ЧАСТИНА 2

НАУКОВІ ПОВІДОМЛЕННЯ

УДК 502

Claire Haggett, Beatrix Futák-Campbell

Tilting at windmills? Using discourse analysis to understand the attitude-behaviour gap in renewable energy conflicts

The UK government is committed to a target of 15% of energy from renewable sources by 2210, yet it is unlikely that this will be met on current progress. While surveys indicate wide support for renewable energy, attempts to site wind farms in specific locations are frequently and fiercely resisted. In this paper, we examine this apparent contradiction. We draw on a number of wind farm conflicts, and explore the discursive formulations of key stakeholders. In particular, the management of opposition against something that has popular support is considered, along with the strategies deployed to avoid accusations of selfish parochialism. The effect that opposition has on particular sitting conflicts, the state of wind energy developments, and the renewable debate at large will be reflected upon. The importance of sociological inquiry into these issues will be emphasised, but more importantly, the application of discourse analysis is put forward as an applied method to investigate ecological problems, such as the resistance of renewable energy sources.

Keywords: Renewable Energy, windmills, discourse analysis, attitude-behaviour gap, NIMBYism.

1. Introduction

On the 28th of August 2003, the lights went out over London. A power cut caused chaos, panic, and massive disruption as commuters were trapped underground, traffic signals failed, and homes and offices were blacked out. The messages about the security of our energy supply were clear; not only was this significant in terms of a terrorist attack, but our dependence on oil and on imported supply was questioned yet again. If ever there was a time to guarantee a safe source of energy, this was it.

So what of the alternatives to oil, and particularly to foreign supply? The Government has been promoting renewable energy for some time, and in 2008 a policy document about energy set a number of ambitious goals. Cuts of 60% in carbon dioxide emissions were targeted for 2050, with real progress by 2020, which will require at least 30% to 40% of electricity from renewable sources.

Of all the renewables, it is wind power that is the most technically advanced and is seen as the way to reach the energy targets (MacCullaich, 2001; Ball 2002), and policies are in place to support the development of wind energy and attempt to meet these ambitious targets. New planning regulations states that the wider environmental and economic benefits of renewable energy developments, whatever their scale, have to be considered in local planning decisions, in an attempt to allow more wind farms to be built.

But there is a problem; or at the very least a contradiction between this backing for wind

Claire Haggett, Dr., School of Social and Political Science, University of Edinburgh; *Beatrix Futák-Campbell*, Dr., School of International Relations, University of St Andrews.

energy, and the successful permitting rate of wind farms. In England and Wales only two in five of the applications for wind energy developments are granted through the planning system, with a further small percentage being granted at appeal (Toke, 2005). Despite high public support in survey research[1], fierce, vocal and seemingly effective opposition exists in areas where turbines are planned.

In light of the social and political importance of the topic, it is clearly vital to understand this opposition and the apparent gap between attitudes and behaviour. In this paper a discourse analysis (DA) approach is used to consider how and why protest manifests, by unpacking the claims and arguments presented by the key players in wind energy developments. In doing so, this research follows Burningham when she argues that how those involved in a conflict "present their position as more credible, robust and convincing than that of others… may have practical implications for the outcomes of the dispute" (2000:55). In the next section therefore, we make a case for using DA as an applied method for solving ecological problems.

2. The analytical framework: principles and origins of discursive analysis

The approach being used is DA. This is appropriate because using DA does not assess the factuality or validity of the claims being made; instead, it studies how those involved in the disputes do this themselves. This is in contrast to other research on opposition that seeks to understand it merely to overcome it (such as Blake, 1999); or categorises the claims being made by protesters into those that are valid and those that are not. Often this categorisation is implicit, but describing the factors that may incite people to protest almost inevitably means engaging in dismissing or legitimating their opposition. Kahn (2000) for example dismisses wind farm protesters by characterising their claims as parochial and selfish; yet even studies that describe legitimate reasons that may cause opposition serve to make judgements about them by doing so. For example, a variety of research states that people may protest because of a recognition that some sites are better suited to developments than others, and it is this that motivates recommending it be placed elsewhere, not a selfish desire not to have it sited locally (see for instance Throgmorton, 1987; Hanley and Nevin, 1999; Walker, 1995; Wolsink, 2000; Luloff et al, 1998). The point is that describing such as motivation as counter to the 'NIMBY'[2] theory involves making judgements about them. DA does not engage in this type of categorisation, or with issues of the validity, accuracy, or truth of accounts. It does not seek to compare them to the 'actual' situation, for such a grasp of this actuality would inescapably be only the researcher's view of it. The researcher has no ability or privilege to assess the situation or to compare claims to it, therefore the only way to understand it (in this case, the way a conflict arises), is to examine the claims that are made about it. The DA researcher therefore studies how the protagonists present themselves, and present the issue and their account of it as valid, accurate, and truthful, rather than presuming that they are able to do this themselves.

In its broadest sense therefore, DA is the study of talk and texts (Wetherell et al, 2001:i), and the search for patterns in language use within them (Taylor, 2001a:10). It is way of investigating language in use, but as has been described, it is more than just a method; it represents a different epistemological and ontological approach to traditional forms of

[1] For example, a study for the Department of Trade and Industry (2003) found over 85% of people advocated the use of renewables rather than fossil fuels, over 90% stated that the Government should encourage the use of renewable energy, and 72% approved of windfarms, even if they lived nearby.

