). Discursive Democracy is not bounded by institutions of state or identity, but rather, is founded in a communicative base of similar interests.

Civil society is therefore engaged as the venue for appropriate discursive breakdown of intersubjectivity and the generation of public opinions as outcomes of contestations (Dryzek 2000). The communicative power of citizen discourse has direct influence on the process and can inform and transform democracy as it finds appropriate, unbounded by institutional expectations (Dryzek 2000). Moreover, there are no vivid distinctions and expectations for what democracy should look like, rather, it is embraced as a continually evolving process (Mouffe 2000). Here is where the bridge between Habermas and Mouffe is built as the approach adopts a post-structrualist understanding of discursive consideration and pretense to understanding a transforming democratic system. Consensus, in the Habermasian prescription, is not

theoretically sound as citizens' deliberation is constantly within a paradigm of antagonism and contestation.

Essential to Transnational Discursive Democracy is its deliberative and communicative core (Dryzek 1999). The deliberative component not only fosters democratic evolution but also perpetuates democratic identity as it reaches beyond boundaries of nation-states and encompasses contesting ideals of identity (Dryzek 1999; Dryzek 2000). The process of reasoning is founded on the politics of identity, contestation, and dialogue as citizens work through differences to address social disputes, and consequently, evolving the democratic process. Civil society organizing in forms of networks, protests, and deliberations is legitimized as it dialectically influences institutions and push for changes. Discursive Democracy embraces transnationalism and envisions itself as the most radical democratic shift. Breaking from formal institutions and cosmopolitan ideals, Transnational Discursive Democracy finds home in the discursive power of civil society – inclusive of networks, non-governmental organizations, and social movements.

However, Discursive Democracy finds critique for its lack of standalone existence from liberal democracy (e.g. without liberal democracy there would be no critique for radical democracy) (Dryzek 2000). Moreover, as much as Discursive Democracy seeks to break from liberal democracy, it may not necessarily do so successfully. Furthermore, Eckersley challenges the promises of Transnational Discursive Democracy as being too extreme of measures, as national democracy has been relatively successful and may be best established to take on the challenges of

transnational regulation and identities (Eckersley 2004). Dryzek, on the other hand,

illuminates the possibilities of Discursive Democracy:

> While allowing that deliberation can occur within (or sometimes about) the
> structures of the liberal state, detaching discursive democracy from liberal
> constitutionalism also opens our eyes to a host of other democratic possibilities:
> In the contestation of discourses in the publics sphere, in the international system
> (where there is no liberal constitution), even across the boundaries between
> humanity and nature. (Dryzek 2000, 175)

Contrary to both Held and Eckersley, Dryzek recognizes an opportunity to detach from

traditional forms of constitutionalism and embraces the space for democratic purposes.

A distinctive wedge emerges between traditions of theory and ideological values

amongst the concepts of transnational democracy. While all three acknowledge a shift

in democratic possibilities, Dryzek positions Discursive Democracy as non-prescriptive.

Cosmopolitan Nationalism, (Liberal) Global Cosmopolitan Democracy, and

Transnational Discursive Democracy all present distinct approaches to pursue or

conceptualize transformations into transnational democracy. With different values

prominent – ecological justice, global liberalism, and pluralism – each pave a different

path with different goals for how to readdress the limitations of state-based democracy.

The three approaches to transnational democracy are presented to inform the World

Wide Views project as a phenomenon. The process of analysis will be elaborated on in

the following section as I present the typology as an analytical tool and attempt to shed

light on the practicalities of transnational democratic exercises in lieu of the authors'

discussions.

METHODOLOGY & RESEARCH DESIGN: THE PHRONETIC RESEARCHER

> Local knowledges, even tacit knowledges, that cannot be taught a prior, grown from the bottom up, emerging out of practice, forgoing the hubris of seeking claims to a decontextualized universal rationality stated in abstract terms of false precision. Add a sense of praxis, seeking the ability to push for change, leaven it with an appreciation of the ineliminable presence of power, and this phronetic social science can help people in ongoing political struggle question the relationships of knowledge and power and thereby work to change things in ways they might find more agreeable and even satisfying.
> - Sanford F. Schram,
> "Return to Politics: Perestroika, Phronesis, and Post-Paradigmatic Political Science"
> In *Making Political Science Matter* 2006, 28

This study of World Wide Views on Biodiversity seeks to provide a holistic overview of the network structure and ideology behind the project. In setting out, I designed semi-structured interviews with the Global Coordinator of WWVB and site host managers from around the network. Furthermore, I utilized available web-based content to review, open code, theoretically code, and inform the developed theoretical and pragmatic typologies. As a qualitative research project, the scope of my analysis remained within and amongst the transnational network. The qualitative methodology used for the project was chosen as most suitable to address the research questions proposed, allowing space for the flexibility and creativity necessary to conceptualize and interpret discourse in lieu of theoretical concepts of transnational democracy while narrowing my focus on the project as a specific case study. The foundation for WWVB in transnational democratic theory will create a next step to further analyzing the repeated processes of the World Wide Views Alliance as a phenomenon. Conducting

qualitative research allows for a dialectic experience with the project and organizers, fundamentally building into the theoretical understanding of the project. Through the process of the research, the qualitative role evidently solidified its necessity as it led to new opportunities for content access, snowball interviewing, and networking opportunities within the WWViews network for the researcher.

In this section, I will provide an in depth discussion of the methodology used and the design implemented to carry out the study. I begin by outlining the importance of bridging theory and praxis followed by a necessary situating of myself in the WWViews Alliance. The chapter then develops the case study approach through the lens of Constructivism and phronetic research. In the final sections, I outline theoretical and pragmatic typologies that have guided the results of this report. The typologies are sorted by theories of transnational democracy and seven indicators identified through close readings of the theories to help differentiate between the three. The chapter concludes with these typologies to lead into results of situating WWVB within these discussions.

Theory and Praxis

This research was designed to analyze WWVB for the first time as a transnational democratic network. In so doing, I operate in a space between theory and praxis to expose the gaps inherent between the theoretical conceptions for transnational democracy and how transnational democracy has been put into practice. The expectations for a complete theory-praxis alignment has never been set by myself or

any involved with the network, but rather, it pragmatically serves as an opportunity to connect academic thought with pragmatic attempt. The research design reflects the intent to bridge theory and praxis and expand the academic conversation of the WWViews Alliance. It is a theoretical standpoint of this research project that there is a global democratic deficit and a need for more direct citizen input in global negotiations.

In efforts to accommodate the needs, expectations, and breadth of the project, the qualitative nature of the design has allowed for continual reflexivity and dialect accounts of the event, researcher interpretation and engagement with materials, and non-empirical academic discussions. Methodologically working between the dichotomy of theory and praxis creates the opportunity to melt and muddy the in-between to emerge strong, efficient accounts and representation of how either starting point may interpret, learn, and adopt from the other. The intent of the project outcomes will be directed to five outlets: (1) academic understandings of transnational democratic networks and WWViews, (2) theoretical discussions of transnational democracy, (3) the WWViews network and DBTF, (4) civil society (that of the network and grander interested public), and (5) informing my own organizing of World Wide Views on Climate and Energy in Summer 2015.

Situating the Self

In the interest of clarity, I will begin by reviewing my role within WWVB and the WWViews Alliance. It is first important to recall the scale and complexity of the network: As a transnational democratic network, the WWViews Alliance has

conducted two global deliberative events. The first was in 2009 on Global Warming and the second on Biodiversity in 2012. As the study will display, the network is diverse and interconnected often through supportive, regional networks. For WWVB, the United States was represented in four national sites - Massachusetts, Washington D.C., Colorado, and Arizona – through the coordination of the Expert & Citizen Assessment of Science & Technology (ECAST). As a recent graduate, I volunteered with the Massachusetts host site.

My association with ECAST came in spring 2012 leading up to the Day of Deliberation. My role in organizing the Boston site was rather ad hoc and responsive to needs as they arose, inclusive of recruiting citizen volunteers, reaching out to those chosen to participate, organizing citizen data, and aiding as a research assistant. I actively recruited citizen volunteers throughout Western Massachusetts and, occasionally, the Greater Boston Metro area, organizing tabling opportunities at farmers' markets and malls, distributing flyers, and meeting with affiliates of interest. I regularly attended meetings with fellow Massachusetts's organizers (from University of Massachusetts Amherst and Museum of Science Boston) and less frequently with the greater ECAST network (typically via phone conference but including a national kick-off gathering in Washington D.C.). On the Day of Deliberation, I participated as a research assistant for a former professor, conducting observation at one table of 5-8 participants for the entire day. Prior to the event, I assisted with survey data coding and participant designation coding to submit to the network as final overview of Boston participants. Furthermore, I conducted a single interview with a Nigerian site host

manager for a research project executed from Technische Universität (TU) in Berlin, Germany.

In the context of ECAST, I sat on the fence between active membership and complete membership roles (Adler and Adler 1987). Conducting research and contributing to broader network support, I continue to slide on the spectrum towards complete member (Adler and Adler 1987). In the context of the WWViews Alliance, I teeter, rather, between peripheral and active membership (Adler and Adler 1987). Considering ECAST's role in the network assumes my active membership, but in consideration of my role in ECAST in the scope of the network, I maintain peripheral membership due to my distance from the network core. In understanding the dynamics and hierarchical structure of the network, the DBTF may be understood as the central organizing point and the 'network core' entity. Therefore, ECAST may be seen as peripheral entity to the WWVB project dissemination.

I am now in the process of organizing World Wide Views on Climate and Energy (WWVCE) in Fort Collins, Colorado for Summer 2015. My responsibilities have shifted to site host organizer, and I attended the global coordination meeting in Paris, France and national coordination meeting in St. Paul, Minnesota. Through my involvement during the WWVB project, I have gained a favorable reputation within the network, and it was in fact this project that spurred my proposal to ECAST to take on WWVCE. As my involvement with the network becomes more embedded, the fruition of the research goals and significance of this analysis for the network become even more

pragmatic. Through my work as a member of the WWViews Alliance, I assume the role
as a Constructivist and *phronetic researcher*.

On Constructivism & *Phronesis*

As a theoretical approach to International Relations, constructivism developed to
emphasize the social dimensions as contribution and influence to international change
(Fierke 2013). Contrasting dominant field perspectives of realism and liberalism,
constructivists broadly interpret reality as socially constructed (Fierke 2013). Social
foundations of norms, rules, and values become intersubjective amongst individuals,
perpetuating a causal cycle between individuals and global systems, such as (loosely
defined) institutions, regimes, and values. Constructivism balances a need for
understanding and explaining within the field and accounts for both domestic and
international change and transformation.   Going beyond arbitrary identities of
countries, nationalism, security, institutions, and cooperation, constructivism defines
the international sphere as a reciprocal process between all whom have contributed to
its construction. The nature of the study is founded on constructivism as a
methodological understanding and application to research and is reflected in the
qualitative research in design.

Emanuel Adler (1997) and John Ruggie (1998) utilize constructivism in a broad,
exploratory fashion as an approach to understand International Relations. According to
Adler, constructivism can "lead to new theoretical and empirical ways of
understanding international reality" (Adler 1997, 320). In this fashion, constructivism is

a pragmatic approach to social science as it utilizes its tools of intersubjectivity, *Verstehen*, and mediation to understand and explain the international world (Adler 1997, 325-329). Moreover, there are no "given" concepts in International Relations, and constructivists must straddle a middle ground "to address the question of which interpretations and whose interpretations becomes social reality" (Adler 1997, 337).

While constructivist application and particular theory in context may vary, the value of constructivism in International Relations exists in its ability to explore prior ''givens'' and theories of international interaction and take consideration for social dynamics behind these accepted concepts. Constructivism often seeks to answer the *how* in International Relations as opposed to the *why*. Expanding beyond values, institutions, rules, and actors, constructivism seeks to understand and explain the dynamics that contribute to the interplay of these ideas and material arrangements. In *Making Social Science Matter*, Bent Flyvbjerg offers four value-rational questions to provide guidance for, which he identifies as, a *phronetic* researcher (2001, 60):

1) Where are we going?

2) Who gains, and who loses, by which mechanisms of power?

3) Is this desirable?

4) What should be done?

Constructivism, as an approach to phronetic research, offers the ability to answer the fundamental questions under reflection in *phronesis* related to value-laden interest and in contribution to ongoing processes. These questions inherently ask not only *why*

is this a topic of interest, but also *how* do we understand these mechanisms that have come into play in the study.

Flyvbjerg (2001) adopts *phronesis* as presented by Aristotle. Flyvbjerg situates *phronesis* within the same field as *episteme* and *techne* to explain its relation to the social sciences. *Episteme* is the intellectual virtue of what is to be or what can be known as scientific knowledge, independent of context, and rational and universal in application (Flyvbjerg 2001). On the other hand, *techne* represents what is known as craft, art, or skill, dependent on the context based of a tangible activity (Flyvbjerg 2001). *Phronesis*, though, moves beyond these concepts to inform on values and ethics of society and incorporates rational decisions on context-dependent events (Flyvbjerg 2001). *Phronesis* considers rationality of context to best inform on ethics, on good and bad, and intends itself to be deliberated in and with regards to societal morals and perception. While *phronesis* recognizes the value of a rational, well-informed conclusion of *episteme*, it limits itself in proclamation of a universal known. Within the same stroke, a universal known would not be possible to conclude based on the context-dependent and variable conditions understood in *techne*. *Phronesis* utilizes both the rational experience of explanation and the contextual understanding to inform the outcome in consideration of values and ethics. In this study, I assume the role of a phronetic researcher, valuing the deliberative democratic response to the global democratic deficit. Phronetic research constructs a theory of the particular social phenomena within its context rather than assuming a position with expectations of a universal, objective theory of *all* transnational networks and deliberative practices.

