

Tables

1.1	Actors and their different positions in the consulting process	9
3.1	Three rhetorical genres	50
4.1	Warrants that can support normative or positive claims	103
4.2	Emphasis in the argumentation	126
4.3	Methodological outline of reports	127
4.4	Preferred styles of argumentation	132
5.1	Claims, grounds and rebuttals in the Amsterdam Airport debate	140
5.2	Advice by consultants about Amsterdam Airport	144
5.3	Advice by academics about Amsterdam Airport	145
5.4	Quantification of grounds by consultants	152
5.5	Quantification of grounds by academic advisers	153
5.6	First and second level warrants implied in reports about growth of Amsterdam Airport	158
5.7	Sources as backing for statements in reports about the growth of Amsterdam Airport	166
5.8	Differences in structure and presentation of Amsterdam Airport reports	170
6.1	Claims, grounds and rebuttals in the liberalization debate	182
6.2	Consultant advice about liberalization	188
6.3	Academic advice about liberalization	189
6.4	Quantification of effects by consultants in liberalization debate	192
6.5	Quantification of effects by academics in liberalization debate	193
6.6	First and second level warrants in the debate about liberalization of the electricity market	196
6.7	Sources as backing for statements in reports about liberalization	201
6.8	Differences in structure and presentation of liberalization reports	205
7.1	Specialist or generalist argumentation	216
7.2	Treatment of the claim	218
7.3	The use of grounds	220
7.4	Implied warrants on the first and second argumentation level	222
7.5	The use of backings	225
7.6	Styles of presentation	228

7.7	Confrontation between ethos and the practice of advice argumentation	231
7.8	Cases where academic argument varies between debates by three or more reports	235