[2] 'NIMBY' of course stands for 'Not In My Backyard' and is a term used to denote protest based on very local concerns (See for example Freudenberg and Pastor, 1992).

research. The features of a DA approach[1] that are therefore that language is not merely means of information transmission; and that language is constructive and oriented to action (Heritage, 1984; Edwards and Potter, 1992; 2001). These understandings are a move away from a cognitive conception of language as representing an inner reality, or the often implicit view that it is a window on 'what people really think'. They also encompass an understanding of language as contingent and variable on the context of its production (Edwards and Potter, 1992:2). The emphasis on language and interaction flows from the adoption of ethnomethodology (see Garfinkel, 1967) as one of the foundations for DA and the incorporation of speech act theory (see Austin 1962; Searle, 1969). The concern with the function of language, in relation to the management of impression, has evolved from the interpretive sociology of Goffman (e.g. 1959). The focuses that DA takes on the constructive power of language, its action oriented use, and the meaning that it has for participants mean it is of "enormous value to social scientists whose concerns include the circumstances and experiences of people's everyday lives" (Lawes, 1999:17).

This paper adds to research carried out on factual accounts (Billig, 1996; Wooffitt, 1992; and Potter, 1997), and those, which have pointed to the benefits of focusing on the rhetorical organisation of accounts (for example Speer and Potter, 2000:545; Horton-Salway, 2001b:247; Puchta and Potter 2002:347; Te Molder, 1999:246; Simons, 1990:11; and Edwards and Potter, 1993:24). It does not therefore consider that the accounts being produced by those interested in conflicts are just a factual description of the situation, or merely a representation of their views; instead, the language used has a function in presenting the issue in a particular way. In this way, the accounts that are produced in a conflict constitute that conflict. This type research does not presume that by examining these accounts, it is possible to sort out the factual from the inaccurate or constructed ones. There is no such privilege or methodological criteria.. Furthermore, rather than aiming to get a general understanding of the issue, or even of each of the perspectives presented by different groups, this research acknowledges and focuses on the variability in accounts; where two texts or two incidences within the same text appear to be in contradiction. Examining the context in which they are situated may give an insight into the function of that language use. Lastly, it is also important to stress that this research is not aiming to resolve or even address philosophical debates, or engage in questions about whether things exist or not. This paper does not intend to become involved in epistemological debates about the nature of discursive research; overviews of these debates are provided in Taylor (2001a; 2001b) and have been much discussed elsewhere (Edwards et al, 1995; Smith 2000). As Potter (1997:6) says, considering the factual construction of accounts does not require an answer to the philosophical question of what factuality is, and as he goes on to say, it "need do no more than consider reality construction a feature of descriptive practices; the concern is with interaction, such that philosophical questions of ontology can be left to the appropriate experts" (Potter, 1997:178). This is what this research has aimed to do.

3. The data set

Besides putting a case forward for DA as a new analytical framework for solving ecological problems, this research has attempted to gain an understanding of wind farm conflicts, as its case study. Thus, it took into account the variety of groups involved, and has

[1] It should firstly be noted that there are of course a wide range of approaches that come under the term 'discourse analysis' (Hook, 2001; Edley, 2001). There seems even to be contradiction over what such a term may mean (see for example, Elliott et al, 2000). As will be explored, this research has adopted a social psychological perspective on DA.

collected data from a number of sources. Both the national strategies of wind power developers and the specific press releases, public information leaflets, technical specifications and proposals for wind farms in particular locations have been collected. The data collection period was between August 2003 and April 2004. Where available, planning inquiry documents have been collected, and contacts made with planners across the country. In terms of opposition, a comprehensive search has been undertaken of campaign groups formed to oppose specific developments, and websites for over twenty UK based groups have been analysed. The information produced by national level campaign groups (both those in support and opposition) has also been collected, including their websites, campaign literature and contacts made with the leading members; these groups include Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, Worldwide Fund for Nature in support, and Country Guardian and Views of Scotland in opposition. Qualitative interviews were carried out with representatives from the 'sides' in one particular conflict in rural North East England; these included a local government councillor, a developer, and a local protester. Lastly, local and national newspaper coverage (and where available television coverage) of conflicts in particular areas has also been collected and analysed. The presentation of the analysis in this paper is not intended to be a comprehensive, nor a systematic analysis of all the data from one area or from a particular type of stakeholder or time frame; rather it is intended to present examples of the types of concepts that were developed through a DA approach.

4. Analysis

This paper will outline a number of themes that have arisen from the data.

4.1. Issues of stake: global versus local

For proponents in any debate, issues of 'stake' are key. Potter (1997:110-111) describes stake management as authors ensuring that their accounts are not dismissed as a product of their interest. It also concerns the efforts that may be undertaken to make accounts seem distant from their production, and how authors may seek to undermine other accounts by discrediting them in this way (McGhee and Miell, 1998:65). It is clearly crucial for all concerned in a wind farm conflict to avoid having their claims dismissed as a matter of stake. For developers, this means proving that they are motivated by issues other than profit. For protesters, this means proving that they are not motivated purely by selfish parochial concerns . Additionally, there is a label often applied to people who protest against a development which is planned in their local vicinity: 'NIMBY' This acronym stands for 'Not In My Backyard' and is intended to suggest that protesters are only opposed to a development because of its proximity and not the development itself; so they apparently support wind farms as long as they are built far away from their local area. The 'NIMBY' label is often used by those who want to build a development as a way of explaining opposition to it.