While the questions Flyvbjerg has designed seek to expose the ground-level implications of the conducted research, research is forced to expose the concepts of understanding and explanation to how the above are answered. One may not explain *where* they are going without initially interpreting *why* they are there. In a similar fashion, the question of power extends itself to the question of *how* in the particular context of the study. Methodologically, constructivism offers resolution to the question of *how;* in its elaboration on specifics, the approach extends to a holistic understanding of the conditions in the study. Phronetic research is fundamentally concerned with asking the question of *how* to best understand the context in addition to its inquiry of *why* (Flyvbjerg 2001).

While constructivism is not typically discussed as a methodology, it is an important analytical tool for phronetic research and my approach through situating WWVB in global governance debates. Constructivists, in general, develop the researched world within an axiology of intersubjectivity of social facts and knowledge (Wendt 1992; Adler 1997; Ruggie 1998; Hynek & Teti 2010). Rational assumptions within particular context are to be demonstrated under a reflexive vision as constructivism builds the path for the 'middle ground' or 'explanatory understanding' approach (Adler 1997; Ruggie 1998). Operating as a narrative for the WWViews study, constructivism seeks to bridge the gap in understanding as it best contributes to relational and contextual explanations.

Case Study Research Design

In order to better understand how transnational networks contribute to the democratization of global environmental governance, I conduct a case study of WWVB as an instance of a transnational democratic network. This case study relies heavily on qualitative interviews, data analysis, and coding (Yin 2009). Consequently, the role of the particular researcher includes the ability to remain adaptive and flexible to new encounters of opportunity and to utilize the context of the study to guide further analysis (Yin 2009). Moreover, a case study must exemplify fairness through the inclusion of diverse voices and by opening up its research to appropriate debate and dialogue.

Sanford Schram (2006) advocates for the dialogical and collaborative opportunities offered by case studies. Case studies open the doors to extensive qualitative research, including interviews by those directly impacted in the study as polyphony of representative voices (Flyvbjerg 2001). In return, this may orchestrate a reciprocal process of social action as actors become informed, involved, and aware of the implications of the study. The dialectical process offered in the case study of WWVB may provide implications of dialogue between the network sites, DBTF, and the participants involved in the deliberative exercise. Initiating a review of the contextual matters of event sites, this study intends to spark discussion for improvement of the process. Obtaining a holistic grasp of context around the network and in particular sites, the study is best informed to advise improvements to the network while connecting the discussion to theoretical discussions of transnational democratic

networks. Beginning with questions of how to interpret WWVB in transnational democratic theory, I generated a typology based on a close analysis of the three theories discussed above (see *Table 1*, 43-44).

Table 1: Transnational Democratic Theory Typology

	COSMOPOLITAN NATIONALISM (ECKERSLEY)	(LIBERAL) GLOBAL COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY (HELD)	TRANSNATIONAL DISCURSIVE DEMOCRACY (DRYZEK)
IDEOLOGICAL VALUE	- Justice - Ecological Ideals - Humanitarianism - Membership	- Justice - Liberal Ideals - Affectedness Principle - Legitimacy - Accountability	- Inclusion - Pluralism - Communicative power
THEORETICAL TRADITION	- Communitarian - Deliberative Democracy - Critical Theory - Ecological Theory	- Communitarian - Liberalism - Deliberative Democracy	- Post-Structuralism - Discursive Democracy - Critical Theory - Deliberative Democracy
INSITUTIONS, VENUES, ACTORS	- Republics: Provide basic rights and constituted by institutions	- International Institutions: Provide protection of rights through Courts and interact with regional institutions	- Civil Society: Social and cultural life (inclusive of protests, networks, and deliberations) dialectically interact with institutions
INFLUENCE	- Foreign Policy with Cosmopolitan Justice - Embedded in National Institutions - Legislative	- Constitution-building - Legislative	- Discourse in civil society: social choice theory - Discursive shifts can influence public policy - Communicative power
PROCESSES FOR POWER	- Communicative power - Administrative power - Consensus	- Representation through elections	- Intersubjective communication generates public opinion - Outcome of contestation
PROCESS OF REASONING	- Reciprocity - Publicity - Accountability - Communicative rationality	- Public reason - Public rationality - Democracy is pluralistic: Layered belief system	- Politics of identity and difference - Deliberative and communicative core - Democratic evolution

CONDITIONS OF A PUBLIC SPHERE	- Interacts with National Institutions - Justice determined by consensus - National identity with loyalty to humankind	- Participation by those affected	- Relatively unconstrained - Discursive impacts possible

I developed seven indicators to differentiate between the theories and present a clear vision of ontological positions. The individual theories differ in prescription (or lack thereof) for institutional and actor organization and response. Moreover, they differ in processes of action, development, and influence, including questions of where legitimacy and accountability are found and leveraged. Highlighting differences of influence, representation, reasoning, and expectations of the public sphere enables a deconstruction of values, constructs, and pursuits of transnational democracy.

1) *Ideological values* identify axiological positioning of a theory, creating grounds for analysis based on intentions inherent in the theory. As a critical starting point, ideological values aid understanding of the foundational thoughts of theory, depicting fundamental differences. These are identified through theoretical claims inherently made within each theory. Ideological values are used to differentiate between the theories and come to a root understanding of the ideologically differences in empirical findings.

2) *Theoretical traditions* are identified within each transnational democratic theory and influence the ontologies of the theories. Each author references previous theoretical discussions that influence the groundings for their own

work. An examination of theoretical traditions allows empirical data to be reflected upon and fed back into theoretical discussions.

3) *Institutions, venues, and actors* expose questions about institutional designs in response to changing fora for citizen participation. Where, who, and how may transnational democracy transition, establish, or become institutionalized? Each theory has specific avenues for transnational democracy, whether through institutions or ideas. This is an important pragmatic indicator to identify the structure and boundaries of WWVB.

4) Conversations of *influence* outline epistemologies of the theories, as proposed, and direct the purposefulness of democratic models. Questions of legitimacy within the theories find answers in the response to where such phenomena may be most effective in influencing policy decisions. Influence as an indicator identifies the spheres for input within the democratic propositions. Where would citizen deliberations matter? What decision-makers would be the audience and for what types of reform?

5) The *processes for power* reflect connections between purposes of democratic participation, accountability, legitimacy, and participation, and the institutional arrangements proposed by the theories. How may accountability be found within these processes, and what methods may be used to account for citizen voice? Through what mechanisms of power is citizen response given legitimacy?

6) The *process of reasoning*, therefore, suggests the methods used by citizens to feedback and act within a democratic process. The differences between processes of reasoning offer greater depth to understanding the process of power. How do authors conceptualize the reasoning for the process of power? What are the core beliefs and assumptions of the authors in how civil society interacts with democratic values?

7) Finally, *conditions of the public sphere* provide an axiological understanding of expectations for social (public) relations in democratic processes. What becomes clear in this distinction not only further supports the theoretical traditions of the authors, but also provides a foundation of how to conceptualize civil society interactions with institutions, conceptions of democracy, and the global public domain.

The applied identifiers are designed to not only provide analysis of institutional structure differences but also seek to connect theoretical standpoints to concepts of governance. Understanding International Relations literature's embrace of democratic theory and empirical interest in transnational networks necessarily needs to bridge to understand the execution of transnational democracy. Addressing representation, participation, and process of deliberation, the indicators within the typology are designed to expose and explore fundamental conditions apparent within these conversations of transnational democratic theory and provide a foundation for exploring how the WWVB as a transnational democratic network.

With the typology developed and a confident grasp of the theories, I began open coding the content and designing guides for global site host manager interviews. While this was an iterative process, the final results strongly indicate pragmatic relevance of the theories in practice of transnational democracy. A second typology (*Table 3*, 58-59) responds to *Table 1* (43-44) and reveals the ways in which these different theoretical perspectives have been put into practice through the WWVB. The following section provides step-by-step insight into the process of data collection to inform *Table 3*.

Data Collection

At the onset of my academic interest in the WWVB process, I began collecting data on individual organizational host sites to develop a comprehensive understanding of network diversity. I recorded the following qualitative information from (at the time) 36 international sites[7]: (1) organization and affiliated networks, (2) organization mission statements, (3) association to World Wide Views' agenda, (4) number of years as an organization, and (5) if the organization was environmentally affiliated. This process yielded content for organizational capacity analysis of the network and insight for future interviews with selected site managers. The data collected through the site host comparison chart, described above, was completed almost two years prior to the full launch of the current research project. The succinct chart provided an overview of the network and aided my comprehensive understanding of the vast extension of the network.

---

[7] The initial organizing of the network included sites in Bangladesh and Australia; both withdrew from the process due to limitations on funding and institutional support.

Over the process of two years, I revisited and reflected upon the data to solidify my understanding of the network – the eclectic differences in interests, geography, resources, etc. – and began to focus on specific sites of interest for interviews based on these overarching identifications of difference. When I returned to the project with a refined research interest in transnational democracy, I first sought unobtrusive access to both written and visual content, systemically and thoughtfully chosen for distinct purposes (Warren and Karner 2005). Examples of unobtrusive objects include online documents from the DBTF regarding network and event organizing, online media from affiliated organizations and parties, and reports issued by the network. The material chosen was decided upon for reasons of accessibility and relevance to the research questions. *Table 2* (49-50) includes the content analyzed as well as the qualitative notes made from the data. Through a process of open coding, I was able to see patterns of clustering theoretical themes in correspondence to the typology of *Table 1* (43-44).   The Qualitative Content Analysis table below identifies the material used and the qualitative data extracted from each piece of content. Included in the analysis below are press releases and policy reports from the Palestinian site host manager that came as result of our interview (and, therefore, analyzed post-interviews).

Table 2: Qualitative Content Analysis

CONTENT	QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS
Network Chart (NET)	- Sites were often environmental or communitarian - Sites were interested in citizen education and expansion of democratic processes
WWVB Results Report for Policymakers (RPM)	- Citizen results show strong support for ecological justice - Equity and justice of concern - Results framed by way of international and national institutions and regulation recommendations - Role of civil society and democracy less apparent
Manual for World Wide Views on Biodiversity (MAN)	- Design level of analysis - Demographic inclusion emphasized but through a self-selective process - Interest to influence future structure of democracy and national/international policy
DBT Website Information (1-3) (DBT 1-3)	- Concerned with the involvement of civil society in decision-making processes - Institutional design and appeal are important for citizen deliberations
WWVB Press Releases (1-6) (PR 1-6)	- Citizen views shared as environmentally-concerned - Emphasized importance of global citizen deliberations and civil society
External Newsletters (1-7) (EXN 1-7)	- Design level of analysis - Sometimes citizen and site host manager views shared - Sharing of information, progress, links, and photographs - Design descriptions
Internal Newsletters (1-30) (INT 1-30)	- Network organizing - Logistical information for sites - Avenues for communication with partners - Inclusive of all WWViews Alliance members participating in WWVB
Palestinian Documents (1-3) (PAL 1-3)	- Emphasis on use of different network tools - Interest in international recognition - Share voice globally

	- Educational materials for sharing - Press releases

Interviews were conducted with site host managers, as identified by the WWVB

website[8]. I utilized the site data comparison chart to sort through the network and

select site host managers of interest based on criteria of geographic location, site mission

statements, goals or interests, and organizational affiliations (i.e. NGO, university,

government agency, etc.). Site host managers vary in professions, including but not

exclusive to scholars, lecturers, researchers, organizers, and coordinators from

universities, museums, and non-governmental and governmental organizations and

institutions. While intentions were to accumulate a sample representative of the

network based on these criteria, due to the nature of the project – data collection allotted

time, time lapsed since the event, international communications – I found greater

reliance on interview outreach methods of snowballing, opportunity, and convenience

(Miles and Huberman 1994). For instance, two partners whom I had initially contacted

no longer had a working email with their organization. Many site host managers were

also non-responsive to primary and secondary emails. Therefore, the interviews

accessed and conducted were completed out of ability to do so with timing and

resources accounted for. The final interviews were conducted with partners from

Canada, China, Denmark, Palestine, St. Lucia, and with the DBTF Global Coordinator

Bjørn Bedsted. All interviews were transcribed and coded. The interview with the

global coordinator was referred to me through interviewing snowball effect (Miles and

---

[8] "Partners," World Wide Views on Biodiversity, accessed June 2012.

Huberman 1994). Acknowledging and seeking the social constructive differences of each interviewee's experience, I designed questions to allow and encourage elaboration into specific conditions of network dynamics.

Based upon the results collected in the content analysis, I designed interview guides formatted to accommodate semi-structured interviewing with intentions of addressing particular concepts with all interviewees. Interviews included questions about resources, interest in WWVB values, perceived successes and limitations, and reactions of citizens (see *Appendix II* for Interview Guide). The interview guide was designed to coordinate and elaborate upon descriptions presented in *Table 1: Transnational Democratic Theory* (43-44). Questions were developed to elicit information about the theoretical indicators identified earlier. (The category of "process" did not become developed into specific interview questions as correlating information about the procedural intent of WWViews was found in content analysis processes.) Adopting a '*tree-and-branch structure'* to the interview design, I used these six defining topics and structured questions to provoke stories and narratives about the WWVB experiment (Rubin and Rubin 2005). "In the tree-and-branch structure, the researcher divides the research problem into more or less equal parts, and each part is covered with a main question" (Rubin and Rubin 2005, 145).

A level of flexibility remained available in conversation to allow space for social differences. Rubin and Rubin identify the interview technique employed as *in-depth interviews for an elaborated case study* (Rubin and Rubin 2005). Consequently, I maintained an awareness of my own social identity in relation to interviewees as I

identified under the network but diverged from particular assumptions about lived experiences (Rubin and Rubin 2005; Marshall and Rossman 2011). The design allowed for flexibility of specific discussions under an umbrella question, relatable and contrastable, as content amongst each other. Moreover, the flexibility within the design enhanced ability for exposure of regional and cultural discussions that may have potentially been missed if such space was not allotted.

Reflection through the Interviewing and Coding Process

The process of qualitative coding and analysis is often compared to that of quantitative coding and analysis because it provides an overview and summary of frequency and variety in findings (Altheide 1987). While the analysis process may provide quantitative data, its intent is to go beyond separation of categories to provoke descriptive information (Altheide 1987). I believe the rich possibility of analysis may have been compromised with a quantitative focus. Throughout the data collection and review process, I made several adjustments to better account for the data collected and to extract the most accurate analysis. As I became more familiar with the interviewees and adapted to a flow, I also began to notice how some questions might not have led to as rich of conversations as I had initially anticipated. Miles and Huberman eloquently describe the qualitative process of data collection:

> As qualitative researchers collect data, they revise their frameworks—make them more precise, replace empirically feeble bins with more meaningful ones, and reconstrue relationships. Conceptual frameworks are simply the current version of the researcher's map of the territory being investigated. As the explorer's knowledge of the terrain improves, the map becomes correspondingly more differentiated and integrated, and researchers in a multiple-case study can

coordinate their data collection even more closely. (Miles and Huberman 1994, 20)

The account above exemplifies the experience of working through the research project, interacting, and reinterpreting data as necessary. Coding, for instance, was a process of continuous refinement and clarification as I moved between open coding and theoretical coding (Strauss and Corbin 1998). Open and theoretical coding expanded the opportunity to remain as close to the theoretical analysis with qualitative reflection. The conceptual framework had been consistently evolving from the time of initial data collection of site data comparisons to the compiling of the final coded results.

Despite challenges with interviewee access, the coding process remained nuanced and thoughtful in extraction of data. I first began using open coding techniques as I reviewed the content and interview transcriptions (Strauss and Corbin 1998). Beginning line-by-line to flow through the material, I slowly found myself opening analysis up to a paragraph-by-paragraph frequency, or as representatively needed in the specific content. Strauss and Corbin refer to the initial interactive process of coding as *analysis through microscopic examination* (Strauss and Corbin 1998). Microscopic examination may be open or axial coding but requires "minute examination and interpretation of data" (Strauss and Corbin 1998, 58). Combing through the data, I became familiar with the material and discourses available and refined my ability as a researcher to interpret and become reflexive with the data and analysis process. Conversations about network organizing or design limitations began to come out through the coded materials.

With a round of open coding completed, I reviewed sets of descriptions in comparison with the theoretical typology to begin a secondary analysis of the data with theoretical coding (Strauss and Corbin 1998). Adopting the descriptions provided under each condition of each theory of transnational democracy, I revisited codes that seemingly had already begun to cluster into such themes. Codes turned to the theoretical typology as they began to cluster. Values such as "ecological" or reliance on the "network" provided key guides to informing results. In this stage, the teasing out of the data still appeared cloudy and unsatisfactory. Following a discussion with my advisor, it became apparent I would need to reevaluate and add levels of analysis during data extraction. Providing an overview of the entire network needed greater refining than through a single perspective; I broke down levels of analysis into three perspectives: (1) citizen, (2) network (site host managers/organizers), and (3) DBTF design. These three levels were created to identify the multi-scaled perspectives of the event through the different analysis of citizen reaction, site host manager accounts, and discourse of DBTF intentions.

Data was revisited and reworked in consideration of the three varying perspectives present and identified through color-coding of the descriptive codes. The disaggregating of a single level of analysis provided a window of clarity in data, and results began to affirm three relatively distinct perspectives derived from the collection. New dynamics and interplay of comparisons also began to emerge. The final step of the coding process began to directly correlate with the color-coded descriptive data with specific descriptive boxes from the theoretical typology. Three separate result

typologies were created to represent the three levels of analysis (see *Appendix III*). Each

theory was then alphabetically coded: A (Cosmopolitan Nationalism), B (Cosmopolitan

Liberalism), and C (Discursive Democracy); each theoretical indicator was numerically

coded: 1 (ideological value), 2 (theoretical tradition), 3 (institutions, venues, actors), 4

(influence), 5 (processes for power), 6 (process of reasoning), and 7 (conditions of a

public sphere). Descriptive codes transformed into more structured codes with colored,

alphabetical, and numerical values. Codes were tallied and accounted for within the

three typologies. In a final stage leading to an accumulation of results, codes of high

frequency were then returned to a final process of qualitative analysis for discursive

and contextual significance. The qualitative results are elaborated on below in *Table 3:*

Transnational Democratic Practice (58-59).

Transnational Democratic Practice

The practice of transnational democracy through the case of WWVB exhibits

characteristics of the theories of Cosmopolitan Nationalism, (Liberal) Global

Cosmopolitanism, and Transnational Discursive Democracy. While the network arises

out of civil society networking, the design of the event focuses on legitimizing

representation through the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

Citizen results also show strong support for national policies to protect biodiversity

loss. The questions then become: Are theories of transnational democracy speaking

past one another? Or is there disjunction in the operations of World Wide Views? I

suggest it's neither, but rather the results speak to the complexity of the network and

the ideas it represents. Looking to the frequency of theoretical indicators in coding, I

conclude that WWVB most closely resembles Transnational Discursive Democracy, a conversation to be picked up in the next chapter. For now, I turn to the coded findings on WWVB.

The seven indicators used in *Table 1* (43-44) provided an outline for the differences between author conceptions of transnational democracy. While the indicators contain the same values, empirical results reflected slightly nuanced conceptions through translation from theoretical to practical design:

1) *Ideological values* identify axiological foundations for organizations within the network, including the goals of the DBT.

2) *Theoretical traditions* are translated to understand the ontological characteristics of the network establishment.

3) *Institutions, venues, and actors* are identified engaging, aiding, and/or legitimizing the process of World Wide Views on Biodiversity.

4) *Influence* of mechanisms and sites for outreach with citizen participant results or information.

5) The *processes for power* of the Day of Deliberation and dissemination are presented in structural and procedural design.

6) *Processes of reasoning* provided substantial support for mechanisms conducted.

7) *Condition of the public sphere* refers to the observed reactions, feedbacks, and characteristics of citizen participants.

As the indicators provided a starting point for theoretical comparisons, in application they connect embedded axiological, ontological, and epistemological assumptions of the network to theoretical design. The observations and ability to identify through the indicators supports the notion that transnational democratic theory is applicable to analysis of WWVB. As *Table 3: Transnational Democratic Practice* illustrates, each indicator aligns with particular characteristics of practices, actors, institutes, or ideas situated within the network.

Table 3: Transnational Democratic Practice: World Wide Views on Biodiversity[9]

	COSMOPOLITAN NATIONALISM	(LIBERAL) GLOBAL COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY	TRANSNATIONAL DISCURSIVE DEMOCRACY
IDEOLOGICAL VALUE	- Missions of institutes in the network included environmentally-focused and nationally-affiliated institutes - Regional demographic representation	- Network founded to address democratic deficit of citizen recognition in international policy-making	- Structure requirements for demographic inclusion - Missions of institutes in network include citizen participation in science and technology
THEORETICAL TRADITION	- Network developed around international environmental dialogue	- Network established under tradition of deliberations - Practicality to establish citizen recognition on international level	- Network established as an 'idea' by the DBT - Expansion of previous initiatives
INSITUTIONS, VENUES, ACTORS	- Some actors identify as national institutes - Strong encouragement to use results to appeal to national policy - Regional sites organized/regional or national identities	- Contribution to reaching Aichi Biodiversity Target 1 of the CBD Strategic Plan	- DBT as central to network - Sites join through snowballing outreach through partners
INFLUENCE	- Citizen support for national policy on biodiversity conservation - One case used results for city planning - Some cases directly associated with national institutions	- Official recognition from the CBD and supported to continue as an international project	- Material and reports dispersed to policymakers, citizens, media - Results/Material used for side projects including youth outreach and research - Strong reliance on informative video and material
PROCESSES FOR POWER	- Structure provided uniformity and opportunity to influence national legislation - Consensus not enforced	- Voting procedure by citizens - Quantitative, comparable results - Strict voting structure for presentation of representation	- Deliberative conversations (qualitative responses) not recorded - Design of structure critiqued for lack of qualitative results

---

[9] For levels of analysis, coded data, and qualitative interpretation of material, see Appendices.

PROCESS OF REASONING	- Desire for process and opinions to be reflected upon by citizens and policymakers within the political system	- Citizens reflect on deliberation, order values, and vote	- National results express differences in culture - Process understood to be 'constantly reinvented' - Evolving
CONDITIONS OF A PUBLIC SPHERE	- Citizens identified by nationality with loyalty to solving global biodiversity issues - Citizen results support for ecological value over economic	- Citizens value biodiversity loss as a global crisis - All-affected	- Varying reasons for individual citizen participation

The accumulations of research findings are of result of the qualitative process as described. A close review of transnational democratic literature has informed and guided the methodological application of my research. Through thorough analysis and strict rigor, I provide an account of WWVB in comparison to the theoretical prescriptions of transnational democracy and present implications for both theory and practice of transnational democracy.

RESULTS: THEORY IN PRAXIS

To see the greater picture instead of looking very narrowly at one method, you know, paint it up on certain ideas of what deliberation and participation should be about and then ticking off your boxes to see if this method fulfills these goals or not. Often, for a long time, I think the academics on participation have been focused on the supply and too little on the demand. Looking at: Why… how does the deliberative system work? What do we need? Why is citizen participation needed at all?
- Bjørn Bedsted,
Global Coordinator,
World Wide Views

The opening quote of the chapter is a sentiment towards my project shared by

Bjørn Bedsted, the Global Coordinator of World Wide Views on Biodiversity. Bjørn

appreciated my initiative in its examination of the event not through deliberative

methods, as many important studies have for WWViews (Andersson and Shahrokh

2012, Goldschmidt et al. 2012) but as a global democratic phenomenon. "*To see the*

greater picture" and to frame the network as a project of democratic evolution invites a

new conversation and analysis for continued efforts of the WWViews Alliance. The

following section presents results on the analysis of documents and interviews on the

WWVB project. To present WWVB in comparison to transnational democratic theory, I

revisit *Table 1: Transnational Democratic Theory* (43-44) and *Table 3: Transnational*

Democratic Practice (58-59) to represent the practical implications of network action and

development in reflection of the theoretical analysis. With no intentions to dispute or

refute the presented theories, I present the ways in which praxis aligns with the

theoretical indicators. As the results demonstrate, practical implications of the network

apply to each indicator within a theory. The results presented in *Table 4* (62) review

each theory of transnational democracy – Cosmopolitan Nationalism, (Liberal) Global Cosmopolitanism, and Transnational Discursive Democracy – to explain network practices thoroughly. Some codes were represented more frequently within the three levels of analysis, and I highlight the significant qualitative results as well as the number of codes per level of analysis under each theory for all three theories in practice. Although all theories were identified in the empirical study of WWVB, results conclude that Transnational Discursive Democracy most closely resembles WWVB in practice. To elaborate on practical implications found in WWVB, the levels of analysis – citizen, site hosts, and the Danish Board of Technology design – are examined to articulate the results indicated in *Table 4*.

Table 4: Significant Qualitative Results of Transnational Democratic Practice[10]

LEVELS OF ANALYSIS	COSMOPOLITAN NATIONALISM	(LIBERAL) GLOBAL COSMOPOLITANISM	TRANSNATIONAL DISCURSIVE DEMOCRACY
CITIZEN	- Citizen results support ecological preservation values over economic values **(50)**	- Citizens value biodiversity loss as a global crisis and believe all societies are affected **(39)**	- Varying reasons for individual participation - Citizen value in educational materials **(20)**
SITE HOST MANAGER	- Missions of institutes in the network included environmentally-focused and nationally-affiliated institutions - Some cases used results to inform local and national planning **(129)**	- Compliance with design to the best of organizing ability **(93)**	- Sites join through snowballing outreach and partner networking - Results/education materials were used for side projects **(164)**
DBT DESIGN	- Network developed to support CBD negotiations (ecological issue) **(90)**	- Contribution to reaching Aichi Biodiversity Target 1 of CBD Strategic Plan - Official recognition from the CBD and encouraged continued engagement - Citizens voted and results were quantifiably comparable **(100)**	- Material and reports were disseminated to policymakers, citizens, and media - Process is understood to be 'constantly reinvented' and evolving **(199)**

---

[10] Quantitative frequencies from the coding process are indicated in parenthesis in the bottom right corner of each box.

Cosmopolitan Nationalism

The WWVB network exhibits characteristics of Cosmopolitan Nationalism predominantly through the citizen and network host level of analysis. Although the network had an international policy focus, citizens and sites identified through national or regional association. The association may be influence of the DBT's design in requirement of representative demographics for each site's region. Nonetheless, citizen responses indicated strong support for national reforms in biodiversity policy, aligning with Robyn Eckersley's axiological positioning in ecological thought. The design of the network falls short from Eckersley's call to have direct affects on national political systems, but site hosts and citizen responses support an intriguing analysis of Cosmopolitan Nationalism.