4.1.1 Against accusations of NIMBY – (local) landscapes

It is crucial for opponents of wind farms to avoid accusations of NIMBY. Research has highlighted that if claims can be categorised in this way, then they can easily be dismissed (see Wolsink, 1994). One way in which this is managed is to stress the importance and innate value of the proposed site, and that this is the basis for protest, not just because it happens to be nearby. The following is from the opening statement on the website for a campaign group set up to oppose a wind farm in Whinash, Cumbria, in the North West of England:

Extract 1. from 'Say No To The Whinash Windfarm' campaign website

1. An unspoilt stretch of Cumbrian countryside, itself worthy of
2. National Park status, would be sacrificed for a politically correct

3. fad which experience has shown gives small return for an immense
4. cost. The landscape has been acknowledged by central government
5. organisations and committees as being of national significance.

The group make their intentions clear; they are opposing the scheme because of the value of the landscape. That the landscape *is* valuable is emphasised. It is "worthy of National Park status" (lines 1-2), a high honour indeed, and it is "unspoilt" which of course implies that turbines would 'spoil' it. Indeed, it is stated that they would do more than this, and the area would be "sacrificed" by a wind farm; implying the loss that would be incurred and what would have to be given up and destroyed. The group distance themselves from their description of the value as merely their opinion and instead point to both "central government organisations *and* committees" (lines 4-5; emphasis added) who have determined this. The use of the word "acknowledged" implies that the committees realised what was already known; it is not even just their opinion that the landscape is valuable, it objectively and unarguably is. It is also not just the opinions of the group and their local concerns that the turbines would be unsuitable; they point to "experience" that has proved this. The landscape is not just valuable because it is of "national" significance; this is not a debate about local or selfish interests but preserving the assets of the nation.

4.2 Invoking the global crisis – planet, not profit

While campaign groups may cite the value of the local landscape as a reason to oppose a wind farm, developers manage issues of stake by placing considerations about wind power in the context of a global environmental crisis, and presenting themselves as being motivated by concern to take action on it. For example:

Extract 2. from National Wind Power website

1. As environmental protection and sustainable development are now
2. top priorities worldwide, we all need to consider carefully
3. how the energy that we consume should be produced.
4. National Wind Power is committed to developing and promoting
5. wind energy as a major renewable energy source
6. for a sustainable future.

This is the opening of the text from National Wind Power, and immediately sets the tone for their approach. They are developing wind energy as a response to the "environmental protection" (line 1) that is required. It is not their judgement of the situation alone, but something that has been acknowledged "worldwide"; these are global issues, and moreover require urgent attentions; they are "top priorities" (line 2) that the company are therefore taking action on. A casual link is implied between protecting the environment and energy production, and the responsibility for addressing this is made clear – this is not just something that the energy companies need to consider, but something that "we all" (line 2) need to do. NWP therefore present themselves as proactively taking action on this, and state that they are "committed" (line 4) to developing wind power as a direct means to achieve this necessary environmental protection.

4.2.3 People's champions

Furthermore, developers may present themselves as taking action on these global problems – on behalf of the people. For example, this text is from a public information leaflet produced by United Utilities for a proposed windfarm off the coast of South Wales:

Extract 3. from United Utilities public information leaflet
'Scarweather Sands Offshore Wind Farm Swansea Bay'

1. We are committed to working with communities that will be
2. directly influenced by the Scarweather Sands project. We aim to
3. deliver significant value not only to these local communities but to
4. Wales as a whole

The project is presented as being about the delivery of "significant value" (line 3) by the developer; they are working to benefit not even just the local community but Wales as a whole, such are the beneficial 'influences' that the project will have. This use of the word "influenced" (line 2) is interesting, because it is more neutral than "impacts" or "effects", and the following sentence about value implies that this may be advantageous. The company present themselves as working "with" the community, for the community, and for people everywhere in tackling global environmental problems.

4.2. The Battle for Common Sense

An emphasis on a global crisis ties into a second rhetorical strategy that is prevalent in the debate. While a variety of different developments meet with local protest, what the developers and supporters of wind farms use in their rationale is that renewable energy is *obviously* a good thing; it is clean, green, endless energy. Opponents may therefore have to counter these arguments, redefining the basis of what is purported to be accepted knowledge about them.

The commonsensical nature of the benefits of renewable energy and windfarms are evoked in the documents produced by supporters. For example Linley-Adams for WWF (2003), in a report about off-shore renewable energy potential, states that "there is wide acceptance of the need to reduce our national reliance on fossil fuels for well-rehearsed geopolitical and environmental reasons". Who accepts this is not stated; it is so obvious that this consensus exists and that the information it is so well accepted it does not need even to be stated there; the arguments can be summarised as being "well-rehearsed" because they are so familiar.

The UK government policy on this is also apparent. The former Energy Minister Stephen Timms made it clear that wind was the way forward, because of the myriad benefits that it brings:

Extract 4. from Department of Trade and Industry press release 22 October 2003:
'New Windfarms Given Go Ahead'

1. "Wind power technology is a clean and green alternative to fossil
2. fuels. We are committed to reducing our carbon dioxide emissions
3. by 60% by 2050 and renewable energy will help us meet our long
4. term energy needs while also addressing our environmental
5. concerns."

The Minister makes a number of points in favour of wind energy; firstly it is an alternative to fossil fuels. That one is needed, or what the disbenefits of fossil fuels are does not need to be stated here; they are obvious enough that a "clean and green alternative" can only be a good thing, and fossil fuels are therefore 'un-clean' and 'un-green'. Because of this, the "committed" proactive and responsible position that the Government are taking means that both energy and the environment can be addressed; this is not merely an environmental solution but a practical one as well.

Campaign groups may therefore have a difficult task in presenting their case. Opponents have to present their arguments against this apparent prevailing opinion. Furthermore, while developers can present themselves as being concerned about the environment and protecting it

by promoting renewable energy, protesters do have a more difficult task to manage what may seem as an anti-environmental stance. There seem to be two tactics to be able to do this. The first of these is to try and balance the competing environmental aims of clean energy and unspoilt landscapes. The second is to redefine what may be seen as common sense about the global environmental crisis, the need for renewable energy, and the expediency of wind farms as the answer.

4.2.1 Balancing environmental aims

Campaigners justify their ostensibly 'anti-environmental' stance by reasserting their fundamental concern for the environment; and furthermore, by arguing that turbines will harm, rather than protect the environment, which serves to highlight the environmental damage that wind power can cause. For example, the Rimside Moor Wind Farm Protest group make an appeal to "help us stop this unnecessary environmental intrusion into this beautiful North Eastern corner of England"[1]. Doing so, the group present themselves as being very much concerned about the environment, and that it is this that motivates their opposition to wind farms. Turbines represent an "intrusion" into the environment, something that it must be protected against. They cannot therefore be dismissed as not wanting to protect the environment by not advocating renewable energy, and instead confirm their environmental credentials.

There is an additional element to redefining accepted knowledge that campaigners engage in. To describe a group of turbines as a 'windfarm' seems uncontroversial enough, but putting inverted commas around the word farm, such as Country Guardian does, problematises it and draws attention to the use of the word. The word 'farm' has connotations of working with nature, and of productivity. Describing turbines as 'wind "farms"', groups draw attention to these assumptions, and suggest that while the word is used, these added assumptions are not applicable to wind energy.

4.3. Disclaimers: 'I'm not against wind power, but..'

One of the key benefits of the DA approach is the treatment of variability between and crucially within texts. Instead of having to read a text for the general gist of the argument being presented and ignoring what seem like contradictions, DA focuses on the effect of each piece of language in the precise context in which it is being used. In this way, 'contradictions' may make perfect sense. For example, this paper has described how those in opposition to turbines may attempt to counter prevailing knowledge about the benefits of wind turbines. However, what will be shown in this section is that opponents may also use 'disclaimers' to present their views, such as 'I'm not against windpower, but..'. While, on a superficial reading, it may seem contradictory for opponents to say that they are not against windpower, this tactic is rendered more intelligible once a deeper understanding of the function of the language is uncovered. Disclaimers are used as a way of presenting what may be an unpopular view, and can be used to "ward off potentially negative inferences that they see as flowing from another part of their talk" (Potter and Wetherell, 1988:53). Wetherell and Potter (1992) give the example of the use of disclaimers in their study of racism where statements were typically structured along the lines of 'I'm not a racist, but..'. The point is that language use is designed to achieve effects pertinent to that context. Previously, statements about the unsuitability of wind energy were used to counter the claims encouraging its use. Here the context is one of avoiding the dismissal of one's claims as being biased, ill thought through, or

[1] The Rimside Moor Protest group – http://www.wind-farms.co.uk/index.htm – downloaded 27/07/03.

just what would be expected of someone in this position, and orienting to the fact that windpower is thought to be popular. Campaigners who use this device are engaging against the specifics of a development and highlighting its deficiencies, and are able to do so by outlining their general support.

For example, in an interview[1] a local councillor's opening statement was:

"I'm not against wind farms per se, right, I'm open minded". Doing so immediately presents himself (and what emerged as his opposition to a proposal in his constituency) as not based on lack of or mis-information, bias, or prejudice about turbines, nor that he was against them from the start. His opposition was based on the shortcomings of the project itself and the effects it would have had on his constituents, because of his knowledge and experience of his local area which he went on to emphasise. Stating that he was not against wind farms generally highlighted that it was the deficiencies in this particular project that brought about his opposition.

Use of such a mechanism can also be seen in this extract from campaign group 'Views of Scotland'. The aim of such a presentation is to avoid what might be an indefensible position, and to highlight why, in this case, they are opposed to wind developments. For those who are not in principle against the turbines to be in opposition in this case draws attention to the reasons why they are, and therefore strengthens the reasons for their protest. For example, the group state in an introductory section entitled 'The Wayward Wind' that:

Extract 6. from View of Scotland website

1. Views of Scotland is currently opposing the rush to land based
2. wind power stations in the UK. This is not through an inherent
3. opposition to wind as a form of renewable energy but because our
4. research reveals that the rush arises from an ill considered and
5. redundant approach to sustainable development.