Citizen Response

Robyn Eckersley's proposal to form a 'green state' begins with citizen responses to ecological crises. The vision of Cosmopolitan Nationalism accepts ecological degradation as an imminent threat to society and utilizes the national structures for democratic legitimacy to create reform. Therefore, citizen participants must be both educated in ecological issues and willing to use democratic tools of recognition and participation to enact reform in national policies. Global citizen participant results from WWVB strongly support enforcing existing or establishing new national and international policy agreements for further protection of biodiversity (WWVB Results Report 2012). Moreover, aligned with critical ecological thought, citizens

overwhelmingly support biodiversity protection and restoration over economic gains. While 46% of global participants think "establishing new protected areas on land should have higher priority than economic aims unless these are very important," 31% of participants believe "protected areas should have the highest priority in all circumstances" (WWVB Results Report 2012). Because citizens identified under national sites, results appear to affirm a Nationalist Cosmopolitan ideal with loyalty to humankind and solving global biodiversity issues.

Site Hosts

With ecological crises as a theoretical foundation to the formation of a Cosmopolitan Nationalist society, site host organizations' mission statements were analyzed. Observations of the network show foundational interest in the initiatives of WWVB through environmental concern, as many missions address environmental initiatives. Of the affiliated organizations, 18 (more than half) have an environmental focus. Missions include issues of sustainability, biodiversity, environmental protection and restoration, and climate vulnerability. Awareness of environmental issues around the network supports an ideological framework behind citizen engagement for the cause of ecological awareness and policy changes.

At least seven regional partners were directly affiliated with, subdivisions of, or partnering with national institutions, including South Africa, China, Palestine, India, St. Lucia, and Japan. As Eckersley's theory suggests national institutions as the most effective tool for transnational democracy, slightly more than a fifth of the sites were

affiliated with national institutions. The case of Palestine provides an interesting take

on national identity. Political circumstances have created difficult conditions for

Palestinian national recognition in international society. Emphasizing this aspect of the

Palestinian deliberations led to citizen and media support for the site. Site host

organizers even coordinated with governorate representatives for outreach in eleven

districts to further legitimize the process for citizens. Furthermore, as Canada was

preparing national strategies on biodiversity, representatives from the network were

invited to participate in a summit around its formation. As the strategy was dispersed

to cities and municipalities, the partner also was involved in the host city of the event's

strategic plans on biodiversity consultations.

DBT Design

The framework of WWVB as designed by the DBT emphasizes the requirement

for sites to select citizen participants along the criteria of representative demographic

for the host region. Although some nations had more than one site, and therefore

presented regional demographics, the majority of sites were lone national

representatives. Sites were also given the option of adding a session specifically

addressing a nationally focused question on biodiversity. The logic behind the criteria

diverges from Eckersley's conception under shared common identities and instead is

structured to solidify legitimacy through an international lens. Some partners have

critiqued the design for not putting greater emphasize on local, regional, and national

strategies. As the Canadian partner expressed:

> The one thing that we did in both [the] Climate Change [deliberation in 2009] and Biodiversity [deliberation in 2012], which was different from all of the teams, was that we included a local component. For me, it's very difficult [and] it's challenging to have a local discussion on a global issue – whether it's climate change or biodiversity – without introducing how that issue might be framed locally… Even the process for local was different than the transnational.

The structure, though, did provide uniformity, a foundation for national consultations, and emphasized partners to create their own local strategies to appeal to national policymakers. The process is designed to be reflective in multilateral biodiversity dialogues, and the significance of national partners was not diminishable.

Implications of Practice for Cosmopolitan Nationalism

Site hosts and citizens exhibit conditions supportive of a Cosmopolitan Nationalist approach to transnational democracy through ideological values and conditions of the public sphere. Citizen results do seem to support the notion that education and engagement in ecological issues maintain a value for policy enforcement and reform. In Eckersley's idea of post-liberal democracy, citizen values shift from predominantly economic to predominantly ecological. Citizen response to the question of biodiversity protection despite possibilities for economic gains provides optimism for citizen value shift, possibly presenting a foundation or beginning reformation of citizen ideals. Although citizens discursively suggest a shift in liberal conceptions, actions according to these principles may vary or not hold outside of the deliberative event without institutional support. Reflections demonstrated during citizen consultations are not to be taken for granted. Although citizens may respond with concerns for ecological degradation, everyday political activities may not reflect these ideals.

Global citizen voice represents great concern for biodiversity loss, but how these voices provide influence in deliberative systems differs from the map provided by Eckersley's Cosmopolitan Nationalism. For one, the deliberative forums are not instituted by national affiliations with the intent of directly feeding back into national democratic debate. Rather, there is only suggestion in the methodological design of the process. Partners who did engage a national forum found little or no influence in biodiversity policy changes. The goals of the network encouraged reflection of citizen consultations in national fora but were not the anticipated outcome. Secondly, because the consultations were designed to be foremost legitimized in international negotiations on biodiversity, uniformity for national processes were not pursued or enforced. Furthermore, the abilities for national democratic appeal very much differ within political landscapes of network countries. One can assume the process for implementing deliberative forums on biodiversity may be constructed very differently from China to Canada, Palestine to Denmark. Although national ministry representatives to the COP were engaged and informed of their countries' results, ministries are not delegates within national institutions.

(Liberal) Global Cosmopolitanism

David Held's conception of transnational democracy offers a 'scaling-up' of liberal democracy to international institutions. Understanding the deliberative system as most influential through means of representative officials constituting legislation on conceptions of justice, Held supports the appeal to international institutions and

agreements. (Liberal) Global Cosmopolitanism is mostly visible in the DBT's design of the process. For pragmatic reasons, the DBT developed a structure in accordance to the CBD initiatives and feasibility of presenting citizen participant results at the COP. Citizen results also support conceptions of justice in biodiversity conservation under conditions of an 'all-affected' principle. Critiques of the theory's faith in international institutions, though, echo throughout the network, and questions of pragmatism versus substantial change surface.

Citizen Response

Deliberation results show an agreeable concern amongst citizens that biodiversity loss seriously affects all who were invited to participate. The conception of "all-affected" may be interpreted as a communitarian understanding of the effects of biodiversity loss. "Although 84% of participants worldwide say that most people in the world are seriously affected by the loss of biodiversity, only 24% say that their home town/village is, and only 28% say they are personally affected" (WWVB Results Report 2012). Global Cosmopolitanism suggests participation by those who are affected by the issue at hand, which seemingly aligns with the conceptions of citizens. Therefore, the strong support for greater enforcement and creation for stricter laws on biodiversity is legitimized through a principle of affectedness. Within international agreements, though, the question remains for Global Cosmopolitanism if those who believe they are directly affected by biodiversity loss should have greater standing in international agreements on biodiversity.

Site Hosts

Overall, site host partners value the initiatives and design of WWVB. Partners interpret the design as a pragmatic method to engage international institutions and decision-makers. In response to a question on the DBT's decision, the site host manager from Canada replied, "I think given the United Nations is the international venue for where countries can find some common platform - yes, I can see doing the value of consultation in this context." Held's value in international institutions generally holds true for network site host managers and no sites deviated from the design. At the very least, the method for participation addresses the democratic deficit in international policy-making and the deficit between science policy, decision-makers, and people. In design, WWVB implements a rigorous methodology to orchestrate delivery of citizen consultations to decision-makers. Bridging the gap in any form has relevance for the evolution of democratic legitimacy. The Convention's recognition of the initiative and support for continuing engagement with WWViews was interpreted as a positive beginning step for democratic change in the international sphere.

DBT Design

The design of the network was by far the greatest indicator of Global Cosmopolitan ideals in the WWVB process. First, the network was established under the condition of democratic deficit in international policy-making procedures. Held identifies the problem of international institutions tackling concerns of the global population without the filtration through citizen deliberative processes. Because the

DBT has a history of conducting citizen consultations through the Danish Parliament and European Union, the pragmatic next step was to address the deficiency in international negotiations. Reflecting upon the first WWViews, Bjørn Bedsted recalls the DBT's reaction, "The COP is going to be here! We need to do something." The environmental focus of WWViews was incidental to international reach. World Wide Views on Global Warming in 2009 was a direct response from the DBT capitalizing on the opportunity of Copenhagen hosting COP15. The link is a pragmatic result of the DBT's initiative to 'scale-up' citizen deliberations.

Secondly, WWVB specifically identifies as a response to the CBD's Aichi Biodiversity Target 1 of the CBD's Strategic Plan for making global citizens more aware of biodiversity loss (WWVB Results Report 2012). The CBD has encouraged the continual process of WWViews and invited the network back in 2020 for a follow up on citizen views (WWVB Results Report 2012, 6). As the October 31, 2012 WWVB press release reports,

> The Conference of Parties (COP) encourages Parties, relevant organizations and stakeholders to support and contribute to communication initiatives, such as the World Wide Views on Biodiversity, which combine the implementation of Strategic Goals A and E regarding mainstreaming of biodiversity, participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building. (WWVB Press Release, 31 October 2012)

The CBD supported the citizen deliberations and interaction with negotiators, proposing its continued legitimacy through future Convention negotiations. Utilizing the target as a catapult for recognition at COP11, WWVB found legitimacy through international institutions that it did not necessarily find in national institutes or civil society.

Finally, the designs of deliberations align with the (Liberal) Global Cosmopolitan conception of deliberation through voting procedures. Citizens deliberated at tables throughout the day but were asked to vote on a set of questions after each deliberative session. The procedure has both practical and ontological implications as it suggests (1) voting as a presentation of representation and (2) representation may be accounted for through ordered values of individuals. The reasoning of procedure offers a similar take to Held's belief in rational individuals and their ability to order values in a holistic representation of public-reason. The practicalities of the voting procedure have made the WWViews process easily quantifiable and comparable, and therefore, more presentable and interpretable for policy-makers and stakeholders. While WWViews in 2009 included qualitative responses from citizens, the design of the presentation of results was adapted to be particularly quantified. Rather than just voting, citizens had the opportunity to submit comments to decision-makers and the final policy report. For WWVB, though, this process was eliminated in favor of a more quantified presentation of results.

Implications of Practice for (Liberal) Global Cosmopolitanism

WWVB most effectively displays characteristics of (Liberal) Global Cosmopolitanism in its design and interaction with international institutions. It is clear the design's intent is to meet the WWVB goals of appealing to and being recognized by (and even effective in) international negotiations. The design is strategic in its approach and able to source funding and support from the CBD. The road to permanent

legitimization of citizen participation in international environmental negotiations may be along the path the WWViews Alliance has begun to lay. The process could ultimately build the foundation for international legislative requirements for citizen feedback that are presently absent and of contribution to the democratic deficit Global Cosmopolitanism seeks to address.

Some critiques warn, though, that such a process would be beating the same drum of liberalism, curtailing from real problems of democratic deficiency. "We tend to think of the UN in terms of these romanticized contexts, but I think we also forget that the UN has interests," the Canadian partner continues from her previous comment, "…It's not as though they are disinterested bystanders that just have provided a forum for different voices to be heard." There are troubling realities of the United Nations as a forum for citizen voices to be recognized which may include, but are not limited to, delegates at the United Nations not coming from citizen-elect with no direct accountability to citizen concerns. Moreover, questions of legitimacy and effectiveness of the United Nations and affiliated international institutions still hang in question in Global Cosmopolitanism. The issue of symbolism in soft law versus the effectiveness of enforced hard law has spurred academic conversations for decades and may be critiqued for its symbolic rather than hard politics. Pragmatic relevance to the UN's acknowledgement of WWViews has, generally, been left to be unseen.

Transnational Discursive Democracy

Of the three theories of transnational democracy, the results showed strongest alignment with concepts of John Dryzek and Transnational Discursive Democracy. Recall the described highest frequency codes of *Table 4* (62). Not only does Transnational Discursive Democracy appear most coded overall, it also represents the highest frequency coding in two of the three levels of analysis. Embedded in a bottom-up approach, the formation and foundation of the network may be understood in its complex and diverse formation in civil society. As a result, the networks ongoing work is evolving, trying new methods, and recruiting new participants to engage in the process. Furthermore, methods of communication are at the foci of the project, fixing its values in the deliberative components of democratic participation. The communicative core is apparent in both the snowballing efforts of a network coming together for the sake of the project to the expansion of media reports and educational materials throughout the grander public sphere besides those at the deliberation tables. Results of Transnational Discursive Democracy appear most frequently in the site host and DBT design levels of analyses.

Citizen Response

Although a less frequent coding response to the citizen analysis, Transnational Discursive Democracy showed strong in citizen response to educational material provided by the network to participants. Citizens reported positive feedback of the material and the information disbursed, not only for self-educational purposes but also

for an educational reach beyond participants at the table. For example, Saint Lucian students used the manual for replicating side projects for youth education and outreach on biological diversity issues. Furthermore, site hosts reported on strong reliance on the educational pamphlet and video to inform participants on the various topic issues to be covered at the deliberation event. Civic discourse and information on the topic of biodiversity contributes to positive citizen reaction in being provided the material and the belief that further sharing of the information will discursively increase the power of the topic and prominence within everyday dialogue.

Site Hosts

Interviews and content analysis, including internal newsletters from the DBT to site host managers, reveal the capacity of the network's ability for organization, coordination, and outreach. Site hosts frequently cited the internal newsletters as a good resource for direction and communication. Working as loosely decentralized cells, sites coordinated via the DBT as the central communicator, but nonetheless, networked from their single cell's position. Each host site networked regionally and transnationally to organize the Day of Deliberation. Without direct institutional instruction, direction, and support, the network was left to its own abilities of extending as a network. Transnational Discursive Democracy does not have an institutional path of influence and relies on civil society to organize through available avenues. The most fruitful exercise for expanding the network's capacity and reach was through a snowballing effect of partners, colleagues, and affiliates. Through interviews it becomes

apparent organizers came on board through connections to the network or invited

partners in themselves. For instance, the Chinese partner was only contacted by the

DBT after being connected by a friend who thought it might be of interest.