The group use the disclaimer that they are not 'inherently opposed' to wind, but make it clear that there are many problems with wind energy, and so justify their position. Firstly, it is twice stated that the development of wind energy is being done in a "rush" (lines 1 and 4). This serves to discredit policy makers and investors as rational decision-makers: how can they be when they're developing wind power in such a chaotic fashion? There is no attempt to operationally define the concept of rushing, with a view to presenting the facts about how many specific decisions have been rushed or not, but the impression is left that this is a situation that is being badly handled by those in power. The group make it apparent that their opposition is not to renewable energy, something that it might be difficult to justify, but to wind as a "form" of it. The basis of this is not just their opinion but their "research", which has "revealed" this to be the case – the results are not an artefact of this research but where there to be found by it. These results are presented as quite damning, and find that the development of wind energy is both "ill considered" and "redundant". The implication is that windpower would be supported if it were being developed properly; it is because it isn't that it is not.

4.4. Everyone is a 'David'

It has become apparent from analysing texts produced about windfarm conflicts that one of the key features of the debate is the way that both the developers and the protesters present themselves as a 'David' compared to the 'Goliath' that they are up against; they both see themselves as having the enormous challenge against huge and unfair odds to achieve their

[1] Interview as part of a 'Tilting at Windmills?' project workshop, held December 2003.

aim. While this may seem more obvious for protest groups, and is something that a variety of them use in their texts, we were able to find instances of this tool being used in an interview with a developer.

To give some examples; opposition groups point to the powerful organisations, vested interests, and legal procedures that they are 'up against'. Country Guardian state that:

"unfortunately there is no point in trying to separate government and the wind industry. The Government seems hell-bent on promoting wind power at all costs"[1]. Rather than being a democratic institution representing the people, the Government is portrayed as hand in glove with the developers; and it is this that ensures their "hell-bent" support. This is presented as "unfortunate" and clearly very difficult to fight against, if even the Government have such an entrenched and biased position. The juxtaposition of campaigners against developers is even more pronounced in this extract from a local campaign group:

Extract 7. from Meikle Carewe Windfarm Action Group website

1. The Meikle Carewe Windfarm Action Group was formed in 2000
2. as the voice of a small rural community concerned with the plans
3. of a large developer to construct a wind energy power station in the
4. N.E. of Scotland near Stonehaven (south of Aberdeen)"

The contrasts are clear – the group represent a "small" community against a "large" developer; they represent a "community" of local people against an outside interest; and they are "rural", based in the countryside, against a company who want to build a "power station", something that jars with this notion. The text serves to highlight the disparities in power that they two groups have, and the unfair advantage that their opponent has.

However, presenting themselves as a 'David' is something that developers also engage in. There is almost a frustration that in spite of all the benefits that windpower brings, and how carefully designed it is, people still oppose it.

Extract 8. from interview with a developer, December 2008

1. In [name of company] we have, in past ten years we've had
2. physicists, engineers designing turbines and they have come up
3. with a fantastic project and we go public with it and we expect to
4. get planning permission…but the planning process, it's just a huge,
5. it's a huge ball of risk for us. As soon as we go public we get an
6. awful lot of, it goes out of control, in effect, public perceptions and
7. problems. So we somehow manage boatloads of risk up front but
8. then as soon as we've got the project ready to go, we get bogged
9. down.

The contrast with the well designed project and the public reaction to it is clear. There is an emphasis on just how well designed the project is, "ten years" (line 1) of work by a variety of engineers has gone into it, and the project has been "designed" (line 2), carefully thought out and worked through, not just planned for or built in a particular location, with all the "risk" (line 7) being thoroughly managed before it is announced. Because of all of the design and experience, they can expect to get planning permission, because the project is a "fantastic" one - it is "ready" and it works. In contrast to all this carefully planning, public opinion goes "out of control" (line 6). Getting "bogged down" (lines 8-9) is an interesting phrase to use here, because it has a faintly depressing and frustrated air to it, and one of difficult and wearing

[1] Extract from Country Guardian website [http://www.countryguardian.net/ downloaded 24/06/03]

struggles. In this text, the developer presents their company as being the David to the Goliath of ill thought through yet effective public opinion and the trials of the planning system.

In this further extract, the developer draws a contrast between themselves and the campaign groups, and the skills and tactics they are able to draw on it in the 'fight':

Extract 9. from interview with a developer ctd, December 2008

1. This is where as an industry we do ourselves a disservice because
2. we are not geared up to match the responsiveness of these anti
3. groups. In a couple of, straightaway, there's a website out, very
4. professional… Then the majority, lets say 80% of people, just out
5. there, the antis are getting at, let's call them the swing voters,
6. they're getting there first, and all of a sudden we are on the back
7. foot, trying to defend. And as soon as it's out there, the mud sticks.
8. I know at [Location X] for example they've produced a photo
9. montage which is vastly out of scale. But still, it's put that image
10. there, it's out there, and [Location X] has had huge amounts of
11. attention and its getting on national television.

As a David, the developer presents themselves as able to do very little against the tactics and abilities of the Goliath-like protesters. The protesters are able to be responsive, and to produce their material to a high and "professional" (line 4) standard in such short time. The developer even changes their assessment of how long this might take, from "a couple of.." to "straightaway" (line 3) which really emphasises this. Because of their speed and responsiveness, the protesters are able to turn public opinion by "getting there first" (line 6) in the battle for hearts and minds. Again, their speed is emphasised, because this has happened almost before the developers have realised – "all of a sudden" (line 6) they are already having to defend themselves. It is made clear that these people were not originally against the turbines, this "majority" of people are "just out there" (line 4), they are not involved or necessarily even informed; they are just there, and are open to either side, they are "swing voters" (line 5) – but they become turned against the turbines when the campaigners get to them first. The developer also presents the difficulties of being on the defensive once the campaigners have elicited this support; they have to "try" and defend, but have already been forced into a difficult position and are on the "back foot" (lines 6-7). This is presented as being made more difficult by the analogy of "the mud sticks" (line 7); these are not presented as being important considerations but accusations that are wielded that it is difficult to supersede. Once an idea has been put into the public domain, however "vastly" inaccurate it is, it "sticks". This is compounded by the publicity that the campaigners are able to generate, and the developer implies that it is all negative publicity for them and in favour of the protesters that is being generated, with their quick responses and "out of scale" images. Once the protesters have produced an image, it is presented as almost being distanced from them – it is "out there", in the public domain, and not simply a tactic they are using. Campaigners are presented not only as being able to turn swing voters, but in being able to influence the pool of information from which people form their opinions. In contrast, the developer presents themselves as being unable to countermand the campaigners' speed, tactics, and attacking position, and therefore unable to bring a "fantastic" project to fruition with the support that it should have.

5. Conclusion

This research has highlighted some of the themes in the claims made by those involved in wind energy conflicts. It has detailed some of the rhetorical strategies that interested parties

engage in to encourage support for their view, and indicated that sometimes both 'sides' may use the same tool to achieve similar effects. This research has explored the apparent gap between attitudes and behaviour not in terms of asking why people oppose windfarms when there is high support for them, but by considering how the claims made about wind energy constitute that conflict, and how proponents present their particular version of it. The DA approach taken is in contrast to sociological and psychological research which constrains the responses that those involved may give, and may measure attitudes and behaviour on different scales. It is also in contrast to research that focuses on the factors that influence people in conflicts, which can lead to characterising some of these as valid reasons for protest and others not. A DA approach stands back from all this, and does not engage in such issues; instead, it studies how those involved seek to validate their claims and persuade others of their truth, and discredit contradictory claims. This claims making and counter claims making constitutes the debate itself. In this way, the claims are the conflict; there is no other means to access or study it. Other ecological conflicts could similarly be analysed using a DA approach, to understand how and why that conflict emerges, and exploring the key claims made about it.

There are of course a number of considerations to applying a DA approach (as there naturally are in any methodology). The first of these concerns generalisability. The analysis presented here has been from a number of different sources in an attempt to capture something of the breadth of the debate. It should firstly be said that this is not to imply that analysis is therefore necessarily generalisable across this debate or to others. Gill (1996:155) points out that discourse analysts are critical of the idea that such generalizations are possible, and asserts that discourse is always constructed from particular interpretative resources and designed for specific interpretative contexts. It seems to be however that "although the details of what is talked about may be endlessly varied, the sorts of procedures for constructing and managing descriptions may be much more regular, and therefore tractable in analysis" (Potter, 1997:112) - while the analysis from any data is specific to it, the rhetorical tools that are identified may be highlighted elsewhere; this leads to the recommendation for further research on the controversies surrounding renewable energies, and it is hoped that the analysis presented here is an indication of the wealth of interesting concepts that may emerge.

A second consideration is that in presenting data in this paper, a balance has had to be struck between allowing the context to become apparent, allowing readers to validate work on one hand; and limits on space and reader patience on the other. Whatever position was reached on this would not be ideal, and we do not pretend that it is so. Thirdly, there are also reflexive issues that are relevant in this research. The "non-neutrality of research texts" (Taylor (2001b:319) is acknowledged, and the impossibility of distancing the researcher from the research. Indeed, we have both been influenced in our views on wind energy since carrying out this research. Secondly, it is acknowledged that giving introductory descriptions of a wind energy debate and the key players means moving 'beyond the data', and is only our summary of what the situation might be. This engages with Woolgar and Pawluch's (1985) notion of 'ontological gerrymandering' by describing (and problematising) the existence of something and using language referentially in order to do so. However, to avoid a deconstructive spiral, and for this research to be about 'something' and not just about DA or reflexivity, this research adopts Collins and Yearley's (1992a;1992b) position of social realism, and the ability to alternate between states to be able to carry out analysis of them. The research here has briefly presented some themes in the data on windfarm conflicts; and we would welcome comment and/or validation of them, and a chance to explore both the substantive analysis, and issues in carrying out DA further.