Funding was a topic amongst all interviewees at one point or another, citing

limitations to access and an array of contributors. While the DBT organized to help

initiate support sites with greatest need of financial support, all were left to their own

capacity, in some degree, to find support, financial and in-kind. One site host team

credited the Japan Biodiversity Fund's financial support for some of the hosting costs,

as coordinated through the CBD, after having reached out for national and international

support. Global partners contributed to the network through affiliate promotion or the

DBT's direct invitation. The discursive elements of networking, again, prove to be a

crucial method for successful organizing. National and international institutional

recognition only evolved with the bottom-up persistence of the civil society network to

pursue such outlets. There was no formal avenue for support or collaboration. Rather,

the organization of the network was solely dependent upon the reach of the network

and its ability to extend to like-minded affiliates.

DBT Design

Due to the nature of the project, the design of WWVB was reflective in site host

ability to network regionally. In addition to developing generalized recruitment

strategy plans for all sites, the DBT had sites develop individual media strategy plans.

Creation of media strategy plans for host sites not only invited network partners to

reach out to local media but also emphasized the significance in such strategy. WWVB, as a global network, released six different press releases emphasizing the role of civil society in transforming policy and discourse. For example, the October 31, 2012 press release suggests, "Such involvement is important in order to strengthen public ownership to decisions made, thereby increasing the likeliness of their implementation" (WWVB Press Release, 31 October 2012). Evidently, the communicative expansion of the network holds significance in the design and implementation of the event beyond spatial or temporal boundaries. Moreover, reports were disseminated to the media as well as decision-makers and stakeholders, potentially through every global site. Dissemination of information and material on WWVB expanded its discursive network, and therefore, communicative power.

Secondly, WWViews formatively developed as an expansion of the idea by the DBT to host a global citizen deliberation. Prior to 2009, WWViews had conducted several national and cross-boundary deliberations, including for the European Union, but had not tackled the demanding project of transnational deliberations on a global scale. World Wide Views on Global Warming, as previously discussed, occurred out of the convenience of COP15 taking place in Copenhagen. The environmental regime was strategically the most sound and applicable venue for the DBT to connect to the United Nations and COP. As a formal project, not constituted by institutions, WWViews as a concept snowballed into the event it became through the networking process. In other words, the project began with a globally expanded format offered by the DBT and developed aside from the capacity offered by formal institutionalism. Its expansion was

based solely on the ability of discursive networking by all entities involved. Unlike Cosmopolitan Nationalism or Global Democratic reflections in the process seeking institutional guidance and constitutional legitimacy, WWVB organized at its necessary and expansive capacity. Transnational Discursive Democracy suggests democratic reforms will come through discursive transfers, including through the processes of transnational networks organizing in private and public arenas.

The final point for discussion of Transnational Discursive Democracy within the DBT design concerns the evolving nature of the project. WWViews is to constantly be reinvented. As the idea of the global consultation took form and spread into a network, the frequency of discussion and idea shifting naturally causes the process to evolve and respond to network needs. Because the network is creating its own way, it must remain adaptive and resilient to changes, limitations, and in recognition of successes. As Bedsted noted during the interview:

> I think in many ways it's a door-to-door battle. I think in many ways citizen participation comes in different forms in shapes… even if it's written somewhere that citizens should be consulted and citizen participation should take place, it's not guarantee that it would be done in a meaningful way. *But it has to constantly be reinvented, constantly applied* (emphasis added). People and public administrations change all the time, so it also depends on the people in the system, whether they can see the point or not.

There are a multitude of pushes and pulls of which may shape the network, providing though, it does not lose its main objective to raise the global citizen voice. The binding force of the network is the democratic appeal of the initiative. Although the DBT did implement a design ideal, ultimately, the project happened through the layers of voices and interests reverberating throughout the network. There is an immediate relation to

pluralistic ideals and radical democracy, as encompassed by Dryzek. WWViews continues to organize, readjusting and accommodating when necessary.

Implications of Practice for Transnational Discursive Democracy

Transnational Discursive Democracy shows most prominently in site host and DBT design analysis, although both citizen response and site hosts agree in favor of the educational materials used for the deliberations. I highlight the overlapping opinions in the communicative core of a discursive democracy. Scientific and social information distributed to participants proved to be a positive tool for all parties. There is solidifying contentment with the information provided as the basic talking point for deliberation. These ideas of citizen deliberations and biodiversity issues snowballed a network of affiliates together in a common project. The capacity of the network exemplifies possibilities of civil society around a common idea, as suggested in Transnational Discursive Democracy. While the power of a communicative network is demonstrated in the organizing of WWVB, the strength and extent of the network may come into question against such as: Would the network be more successful if it was institutionalized? Would greater decentralization and less strict and demanding procedures allow the network greater capacity to expand?

The WWVB event may reflect aspects of Global Cosmopolitanism and Cosmopolitan Nationalism but its overarching operations reflect a more ad hoc organization style. While the DBT sets standards for global policy goals and sites are represented as national affiliates, the actual on the ground organizing is largely

dependent on discourse extension (of the project idea and topic) and its capacity to form

a reliable, alternative democratic approach to negotiations. As Bjørn Bedsted noted in

interview, it is a difficult task to coordinate a vast array of national partners who have

different interests, needs and demands. The ability for the project to extend, for

instance, as in the manner of extension to the Chinese partner, represents an aligning of

(differing and similar) discourses and ideals to carry out a common project. While

some sites were interested in the project for environmentally-affiliated reasoning, site

missions included an array of values reflected in hosting the event, including citizen

participation, science and technology assessment, and public policy. Neither global nor

national partners were required by law or force to participate and the process is not

constituted as a mainstay practice. Rather, the bottom up approach to the network

strongly represents the capacity of the ideas and values intertwined in the project.

Although the network may essentially strive to implement a regularly occurring

and constituted process, it is simply not at that level of recognition in the international

sphere. As Dryzek contests, "discursive democracy attempts to capture what is *the*

alternative implicit in, and made possible by, "modern structures of consciousness" (to

use Habermas's term)" (Dryzek 1990, 21). Representing an alternative model possible

in current structures, WWViews may offer a particular design to global citizen

participations but is not necessarily organizing to be *the* global citizen participation

platform. Bedsted expresses:

> [A}s far as we're concerned… this is the first method for global citizen
> participation, but also, for this reason, a lot of different thoughts get directed to
> that one method. But it cannot encompass all the ideas and good thoughts and
> good intentions that the community – citizen participation community – and

experts have… And much more is needed and many different processes from WWViews, also. So I'm hoping… that alternatives also develop.

In targeting international negotiations and national or regional representatives, WWVB opens the possibility for new conceptualizations of democratic participation while remaining an independently new alternative. Furthermore, it also represents an extension of democratic alternatives within "modern structures of consciousness" in design.

Because the network or process is not constitutionalized, there is allowance for greater flexibility to exceptions and challenges. This is a lesson to be learned from John Dryzek's transnational democracy. Global democratic response is a new concept; organizers and researchers alike need to be mindful and reflective of the process to best inform progress. The flexibility in design and acknowledgement as an evolving project alleviates experimental pressures of one-off success of design and implementation. The network sees strength and longevity in the project and design *to* evolve and enacts such changes. WWViews' ability to evolve creates adaptability and resilience in its structure and could possibly benefit by allowing for greater flexibility and demands on individual site host locations. Moreover, the network sees itself as part of a larger deliberative system with a communicative core. Attempting to make impact in negotiations through UN delegates' reflection of citizen results disrupts the common structure of negotiation with global citizen input.

As the results show, WWVB mostly closely represents a Transnational Discursive Democracy approach to global political negotiations creating a better understanding of the logistics and ideals behind the network. Of most importance, the analysis reveals a

consistently shifting, resilient, and reactive network to needs and interests amongst the

project and its partners. While WWVB was a stand-alone event, the WWViews network

is not and will continue to make adjusts to implement meaningful global citizen

participation practices. Understanding WWVB through the Transnational Discursive

Democratic lens helps paint a picture of a network evolving to highlight an alternative

model to current structures. National and global partners may have aligned for the

event, but the intentions in alignment differ, representing a plurality of ideas and

voices. Nonetheless, the network succeeded in organizing, participating in the same

experimental democratic processes.

Implications for World Wide Views

To revisit Bent Flyvbjerg's questions of a phronetic researcher (and a

conversation I will more directly pick up in the concluding chapter), the results of the

research project lead me to turn to the network and ask: "Where are we going?" and

more specifically "Where are we going with transnational democracy?" (Flyvbjerg 2001,

60, 145). Where is the network situated in theories of transnational democracy, and

where may it be headed? My analysis, based on coding WWVB documents and

interview transcripts, revealed a high frequency of Transnational Discursive

Democracy, especially in the site host and DBT design levels of analysis. With majority

of the total codes being supportive of evidence of Transnational Discursive Democratic

design, I conclude that this theory speaks most appropriately to World Wide Views on

Biodiversity. As the results show strong relations to Transnational Discursive

Democracy, what now may theory teach practice?

For one, success in feedback of educational materials across all levels of analysis

shows strong support for and possibly hints at expanding the dissemination of the

education materials for practices outside of the Day of Deliberation. Sharing of

educational material will not only create new cells for knowledge and interest but will

expand the deliberative core. Citizens and site host managers should be encouraged to

share the educational materials and experience beyond the events of a single day.

Through frequency and practice, the network has the ability to strengthen its *discursive*

power. Discursive power is important for the understandings of complex ecological,

political, and social issues and should be encouraged to be used in alternative ways,

beyond the day program. According to Dryzek:

> The idea of a deliberative system begins with the recognition that a deliberative
> democracy cannot easily be sought in a single forum. Instead, it should be
> sought in the contributions of multiple sites. Rhetoric is essential when it comes
> to communication between different elements in a deliberative system, because
> those elements will often feature differently situated actors with different
> perspectives, subscribing to different discourses. (Dryzek 2010, 66)

To begin to cross discourses in lieu of global deliberations on ecological, political, and

social issues, rhetoric to bridge discourses must be consistent. The information packets

serve as a rhetorical device for the network, bridging together parties that may have not

otherwise been affiliated. Such a tool should be encouraged to use in "multiple sites."

Secondly, as the WWViews network is working on hosting a third global

deliberation, continued expansion of the project to incorporate more partners and be

represented at future COPs remains a priority. Loosening some of the procedural

requirements, such as in design, may alleviate some financial burdens on individual host sites as well as allow for a greater accommodation of variety of participants and site locations. As the network organized through snowballing procedures of discursive and affiliate connections, the design of the network should allow for greater flexibility in organization and design to meet the goals of extending the network. "Central to discursive democracy is the idea of engagement and contestation across multiple discourses in the public sphere," and a dominating discourse within a network may be constraining (Dryzek 2010, 127). Providing greater room for network partner input and allowing for greater flexibility in design may cast a wider net in the deliberative system, extending scopes of discourse. Caution is thrown to casting too wide of a net and losing credibility in international institutions. The structure of the network, Day of Deliberation, and dissemination builds credibility in the process and citizen results in international and transnational discussions. As shown, the CBD advised the continuation of WWViews involvement in the conference creating future accreditation of the network in the negotiations.

It may appear troubling that WWVB appears to reflect all three theoretical designs for transnational democracy. I suggest this is not an issue, but rather, may be characteristic of the discursive democratic nature of the project – expanding influence through any available avenue of communication and idea. Although there is flexibility for the network to move predominantly into other conceptions of transnational democracy, this would be a process for a review after WWVCE. The rigorous research process presented, nonetheless, concludes that the frequencies of shared theoretical

results are both of significance but based in the fragmentation and discursive influence potentiality of the network.

Finding answers to Flyvbjerg's initial value-rational question guiding the phronetic researcher may entail looking at WWVB in its shared characteristics to Transnational Discursive Democratic theory in praxis. The proceeding questions are answered in the following chapter, but first it is necessary to reflect upon the identification of the current state of the network. As a deliberative system, WWViews should aim to expand its discursive reach for upcoming projects. The methods of doing so may include the scaling back of DBTF guidelines, topics of discussion, or an increase in guiding post-deliberation processes and individual site host reach. Are there any shifts of power dynamics in these suggested adjustments? Is the track desirable, and based upon this position, what should be done?

CONCLUSION: WHERE ARE WE GOING WITH TRANSNATIONAL DEMOCRACY?

In the case of networked governance, discursive accountability could be facilitated by specifying that a network does not require as the price of entry that participants commit to the hegemonic discourse of the network and renounce other relevant discourses. This kind of accountability would be hard to secure in transnational financial networks that currently exclude discourse of sustainability and social justice.
- John Dryzek and Simon Niemeyer,
Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative Governance, 64

The Phronetic Researcher

> The result of phronetic research is a pragmatically governed interpretation of the studied practices… Phronetic research is in this way interpretive, but it is neither everyday nor deep hermeneutics. Phronetic research is also not about, nor does it try to develop, theory or universal method. Thus, phronetic research is an analytical project, but not a theoretical or methodological one. (Flyvbjerg 2001, 140)

The analytical approach to bridging theory and praxis pragmatically steers theories of transnational democracy and methods of transnational democratic networks while simultaneously guiding future research within the World Wide Views network. There is value layered in the research analysis as I continue interacting and organizing with the WWViews network, deliberative system, and transnational democracy. Given the interest, the analysis serves as a pragmatic tool for both theory and praxis.