1. *Austin, J.L.* 1962. *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

2. *Ball, I.* 2002. 'Turning the Tide: Power from the sea and protection for nature'. Cardiff: Report for WWF Cymru.
3. *Billig, M.* 1996. *Arguing and Thinking: A Rhetorical Approach to Social Psychology - Second Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. *Blake, J.* 1999. 'Overcoming the 'Value-Action Gap' in Environmental Policy: tensions between national policy and local experience'. *Local Environment* 4: 257-278.
5. *Collins, H.* and Yearley, S. 1992a. 'Epistemological Chicken' in Pickering, A. (ed.) *Science as Practice and Culture*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
6. Collins, H. and Yearley, S. 1992b. 'Journey into Space' in Pickering, A. (ed.) *Science as Practice and Culture*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
7. *Edley, N.* 2001. 'Analysing Masculinity: Interpretative Repertoires, Ideological Dilemmas and Subject Positions' in Yates, S.J. (ed.) *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage.
8. *Edwards, D.* and Potter, J. 1992. *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage.
9. *Edwards, D.* and Potter, J. 1993. 'Language and Causation: A Discursive Action Model of Description and Attribution'. *Psychological Review* 100: 23-41.
10. *Edwards, D.* and Potter, J. 2001. 'Discursive Psychology' in Rapley, M. (ed.) *How to Analyse Talk in Institutional Settings: A Casebook of Methods*. London: Continuum.
11. *Elliott, R.*, Fischer, C.T. and Rennie, D. 2000. 'Also against methodolatry: A reply to Reicher'. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 39: 7-10.
12. *Freudenberg, W.R.* and Pastor, S.K. 1992. 'NIMBYs and LULUs: Stalking the syndromes'. *Journal of Social Issues* 48: 39-61.
13. *Garfinkel, H.* 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
14. *Gill, R.* 1996. 'Discourse analysis: practical implementation' in Richardson, J.T.E. (ed.) *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences*. Leicester: BPS Books.
15. *Goffman, E.* 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Allen Lane.
16. *Hanley, N.* and Nevin, C. 1999. 'Appraising renewable energy developments in remote communities: the case of the North Assynt Estate, Scotland'. *Energy Policy* 27: 527-547.
17. *Heritage, J.* 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
18. *Hewitt, J.* and Stokes, R. 1975. 'Disclaimers'. *American Sociological Review* 40: 1-11.
19. *Hook, D.* 2001. 'Discourse, Knowledge, History and Materiality: Foucault and Discourse Analysis'. *Theory and Psychology* 11: 521-547.
20. *Horton-Salway, M.* 2001b. 'Narrative identities and the management of personal accountability in talk about ME: A discursive psychology approach to illness narrative'. *Journal of Health Psychology* 6: 247-259.
21. *Kahn, R.* 2000. 'Siting Struggles: The Unique Challenge of Permitting Renewable Energy Power Plants'. *The Electricity Journal* 13: 21-33.
22. *Linley-Adams, G.* 2003. 'All at sea: Welsh case study on marine renewable energy'. Cardiff: Report for WWF Cymru.
23. *Luloff, A.E.*, Albrecht, S.L. and Bourke, L. 1998. 'NIMBY and the Hazardous and Toxic Waste Siting Dilemma: The Need for Concept Clarification'. *Society and Natural Resources* 11: 81-89.
24. *MacCullaich, F.* 2001. 'UK Onshore Wind: Constraints and opportunities for wind farms in the UK'. *Refocus* November/December 2001: 30-33.
25. *McGhee, P.* and Miell, D. 1988. 'Relationships, social networks and social interaction: an exploration in diary methodologies' in Miell, D. (ed.) *Doing Social Psychology*. Milton Keynes: Open University.
26. *Potter, J.* 1996a. *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London: Sage.
27. *Potter, J.* and Wetherell, M. 1987. *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.
28. *Potter, J.* and Wetherell, M. 1988. 'Accomplishing Attitudes: Fact and Evolution in Racist Discourse'. *Text* 8: 51-68.
29. *Puchta, C.* and Potter, J. 2002. 'Manufacturing individual opinions: Market research focus groups and the discursive psychology of evaluation'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 41: 345-363.

30. *Ricoeur, P.* 1981. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences (Trans. Thompson, J.B.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
31. *Rorty, R.* 1991. *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth - Philosophical Papers, Volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
32. *Saussure, F.D.* 1959/1966. *Course in General Linguistics (Trans. Baskin, W.)*. London: McGraw-Hill.
33. *Seale, C.* 1999. *The Quality of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
34. *Searle, J.R.* 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
35. *Simon, A.M.* 1996. 'A Summary of Research Conducted into Attitudes to Wind Power from 1990-1996': British Wind Energy Association.
36. *Simons, H.W.* 1989. *Rhetoric in the Social Sciences*. London: Sage.
37. *Speer, S.* and Potter, J. 2000. 'The management of heterosexist talk: conversational resources and prejudiced claims'. *Discourse and Society* 11: 543-572.
38. *Taylor, S.* 2001. 'Locating and Conducting Analytic Research' in Yates, S.J. (ed.) *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage and The Open University.
39. *Taylor, S.* 2001b. 'Evaluating and Applying Discourse Analytic Research' in Yates, S.J. (ed.) *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage.
40. *te Molder, H.F.M.* 1999. 'Discourse of dilemmas: An analysis of communication planners' accounts'. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 38: 245-363.
41. *Throgmorton, J.A.* 1987. 'Community Energy Planning: Winds of Change from the San Gorgonio Pass'. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 53: 358-367.
42. *Toke, D.* 2005. 'Explaining wind power planning outcomes: Some findings from a study in England and Wales'. *Energy Policy*.
43. *Walker, G.* 1995. 'Renewable energy and the public'. *Land Use Policy* 12: 49-59.
44. *Wetherell, M.* 2001a. 'Introduction' in Yates, S.J. (ed.) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*. London: Sage and The Open University.
45. *Wolsink, M.* 1994. 'Entanglement of Interests and Motives: Assumptions behind the NIMBY-theory on facility siting'. *Urban Studies* 31: 851-866.
46. *Wolsink, M.* 2000. 'Wind power and the NIMBY-myth: institutional capacity and the limited significance of public support'. *Renewable Energy* 21: 49-64.
47. *Wooffitt, R.* 1992. *Telling Tales of the Unexpected*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
48. *Wooffitt, R.* 1993. 'Analysing accounts:' in Gilbert, N. (ed.) *Researching Social Life*. London: Sage.
49. *Woolgar, S.* and Pawluch, D. 1985a. 'Ontological gerrymandering: the anatomy of social problems explanations'. *Social Problems* 32: 214-227.