The case study of World Wide Views on Biodiversity is the beginning of projects around the network. As the network develops, the intentions of the research are to develop alongside the process. More specifically, the research analysis of WWVB serves as a starting point for continued research in the network. As mentioned, the findings of this analysis present a stepping-stone for research-coordinated efforts for World Wide

Views on Climate and Energy. The purpose of the study, though, is not to add theory

to theory or minutely adjust method of deliberation, but rather, "to see the greater

picture" and take in: "What does this process mean? Where are we headed?"

WWViews is the first repetitive network of its kind. Raising voices of global citizens

and fulfilling a democratic deficit long acknowledged in academia, the WWViews

network offers a nuanced outlet for political change. The change being advocated is to

constructively navigate 'the political.' 'The political' is understood in the context of

Chantal Mouffe: "the ineradicable dimension of antagonism which exists in human

societies" (Mouffe 2005, 119). Not one value is granted above another; rather, there are

competing power dynamics always at play in discourse. In future research on the

WWViews network, I will further elaborate on dynamics of power. It was first

necessary, as this report has shown, to situate WWViews within global governance

literature, and specifically, in theories of transnational democracy. In conclusion of the

analysis, I return to Flyvbjerg's four questions of a phronetic researcher and attempt to

provide answers for the context of WWVB: (1) Where are we going with transnational

democracy? (2) Who gains, and who loses, by which mechanisms of power? (3) Is this

desirable? (4) And what should be done?

Where are we going with transnational democracy?

The initial research question for this project began with a relative form of the

question, "*Where are we going?*" Bridging theory and praxis allows me to begin the

conversation in transnational democracy. The findings of the research show citizens

and site host managers valued the use of educational materials, including pamphlets and videos, to explore complex ecological, social, and political topics. The network organized in a decentralized fashion with sites independently organizing regional events to coordinate with the global plan. Methods of organizing included a snowballing effect of individuals contacting affiliates, colleagues, and like-minded interested partners. Furthermore, the design of the network is viewed as an evolving process. Without constitutional bounds, the network is free to explore and reshape according to the demands and needs of organizers, regions, and institutions. The flexibility allows for quicker response resiliency and adaptation to the immediate needs of the network and long-term exploration of the network structural design.

Therefore, results of my analysis conclude normative implications for praxis and empirical implications for theory, answering the question, *"Where are we going with transnational democracy?"*

1) *Theoretical implications in lieu of praxis* – *Transnational Discursive Democracy (Dryzek)* best explains and understands the WWVB network.

2) *Practical implications in lieu of theory* – Values of *inclusion* and *discursive power* from Transnational Discursive Democracy are most prominently seen in design and perception of the WWVB network and are used to provide recommendations to the WWViews Alliance.

Who gains, and who loses, by which mechanisms of power?

The question of power stands beyond the scope of the network and is placed within a grander scheme of *discursive power* (or *productive power*). Dominant discourses of neoliberalism and liberal democracy currently serve as global guiding principles for institutional political change. As a transnational democratic network, mostly identifying with the transnational discursive democratic model, WWViews' discourse challenges the ideal of neoliberalism in its current state of incompatibility with the deliberative democratic process and the concerns of lay citizens. The goal of the project is to have citizen results reflected in international negotiations or debates around the negotiations. This is a traditionally radical concept, breaking from modern Western democratic discourses and correlations of economic development and democratization previously influencing democratic processes globally. As an experimental model of transnational democracy, WWViews is initiated and organized through a bottom-up approach. Furthermore, promises of sustainable development and economic independence do not reconcile the actual implications of a globalized world. The hegemonic discourse and rhetoric following neoliberal and liberal democratic order do not pull into question the majority of individual citizen voice. The question of power is to be illuminated in future research projects, as specifics in dynamics must be evaluated in action rather than reflection for must thorough analysis.

Is this desirable?

The answer to this question could be found on a spectrum, evermore just so slightly situated towards the 'no' than 'yes'. I find the trajectory of the project desirable in that it offers greater interest and promise than other methods for meaningful political change, such as electoral processes. The pool for change is vast, though, and the ability to expand the deliberative bounds of the network must be taken more strategically by the network in its processes. WWViews needs to put faith in the discursive elements of the network to provide greater inclusion and expansion of the network. The WWVCE event is already starting to move in a direction of greater discursive influence. One crucial difference in design is a six-month dissemination period between the citizen consultations and COP21 rather than previous one or two month periods. The idea is to get to the table with the results before decision-makers deliberate and expand the opportunities for regional and national dissemination strategies. The change reflects design lessons learned in emphasis on discursive power. While WWVB represents a slightly less desirable path of Transnational Discursive Democracy, there appears to be interesting evidence of recent modifications in design.

What should be done?

The findings of the analysis of WWVB reveal a network of common discourses interacting with institutions to leverage support and legitimacy. Citizens are overall receptive to the information provided and emphasized interest in global response to biodiversity issues. As the network prepares for a third event and continues to gain

esteem, the analysis attempts to provide an additional lens to the transnational democratic practice applied. Results of this analysis suggest four answers to the question of: "What should be done?"

1) *Scale back Danish Board of Technology Foundation guidelines* – The network should emphasize scale and inclusion, but as a trade-off, slightly reduce guidelines to alleviate financial and organizing burdens on site host organizers. The site hosts develop unevenly based on access to resources (both financial and in-kind). While standards for legitimation are significant, there may be avenues to explore reduction on site host requirements in lieu of interest for network reach.

2) *Adjustments to design of citizen consultation*– Adjustments to the themes may create space for a non-themed but important discussion to arise organically amongst participating citizens, particularly at the end of the deliberation day. Citizen consultations are broken into themed sessions throughout an eight-hour day. Reducing citizen time spent on global issues, the design should give proper time to national and more qualitative citizen response. Providing fora for spontaneous conversation, may further bridge discourses, as citizens use skills developed throughout the deliberation to speak from an un-facilitated point-of-view. An optional single session was dedicated to national debates in WWVB, but I suggest that restructuring the length of Day of Deliberation may best accommodate national and qualitative time while possibly alleviating some of the time commitment pressure on citizens.

3) *The Danish Board of Technology Foundation should support post-deliberation processes throughout the network* – In this context, by support, I mean continue facilitating network processes. However, autonomy would need to be given to regional and national sites to specifically implement. Post-deliberation processes generally include the dissemination process but may also extend to spin-off events with educational material, as partners in St. Lucia did with citizen manuals. Furthermore, as Betsill and Bulkeley's (2006) case of the Cities for Climate Protection (CPP) program highlights, networks can exist through a range of multilevel institutions. Is it an unattainable goal for the WWViews Alliance to sustain a network beyond organizing for global deliberation days?

4) *The Danish Board of Technology Foundation could help facilitate an increase in guiding individual site host reach* – Related to DBTF support role in the network, I suggest the Foundation encourage and facilitate methods for the global network to communicate with one another more frequently. Such efforts may result in the idea for a sustaining WWViews network and programs beyond deliberation days.

These suggestions are in direct response to the analysis of WWVB's efforts to expand the network and discourse. Scaling back the requirements for site hosts and Day of Deliberation may invite more partners to join, particularly if ways to alleviate the financial burden were found. Secondly, the structure of citizen deliberations could be altered to be less intense and create organic space for dialogue. An example in change of guidelines could include a restructuring for the deliberation process to a two days

event with four-hour deliberations or lessening the eight-hour deliberation process so it is more accessible. While there is relevance in sharing standards throughout the global network, particularly in relation to COP dissemination, limiting dialogue also limits opportunities for discursive overlap. Discursive power is dependent on its ability to transcend discourses and create new space for dialogue.

My third point relates to the second goal of bridging discourses. I recommend the Danish Board of Technology Foundation also help to guide post-deliberation processes. With citizen, site host, and design all exemplifying support for and dependence on the educational material, it becomes clear this is a key component to the network's efforts. Furthermore, with the global deliberations complete, sites then have quantified data on citizen response to the particular issues addressed. The DBTF could help guide post-deliberation processes with the use of the educational materials and deliberation results. Similarly, the final recommendation is for the DBTF to encourage and facilitate individual site reach. The DBTF could better facilitate transnational communication between sites as well as support the sites as ongoing partners. Deepen the connection may create stronger ties amongst the network and greater opportunity for all voices within the network to be heard.

Conclusion

The World Wide Views process is understood to be an evolving initiative. Through trial and progress, the network will iteratively work through changes and structure and design. The results of my thesis recommend WWViews extend inclusion through the

network and use discursive means to further develop network influence. Four recommendations are suggested to WWViews: (1) scale back DBTF guidelines, (2) adjust the design of citizen consultations, (3) DBTF should support post-deliberation processes throughout the network, and (4) DBTF should help facilitate an increase in guiding individual site host reach. Future research on WWViews will include an analysis of World Wide Views on Climate and Energy to compare to the study of World Wide Views on Biodiversity. Theoretical discussion of WWViews will engage Transnational Discursive Democracy more directly, including recent research conducted by global governance academics John Dryzek and Hayley Stevenson (2011) and Simon Niemeyer (2012). A promising insight for the discursive influence comes in the six months prior to COP21 for citizen results to be disseminated. The change in design from WWVB to WWVCE represents an intriguing strategy for discursive influence recognized by the network. Furthermore, the results of the analysis of WWVB will be a pragmatic tool for analyzing upcoming research projects on WWVCE and organizing the event as a site host manager.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aart Scholte, Jan. "Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance." *Global Governance* 8, (2002): 281-304.

Adler, Emanuel. "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics." *European Journal of International Relations* 3, no. 3 (1997): 319-363.

Adler, Patricia A. and Peter Adler. Membership Roles in Field Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1987.

Altheide, David L. "Ethnographic Content Analysis." *Qualitative Sociology* 10 (1987): 65-77.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1983.

Anndersson, Edward and Thea Shahrokh. "Crossing Boundaries with Deliberation: But Where Are We Going?" In *Citizen Participation in Global Environmental Governance*, edited by Mikko Rask, Richard Worthington, and Lammi Minna, 70-85. New York, New York: Earthscan, 2002.

Baber, Walter F. and Robert V. Bartlett. *Deliberative Environmental Politics: Democracy and Ecological Rationality*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2005.

Bäckstrand, Karin, Jamil Khan, Annica Kronsell, and Eva Lövbrand. "The promise of new modes of environmental governance," In *Environmental Politics and Deliberative Democracy: Examining the Promise of New Modes of Governance*, edited by Karin Bäckstrand, Jamil Khan, Annica Kronsell, and Eva Lövbrand, 1-27. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc., 2010.

Baker, Andrew. "Deliberative Equality and the Transgovernmental Politics of the Global Financial Architecture." *Global Governance* 15 (2009): 195-218.

Barnett, Michael and Raymond Duvall. "Power in Global Governance." In Power in Global Governance, edited by Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, 1-32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Betsill, Michele. "Transnational actors in international environmental politics," In

International Environmental Politics, edited by Michele M. Betsill, Kathryn Hochstetler, and Dimitris Stevis, 172-202. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.

Betsill, Michele M., and Harriet Bulkeley. "Transnational Networks and Global Environmental Governance: The Cities for Climate Protections Program." *International Studies Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (2004) : 471-493.

Betsill, Michele M., and Harriet Bulkeley. "Cities and the Multilevel Governance of Global Climate Change." *Global Governance* 12 (2006) : 141-159.

Bexell, Magdalena, Jonas Tallberg and Unders Uhlin. "Democracy in Global Governance: The Promises and Pitfalls of Transnational Actors". *Global Governance* 16 (2010) : 81-101.

Biermann, Frank and Philipp Pattberg. "Global Environmental Governance Revisited." In *Global Environmetnal Governance Reconsidered*, edited by Frank Biermann and Philipp Pattberg, 1-24. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012.

Biermann, Frank and Philipp Pattberg. "Conclusions." In *Global Environmetnal Governance Reconsidered*, edited by Frank Biermann and Philipp Pattberg, 265-280. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012.

Bocking, Stephen. *Nature's Experts: Science, Politics, and the Environment*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2004.

Bray, Daniel. "Pragmatic Cosmopolitanism: A Deweyan Approach to Democracy Beyond the Nation-State." *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 37 (2009) : 683-719.

Bronner, Stephen Eric. "The Communitarian Idea." In *Ideas in Action: Political Tradition in the Twentieth Century*, 41-54. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999.

Bulkeley, Harriet. "Reconfiguiring environmental governance: towards a politics of scales and networks." Political geography, 24, no. 8 (2005) : 875-902.

Bulkeley, Harriet, Liliana Andonova, Karin Bäckstrand, Michele Betsill, Daniel

Compagnon, Rosaleen Duffy, Ans Kolk et al. "Governing climate change
transnationally: assessing the evidence from a database of sixty
initiatives."*Environment and Planning-Part C* 30, no. 4 (2012): 591 - 612.

Compagnon, Daniel, Sander Chan, and Asem Mert. "The Changing Role of the State."
In *Global Environmetnal Governance Reconsidered*, edited by Frank Biermann and
Philipp Pattberg, 237-264. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012.

Cox, Robert W. "Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations." *Journal of
International Studies* 12, no. 2 (1983) : 162-175.

Dryzek, John. *Discursive Democracy: Politics, Policy, and Political Science*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Dryzek, John. "Transnational Democracy." *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 7, no. 1
(1999) : 30-51.

Dryzek, John S. *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Oxford:
Oxford University Press, 2000.

Dryzek, John S. with Simon Niemeyer. *Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative
Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Dryzek, John S. and Hayley Stevenson. "Global democracy and earth system
governance."*Ecological Economics* 70 (2011) : 1865-1874.

Dryzek, John S. *The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses*. Oxford: Oxford
University Press, 2013.

Eckersley, Robyn. "From Cosmopolitan Nationalism to Cosmopolitan Democracy."
Review of International Studies 33 (2007) : 675-692.

Eckersley, Robyn. *The Green State: Rethinking Democracy and Sovereignty*. Cambridge: The
MIT Press, 2004.

Fierke, K.M. "Constructivism**.**" In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*,
3rd edition, edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith, 187-204. Oxford :
Oxford University Press.

Flyvbjerg, Bent. *Making Social Science Matter*. Cambridge: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 2001.

Fox, Jonathan. "Unpacking 'Transnational Citizenship'." *Annual Review of Political Science* 8 (2005) : 171-201.

Goldschmidt, Rüdiger, Leonhard Hennen, Martin Knapp, Christiane Quendt, Nadine Brachatzek and Ortwin Renn. "Deliberating or Voting? Results of the Process Evaluation of German WWViews." In *Citizen Participation in Global Environmental Governance*, edited by Mikko Rask, Richard Worthington, and Lammi Minna, 89-106. New York, New York: Earthscan, 2002.

Goodin, Robert E. "Globalizing Justice." In *Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance*, edited by David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archi, 68-92. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003.

Gutmann, Amy and Dennis Thompson. *Why Deliberative Democracy?*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Popular Sovereignty as Procedure." Translated by William Rehg. In *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, edited James Bohman and William Rehg, 35-66. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1997.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Translated by William Rehg. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1998 [1992].

Haas, Ernst B. *Beyond the Nation-State: Functionalism and International Organization*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Haas, Ernst B. *Nationalism, Liberalism, and Progress: Volume 2: The Dismal Fate of New Nations*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Haas, Peter M. "Do Regimes Matter? Epistemic Communities and Mediterranean Pollution Control." *International Organization* 43, no. 3 (1989) : 377-403.

Hay, Colin. "International Relations Theory and Globalization." In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, 287-305. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Held, David. "From Executive to Cosmopolitan Multilateralism," In *Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance*, Edited by David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archi, 160-186. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003.

Held, David and Anthony McGrew. *Globalization/Anti-Globalization*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002.

Held, David and Heikki Patomaki. "Problems of Global Democracy," *Theory, Culture & Society* 23, no. 5 (2006) : 115-133.

Hynek, Nik and Andrea Teti. "Saving identity from postmodernism? The normalization of constructivism in International Relations." *Contemporary Political Theory* 9, no. 2 (2009) : 171-199.

Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. "Transnational advocacy networks in international and regional politics." *International Social Science Journal* 51, no. 159 (1999): 89-101.

Keohane, Robert O. "Global Governance and Democratic Accountability," In *Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance*, edited by David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archi, 130-159. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003.

Keohane, Robert and Joseph Nye. *Power and Interdependence*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.

Koenig-Archi, Mathias. "Introduction: Globalization and the Challenge to Governance." In *Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance*, edited by David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archi, 1-17. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003.

Kütting, Gabriela and Sandra Rose. "The environment as a global issue." In *International Environmental Politics*, edited by Michele M. Betsill, Kathryn Hochstetler, and Dimitris Stevis, 113-141. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.

Leisure, Chlóe. "*Salvelinus fontinalis*: Trout Song." In *A Poetic Inventory of Rocky Mountain National Park*, 115. Fort Collins: Wolverine Farm Publishing, 2013.

Lövbrand, Eva and Jamil Khan. "The deliberative turn in green political theory." In

Environmental Politics and Deliberative Democracy: Examining the Promise of New Modes of Governance, edited by Karin Bäckstrand, Jamil Khan, Annica Kronsell, and Eva Lövbrand, 47-66. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc., 2010.

Marshall, Catherine and Gretchen B. Rossman. *Designing Qualitative Research: Fifth Addition*. California: Sage Publications, 2011.

Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook, Second Edition*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California, 1994.

Mouffe, Chantal. "Deliberative Democracy or Agnostic Pluralism." *Institute for Advanced Studies, Political Science Series* 72 (2000): 1-17.

Mouffe, Chantal. *On The Political*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2005.

Mouffe, Chantal. *The Democratic Paradox*. London/Brooklyn: Verso, 2009 [2000].

Niemeyer, Simon. "Building a Deliberative System for Earth Systems Governance: Lessons from and Possibilities for Minipublics." Paper presented at the 2012 Lund Conference on Earth Systems Governance, Center for Deliberative Democracy and Global Governance, The Australian National University, 2012.

O'Brien, Robert. "Global civil society and global governance," In *Contending Perspectives on Global Governance: Coherence, contestation and world order*, edited by Alice D. Ba and Matthew J. Hoffmann, 213-230. London: Routledge, 2005.

O'Brien, Robert and Marc Williams. *Global Political Economy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Picciotto, Sol. "Regulatory Networks and Multi-Level Global Governance" In *Responsible Business: Self-Governance and Law in Transnational Economic Transactions*, edited by Olaf Dilling, Martin Herberg, and Gerd Winter, 315-341. Portland, Oregon: Hart Publishing, 2008.

Rask, Mikko, Richard Worthington, and Lammi Minna. *Citizen Participation in Global Environmental Governance*. New York, New York: Earthscan, 2002.

Rawls, John. "The Idea of Public Reason." In *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and*

Politics, edited by James Bohman and William Rehg, 93-130. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1997.

Rehg, William. "Translator's Introduction." In *Between Facts and Norms*, x-xxxvii. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1998.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas. *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures, and International Institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Rosenau, James N. "Governance in the Twenty-first Century." *Global Governance* 1, (1995) : 13-43.

Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data.* California: Sage Publications, 2005

Ruggie, John Gerard. "Taking Embedded Liberalism Global: the Corporate Connection." In *Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance*, edited by David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archi, 93-129. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003.

Ruggie, John Gerard. "Reconstituting the Global Public Domain – Issues, Actors, and Practices." *European Journal of International Relations* 10, no. 4 (2004) : 499-531.

Ruggie, John. "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge." *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998) : 855-885.

Schram, Sanford F. "Return to Politics: Perestroika, Phronesis, and Post-Paradigmatic Political Science." In *Making Political Science Matter: Debating Knowledge, Research and Method*, edited by Sanford F. Schram and Brian Caterino, 17-32. New York and London: New York University Press, 2006.

Speth, James Gustave and Peter M. Haas. *Global Environmental Governance.* Washington D.C.: Island Press, 2006.

Stone, Diane. "Global Public Policy, Transnational Policy Communities, and Their Networks." *The Policy Studies Journal* 36 (2008) : 19-38.

Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and*

Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory, Second Edition. Sage Publications, Inc.: Thousand Oaks, California, 1998.

Merriam Webster Online, s.v. "Trans-," accessed October 29, 2014, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/trans.

Viotti, Paul R. and Mark V. Kauppi. "Thinking About IR Theory." In *International Relations Theory*, edited by Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kauppi, 1-16. United States: Pearson Education, Inc., 2010.

Warren, Carol A. B. and Tracy X. Karner. "The Textual and the Visual as Qualitative Data." In *Discovering Qualitative Methods: Field Research, Interviews, and Analysis*, 159-186. Los Angeles: Roxbury, 2005.

Wendt, Alex. "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (1992) : 391-425.

World Wide Views on Biodiversity. "Partners." Accessed June 2012. http://biodiversity.wwviews.org/.

Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Fourth Edition. California: SAGE Publications, 2009.

APPENDIX I: DATA CODING KEYS

CONTENT	KEY
Danish Board of Technology Website	DBT 1-3
External Newsletters	EXN 1-7
Internal Newsletters	INT 1-30
Manual for World Wide Views on Biodiversity (for project managers	MAN
Network Chart	NET
World Wide Views on Biodiversity Results Report for Policymakers	RPM
Palestinian Documents	PAL 1-3
World Wide Views on Biodiversity Global Press Releases	PR 1-6

INTERVIEWEE	KEY
Global Coordinator	BJO
Canada	CAN
China	CHI
Denmark	DEN
Palestine	PAL
St. Lucia	STL

APPENDIX II: INTERVIEW GUIDE

	CONCEPTUALIZING TRANSNATIONAL DEMOCRACY INTERVIEW GUIDE
VALUE/ THEORETICAL TRADITION	**Socio-Political Context:** 1. How were the values of WWVB appealing for the site hosts and in application to the region? 2. Were certain criteria or values more important to meet than others through the organizational process? 3. Who was present at the site event and what views were represented?
INSITUTIONS, VENUES, ACTORS	**Resources:** 1. What were the most valuable resources for the execution of the event and how were they obtained? **Actors:** 2. How well were demographic standards set by the DBT met by the WWVB site? 3. Who were core entities (persons and organizations) involved and dedicated to the project and how did they interact? How did they become affiliated? **Institutions:** 4. Aside from WWVB's appeal to the UN, did your site seek outreach to other institutions or organizations (including media, local, and national entities)? 5. What aspects of the project design were limiting, troubling, or most helpful?
INFLUENCE	**Socio-Political Context:** 1. To what extent has the region utilized citizen participatory and deliberative techniques? 2. How was the event being discussed within the internal host site and the external population of the region represented? 3. Were any results seen as an outcome of the event? Explain.
REASONING	**Socio-Political Context:** 1. What were topics of greatest interest to the participants during deliberation? 2. Were points of contestation amongst citizens often brought to surface? 3. How did citizens react to the WWVB material as an educational resource?
CONDITIONS OF A PUBLIC SPHERE	**Internal and External Communication:** 1. Describe communications with the DBT, including initial contact and connections made, reliance of project initiatives, and regularity of interactions. 2. How have you situated your site within the network in relation to other sites? 3. What sites have you established communications with? Describe the frequency and intensity of interactions.

APPENDIX III: CONTENT ANALYSIS CODING

Level of Analysis: Citizen	COSMOPOLITAN NATIONALISM	(LIBERAL) GLOBAL COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY	TRANSNATIONAL DISCURSIVE DEMOCRACY	TOTALS
IDEOLOGICAL VALUE	A1: II (2 - PR5) IIIIIIIIII (10 - RPM) II (2 – PAL3) I (EXN5) III (3 – EXN7) **(18)**	B1 I (PR4) I (PR5) IIIIIIIIIIIII (13 - RPM) IIIII (5 – PAL3) II (2 – EXN7) **(22)**	C1 (0)	(PR 4) (RPM 23) (PAL 7) (EXN 6) **(40)**
THEORETICAL TRADITION	A2 I (PR5) IIIIIIIII (9 - RPM) III (3 – PAL3) **(13)**	B2 III (3 - RPM) I (PAL3) (4)	C2 II (2 - RPM) (2)	(PR 1) (RPM 14) (PAL 4) (19)
INSITUTIONS, VENUES, ACTORS	A3 (0)	B3 I (EXN5) (1)	C3 I (PR4) I (RPM) **(2)**	(PR 1) (RPM 1) (EXN 1) (3)
INFLUENCE	A4 III (3 - RPM) I (PAL3) (4)	B4 I (PR4) IIIII (5 - RPM) II (2 – PAL3) **(8)**	C4 IIIIIII (7 - RPM) I (EXN5) I (EXN7) **(9)**	(PR 1) (RPM 15) (PAL 3) (EXN 2) (21)
PROCESS	A5 I (PR4) (1)	B5 I (RPM) (1)	C5 II (2 - RPM) I (PAL3) **(3)**	(PR 1) (RPM 3) (PAL 1) (5)
REASONING	A6 IIII (4 - RPM) I (PAL3) **(5)**	B6 I (PR4) I (PAL3) I (EXN5) (3)	C6 III (3 - RPM) (3)	(PR 1) (RPM 7) (PAL 2) (EXN 1) (11)
CONDITIONS OF A PUBLIC SPHERE	A7: I (PR4) I (PR5) IIIIIII (7 - RPM) I (EXN2) **(10)**	B7 (0)	C7 I (EXN5) (1)	(PR 2) (RPM 7) (EXN 2) (11)
TOTALS	(PR 6) (RPM 33) (PAL 7) (EXN 4) **(50)**	(PR 4) (RPM 22) (PAL 9) (EXN 4) (39)	(PR 1) (RPM 15) (PAL 1) (EXN 3) (20)	