Received 10.12.2010

Клайр Хаггет, Футак Кемпбел

Вітрова енергетика? Використання дискурсивного аналізу для вивчення розходження ставлень в конфліктології відновлювальних ресурсів

Уряд Великобританії прагне до 2210 року досягти 15% бар'єру виробництва енергії за рахунок поновлюваних джерел, але на думку автора це малоймовірно, враховуючи поточний прогрес. Дослідження показують широку підтримку в суспільстві щодо використання поновлюваних джерел енергії, проте спроби встановлення вітрових електростанцій в придатних для цього місцях часто призупиняються через різного роду конфлікти. У цій статті автори розглядають суперечності розвитку вітрової енергетики в Великобританії, описують ряд конфліктів вітрової енергетики, а також досліджують дискурсивні позиції зацікавлених сторін. Зокрема вивчаються питання управління спротивами процесам, що мають широку підтримку суспільства. Автори підкреслюють важливість соціологічного опитування в цих питаннях, на чому і буде зроблений акцент, проте ще більш важливим є застосування дискурсивного аналізу як прикладного методу дослідження екологічних проблем, зокрема таких як опір впровадження поновлюваних джерел енергії.

Claire Haggett, Beatrix Futák-Campbell. **Tilting at Windmills? Using Discourse Analysis to Understand the Attitude-Behaviour Gap in Renewable Energy Conflicts**

Дане дослідження акцентує увагу на окремих сторонах конфліктів, що виникають в процесі впровадження альтернативної енергетики, зокрема – енергії вітру. Дослідження містить докладні риторичні стратегії, які зацікавлені сторони використовують для підтримки своєї точки зору, також показано, що іноді "сторони" використовують той самий інструмент для досягнення аналогічних ефектів. В роботі описано очевидний розрив між установками і поведінкою не в плані того, щоб питати, чому окремі люди виступають проти вітрової енергетики, незважаючи на її значну підтримку, проте більшою мірою вивчаються питання яким чином вимоги щодо впровадження вітряної енергії створюють конфлікт, і як прихильники альтернативної енергетики представляють свої конкретні його версії.

Дискурсивний аналіз в статті використовується як альтернативний метод соціологічним і психологічним дослідженням, котрі мають недоліки і обмежують відповіді респондентів. Перевагою використання дискурсивного аналізу є те, що респонденти можуть вимірювати ставлення та поведінку в різних масштабах.

Дана стаття виступає на противагу дослідженням, що зосереджується на факторах впливу у конфліктних ситуаціях і їх визначенні їх ролі у подальшому перебігу конфлікту. Дискурсивний аналіз відходить від усього цього і замість цього вивчає, як учасники конфлікту намагаються переконати в своїй правоті та дискредитувати вимоги суперників. Таким чином, на думку авторів, претензії уже є конфліктом, а дискурсивний аналіз є найкращим інструментом для їх вивчення. Екологічні конфлікти також можуть бути проаналізовані за допомогою дискурсивного аналізу, щоб краще зрозуміти, як і чому, виникає конфлікт, а також визначити ключові претензії з цього приводу.

Звичайно є ряд припущень щодо використання дискурсивного аналізу так як, і в будь-якій методиці. Перше з припущень є узагальненість проблеми. Аналіз, представлений в даній роботі був проведений на основі ряду джерел у спробі виокремити основну думку у широті дискусій. Проте автори підкреслюють, що це не означає, що проведений ними аналіз обов'язково узагальнює усю проблематику провадження альтернативної енергетики описану в ряді наукових праць. Для підтримки цієї думки автори приводять роботу Гілл (1996:155), котрий зазначає, що дискурсивний аналіз критично ставиться до ідеї, що такі узагальнення взагалі можливі, і стверджує, що дискурс завжди будується з конкретних тлумачення ресурсів і призначений для конкретного тлумачення контекстів. Значну увагу автори приділяють поданню даних у цій статті і як стверджується в роботі намагаються зберегти баланс між забезпеченням зрозумілості контексту, що дозволяє читачеві перевірити роботу, з одного боку, та врахувати обмеження щодо обсягу та терпіння читача з іншого боку.

Автори критично ставляться до свого дослідження і стверджують, що які б висновки не були отримані в роботі вони не є ідеальними, крім того підкреслюється важливість рефлексивних проблем, які не мають однозначних відповідей.

Ключові слова: альтернативна енергетика, вітрові електростанції, дискурсивний аналіз, поведінка споживачів, екологічні конфлікти.

Підготував ***О.В. Кубатко***

Клайр Хаггет, Футак Кемпбел
Ветровая энергетика? Использование дискурсивного анализа для изучения различий в конфликтологии возобновляемых ресурсов

Правительство Великобритании стремится до 2210 года достичь 15% барьера производства энергии за счет возобновляемых источников но, по мнению авторов, это маловероятно, учитывая текущий прогресс. Исследования показывают широкую поддержку в общества относительно использования возобновляемых источников энергии, однако попытки установления ветровых электростанций в пригодных для этого местах часто приостанавливаются из-за разного рода конфликтов. В этой статье авторы рассматривают противоречия развития ветровой энергетики в Великобритании.

Ключевые слова: альтернативная энергетика, ветровые электростанции, дискурсивный анализ, поведение потребителей, экологические конфликты.