Level of Analysis: Network and Site Hosts	COSMOPOLITAN NATIONALISM	(LIBERAL) GLOBAL COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY	TRANSNATIONAL DISCURSIVE DEMOCRACY	TOTALS
IDEOLOGICAL VALUE	A1: IIIIIIIIIIIIII (14 - NET) II (2 – EXN3) (16)	B1 IIIII (5 - NET) I (PAL3) II (2 – EXN3) (8)	C1 IIIIIIIIIII (12 - NET) I (DBT2) II (2 – PAL2) III (3 – PAL3) III (3 – EXN2) **(21)**	(NET 31) (DBT 1) (PAL 6) (EXN 7) (45)
THEORETICAL TRADITION	A2 I (PAL1) (1)	B2 I (PAL1) (1)	C2 I (PAL2) (1)	(PAL 3) (3)
INSITUTIONS, VENUES, ACTORS	A3 I (PAL1) III (3 – PAL2) II (2 – PAL3) (6)	B3 III (3 – PAL1) I (PAL3) (4)	C3 III (3 - DBT2) II (2 - DBT3) IIIIIIII (8 – PAL1) IIII (4 – PAL2) I (PAL3) I (EXN7) **(19)**	(DBT 5) (PAL 23) (EXN 1) (29)
INFLUENCE	A4 III (3 – PAL1) I (PAL2) **(4)**	B4 II (2 – PAL3) (2)	C4 I (DBT2) II (2 – PAL1) I (PAL2) **(4)**	(DBT 1) (PAL 9) (10)
PROCESS	A5 II (2 - DBT3) I (PAL2) (3)	B5 I (DBT3) I (PAL1) I (PAL2) I (PAL3) **(4)**	C5 I (DBT2) (1)	(DBT 4) (PAL 4) (8)
REASONING	A6 I (PAL2) I (PAL3) **(2)**	B6 I (DBT2) I (EXN7) **(2)**	C6 I (PAL2) (1)	(DBT 1) (PAL 3) (EXN 1) (5)
CONDITIONS OF A PUBLIC SPHERE	A7: III (3 – PAL1) III (3 – PAL2) II (2 – EXN2) **(8)**	B7 II (2 – PAL1) (2)	C7 I (PAL1) (1)	(PAL 9) (EXN 2) (11)
TOTALS	(NET 14) (DBT 2) (PAL 17) (EXN 4) (37)	(NET 5) (DBT 2) (PAL 13) (EXN 3) (23)	(NET 12) (DBT 8) (PAL 24) (EXN 4) **(48)**	

Level of Analysis: Network and Site Hosts from Interviews	COSMOPOLITAN NATIONALISM	(LIBERAL) GLOBAL COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY	TRANSNATIONAL DISCURSIVE DEMOCRACY	TOTALS
IDEOLOGICAL VALUE	A1 IIII (4 – CAN) IIIIII (6 – CHI) I (BJO) IIIIIIIII (9 - PAL) IIIII (5 - DEN) IIIII (5 - STL) (30)	B1 III (3 – CAN) I (CHI) IIII (4 - BJO) III (3 - PAL) II (2 - DEN) (13)	C1 II (2 – CAN) III (3 – CHI) III (3 - BJO) II (2 - DEN) I (STL) (11)	(9 – CAN) (10 – CHI) (8 – BJO) (12 – PAL) (9 – DEN) (6 – STL) (54)
THEORETICAL TRADITION	A2 III (3 – CHI) III (3 – PAL) I (STL) (7)	B2 IIII (4 – CAN) II (2 – CHI) IIII (4 - BJO) III (3 - PAL) II (2 - DEN) II (2 - STL) (17)	C2 I (CHI) III (3 - BJO) (4)	(4 – CAN) (6 – CHI) (7 – BJO) (6 – PAL) (2 – DEN) (3 – STL) (28)
INSITUTIONS, VENUES, ACTORS	A3 I (CAN) II (2 –CHI) III (3 - BJO) III (3 - PAL) III (3 - DEN) (12)	B3 I (CHI) IIIII (5 - BJO) II (2 - PAL) I (DEN) I (STL) (10)	C3 IIIIII (6 – CAN) IIIII (5 – CHI) IIIIIII (7 – BJO) IIIIIIIIIIIII (13 - PAL) IIIIII (7 - DEN) IIIIIIII (9 - STL) (38)	(7 – CAN) (8 – CHI) (15 – BJO) (18 – PAL) (11 –DEN) (10 – STL) (69)
INFLUENCE	A4 I (CAN) I (CHI) IIIII (5 - BJO) IIIII (5 - PAL) II (2 - DEN) I (STL) (15)	B4 II (2 – CHI) II (2 - BJO) I (PAL) II (2 - DEN) I (STL) (8)	C4 I (CAN) IIIIIIIIII (10 – CHI) IIIIIIII (8 - BJO) IIIII (5 - PAL) III (3 - STL) (27)	(2 – CAN) (13 – CHI) (15 –BJO) (11 – PAL) (4 – DEN) (5 – STL) (50)
PROCESS	A5 I (CAN) II (2 - BJO) I (DEN) II (2 - STL) (6)	B5 I (CAN) IIII (4 - BJO) III (3 - PAL) III (3 - DEN) (11)	C5 IIIII (5 - BJO) II (2 - PAL) (7)	(2 –CAN) (11 –BJO) (5 – PAL) (11 – BJO) (2 –STL) (31)
REASONING	A6 II (2 – CAN) III (3 - BJO) (5)	B6 I (CAN) III (3 – CHI) I (BJO) I (PAL) I (STL) (7)	C6 IIIII (5 – CAN) II (2 – CHI) IIIIII (6 - BJO) IIIII (5 - PAL) I (DEN) III (4 - STL) (23)	(8 – CAN) (5 – CHI) (10 – BJO) (6 – PAL) (1 – DEN) (5 –STL) (35)
CONDITIONS OF A PUBLIC SPHERE	A7: I (CAN) IIIII (5 – CHI) I (BJO) IIIIII (6 - PAL) I (DEN) III (3 - STL) (17)	B7 II (2 – CAN) I (CHI) I (DEN) (4)	C7 II (2 – CAN) III (4 – CHI) (6)	(5 – CAN) (10 –CHI) (1 – BJO) (6 – PAL) (2 – DEN) (3 – STL) (27)

TOTALS	(92)	(70)	**(116)**	

Level of Analysis: Project Design and DBT	COSMOPOLITAN NATIONALISM	(LIBERAL) GLOBAL COSMOPOLITAN DEMOCRACY	TRANSNATIONAL DISCURSIVE DEMOCRACY	TOTALS
IDEOLOGICAL VALUE	A1: I (MAN) I (PR1) I (PR2) I (PR3) III (3 – RPM) I (EXN3) I (EXN4) I (EXN6) II (2 – INT4) (12)	B1 I (PR2) II (2 - RPM) I (EXN6) I (EXN7) II (2 – INT3) III (3 – INT4) I (INT9) I (INT12) I (INT21) I (INT22) (14)	C1 IIIIII (6 - MAN) II (2 – PR1) I (PR3) I (PR6) III (3 - RPM) I (EXN1) I (EXN2) IIIIIII (7 – EXN5) II (2 - EXN6) III (3- EXN7) I (INT7) I (INT10) I (INT17) I (INT22) II (2 - INT25) I (INT27) **(34)**	(MAN 7) (PR 7) (RPM 8) (EXN 19) (INT 18) (59)
THEORETICAL TRADITION	A2 I (INT4) I (INT21) (2)	B2 I (RPM) I (EXN1) I (EXN7) I (INT3) I (INT4) I (INT17) I (INT21) I (INT29) (8)	C2 I (MAN) I (EXN2) II (2 - INT22) (4)	(MAN 1) (RPM 1) (EXN 3) (INT 9) (14)
INSITUTIONS, VENUES, ACTORS	A3 IIIIII (6 - MAN) IIII (4 - RPM) II (2 - EXN1) I (EXN5) I (EXN7)	B3 III (4 - DBT1) IIIIIIII (8 - MAN) I (PR1) I (PR2) I (PR4) II (2 - PR5) I (PR6) IIIIIIIII (9 - RPM) I (EXN1) I (EXN3) I (EXN4) I (EXN5) I (EXN6) I (EXN7) I (INT2) II (2 – INT4) I (INT10) III (3 - INT29)	C3 IIIII (5 - DBT1) I (DBT2) I (DBT3) IIIIIIIIIIIIIII (15 - MAN) II (2 - PR2) I (PR3) III (3 - PR4) II (2 - PR5) I (PR6) IIIII (5 - RPM) I (EXN1) I (EXN2) I (EXN3) III (3 – EXN5) IIII (4 - EXN6) II (2 – INT1) II (2 – INT2) I (INT3) I (INT4) II (2 – INT5) I (INT6) II (2 - INT7) I (INT8) I (INT9) I (INT10) II (2 - INT12)	(DBT 11) (MAN 29) (PR 15) (RPM 18) (EXN 20) (INT 45)

			I (INT13) I (INT14) I (INT15) I (INT16) II (INT17) I (INT18) I (INT19) II (2 - INT20) II (2 - INT21) II (2 - INT22) I (INT23) I (INT24) III (3 - INT26) II (2 - INT28) I (INT30)	
	(14)	(40)	**(84)**	**(138)**
INFLUENCE	A4 I (DBT1) IIII (4 - DBT3) I (MAN) I (PR5) IIIIII (6 - RPM) II (2 - EXN7) I (INT27) I (INT29)	B4 IIII (4 - DBT3) I (MAN) IIII (4 - RPM) I (EXN7) I (INT29)	C4 I (DBT2) I (DBT3) IIIII (5 - MAN) I (PR2) I (PR3) I (PR5) III (3 -RPM) I (EXN5) III (3 - EXN6) I (EXN7) II (2 – INT12) I (INT21) I (INT22) I (INT27) I (INT28) I (INT29)	(DBT 11) (MAN 7) (PR 4) (RPM 13) (EXN 8) (INT 10)
	(17)	(11)	**(25)**	(53)
PROCESS	A5 I (DBT1) IIIII (5 - MAN) I (PR1) I (PR6) IIII (4 - RPM) II (2 – EXN1) II (2 – EXN5) IIII (4 - INT21) I (INT22) I (INT24)	B5 I (DBT1) I (MAN) I (PR3) IIIIIII (7 - RPM) I (EXN3) I (EXN7) I (INT25)	C5 II (2 - MAN) II (2 - RPM) I (EXN6)	(DBT 2) (MAN 8) (PR 3) (RPM 13) (EXN 7) (INT 7)
	(22)	(13)	(5)	(40)
REASONING	A6 II (2 - MAN) I (RPM) I (INT4)	B6 II (2 - MAN) I (PR3) III (3 – PR4) IIII (4 - RPM) I (EXN1) I (EXN3) I (INT26)	C6 IIIII (6 - MAN) II (2 - RPM) I (EXN2) I (EXN5) I (EXN6) I (EXN7) I (INT22)	(MAN 10) (PR 4) (PRM 7) (EXN 6) (INT 3)
	(4)	**(13)**	**(13)**	(30)
CONDITIONS OF A PUBLIC	A7: II (2 - MAN)	B7 I (EXN4)	C7 II (2 - MAN)	(MAN 4) (PR 6)

SPHERE	IIII (4 - PR4) IIII (4 - RPM) II (2 – EXN1) I (EXN5) I (INT3) I (INT4) I (INT5) I (INT15) I (INT16) I (INT25)	I (EXN6)	I (PR5) I (PR6) I (RPM) II (2 – EXN1) II (2 – EXN2) I (EXN3) IIII (4 - EXN4) III (3 – EXN5) I (EXN6) I (EXN7) II (2 – INT3) I (INT4) I (INT5) I (INT11) I (INT14) I (INT15) I (INT16) I (INT17) I (INT19) I (INT21) I (INT24) I (INT27) II (2 - INT30)	(RPM 5) (EXN 19) (INT 21)
	(19)	(2)	**(34)**	(55)
Level of Analysis: Project Design and DBT	(MAN 17) (DBT 5) (PR 10) (RPM 22) (EXN 16) (INT 19) (89)	(MAN 12) (DBT 9) (PR 11) (RPM 27) (EXN 17) (INT 24) (100)	(MAN 37) (DBT 9) (PR 18) (RPM 16) (EXN 49) (INT 70) **(199)**	

APPENDIX IV: QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF CONTENT

CONTENT	Language	QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS
Network Chart (NET)	- National and International Institutions/Policy (Aichi) - Common values - Eco over Econ - 'Encourages exploration' - National institution/identity	- Sites were often environmental or communitarian - Sites were interested in citizen education and expansion of democratic processes
WWVB Results Report for Policymakers (RPM)	- National participation - International policy - Value of voice - Citizen involvement for future democratic processes - Demographic inclusion - Self-selection	- Citizen results show strong support for ecological justice - Equity and justice of concern - Results framed by way of international and national institutions and regulation recommendations - Role of civil society and democracy less apparent
Manual for World Wide Views on Biodiversity (MAN)	- Voting/polling - International agreements (Aichi/Kyoto) - Hybrid method of actors; "crossing issues and subjects" - Technology	- Design level of analysis - Demographic inclusion emphasized but through a self-selective process - Interest to influence future structure of democracy and national/international policy
DBT Website Information (1-3) (DBT 1-3)	- Network partners - EJ - Media/communication; vote - Shared value - National representation - International institutions	- Concerned with the involvement of civil society in decision-making processes - Institutional design and appeal are important for citizen deliberations
WWVB Press Releases (1-6) (PR 1-6)	- International participation - National association - Shared value - Priority of press/media - Network tools - Citizen representation - Education/video - Local accommodation - Inclusion	- Citizen views shared as environmentally-concerned - Emphasized importance and the of global citizen deliberations and civil society
External Newsletters (1-7) (EXN 1-7)	- Environmental - Hmanitarian - Conservation - Inclusive principles	- Design level of analysis - Sometimes citizen and site host manager views shared - Sharing of information, progress, links, and photographs - Design descriptions
Internal Newsletters (1-30) (INT 1-30)	- Network funding and organizing - Relations/support with international institutions - Inclusive	- Network organizing - Logistical information for sites - Avenues for communication with partners - Inclusive of all WWViews Alliance members participating in WWVB
Palestinian Documents (1-3) (PAL 1-3)	- Citizen involvement - Compare results - International institution	- Emphasis on use of different network tools - Interest in international recognition

	appeal - National representation - Sharing of information/media with public - Language Side even Advise politicians/vote	- Share voice globally - Educational materials for sharing - Press releases