

T01P09 / Advocacy Coalition Framework: Advancing Theory and Evidence about Phenomena of Policy Processes

Topic : T01 / POLICY PROCESS THEORIES

Chair : Christopher Weible (University of Colorado Denver)

Second Chair : Metodi Sotirov (Chair of Forest and Environmental Policy, School of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Freiburg)

Third Chair : Tim Heinmiller (Department of Political Science, Brock University)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

The policy process is complex requiring theoretical approaches to simplify it, help guide in its study, and offer descriptions and explanations. One such theoretical approach is the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF). With about 30 years of conceptual development and research under it, the ACF remains one of the most established and applied theoretical approaches to understanding aspects of the policy process in the world. Applications now span political systems and multiple policy issues where knowledge is accumulating about policy change, learning, and, especially advocacy coalitions.

General Objectives

The general objectives of this panel is to advance the study of public policy and policy processes by exploring and discussing the variety of ACF scholarship that might span across different country-contexts, span across different topics, use different methods of data collection and analysis, and explore theoretical/conceptual improvements to the framework. The main goal of this effort is to tackle phenomena central to the study of policy process and to make clear how the ACF is making a contribution.

Scientific Relevance

The general objectives fall at the heart of the study of policy processes. Stated more generally, this includes the phenomenon of political mobilization of people and organizations in what might be called the pressure system to influence government particularly outside of elections, the phenomenon of policy change via outputs of government decision-making venues (possibly regulation, legislation, and many other types), and the phenomenon of adaptation and belief change through learning from information, experiences and other stimuli over time. This panel will tackle these phenomena collectively through four sessions that touches upon methodological innovations, innovative approaches to network analysis, how the ACF integrates with other theoretical approaches, and a focus on theoretical insights on policy change.

We also expect this panel to contribute to the ongoing discussion of ACF-related phenomena by its research community. Scientific evidence builds up as networks of scholars work together under a shared vernacular to advance similar research questions and publications build populate the field via journals and publishers. This panel will contribute to this effort by integrating scholars under the same research program toward the goal of scientific advancement.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Call

T01P09 / Advocacy Coalition Framework: Advancing Theory and Evidence about Phenomena of Policy Processes

Chair : Christopher Weible (University of Colorado Denver)

Second Chair : Metodi Sotirov (Chair of Forest and Environmental Policy, School of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Freiburg)

Third Chair : Tim Heinmiller (Department of Political Science, Brock University)

Session 1 Methodological Innovations in the ACF

Friday, June 28th 08:00 to 10:00 (MB 5.255)

Discussants

Christopher Weible (University of Colorado Denver)

Advocacy coalitions advancing the right to food in India.

Alyssa Brierley (Toronto Metropolitan University)

To say that hunger is endemic in India is an understatement. Throughout its history, India has had some of the highest rates of hunger anywhere on earth. In 2001, an Indian NGO filed a petition in court, challenging the inaction of the government in the context of starvation,[1] requesting that the government provide some of the massive amounts of food it was storing as a result of its national food procurement and distribution program to those who were starving to death. This seemingly modest request initiated what would ultimately become a seventeen-year court battle to hold the government accountable to take action to fulfil the right to food. Coinciding with this court case has been a vibrant civil society movement which has advocated passionately and tirelessly for the right to food, generating a tremendous amount of activity from the village level to the highest institutions in the country.

This litigation also opened the door for a once-in-a-generation opportunity for significant transformation of major elements of India's social welfare system. Significant policy reforms to India's food procurement and distribution system followed through amendments and expansions of nine different government programs, and two of India's most significant pieces of social rights legislation were also passed during this time. The advocacy coalition broadly referred to as the right to food campaign in India played a significant role in these policy developments, by engaging in a wide range of activity, from litigation to street-level organizing to engaging with more traditional policy actors such as bureaucrats and politicians.

This paper will use the right to food campaign in India as a case study to provide insight into how the right to food movement formed in India, how it organized itself, and the nature of the advocacy work that it engaged in in order to shed light into the broader questions of how advocacy coalitions form and what strategies do they employ to engage in the policy process. Research for this paper was conducted using a multidimensional methodological approach consisting of qualitative data gathering in the form of in-depth personal interviews, on-site data collection, participant observation and secondary academic research.

[1] PUCL v. Union of India & Ors. W.P (C) 96/2001.

Beliefs and Interests within Advocacy Coalitions: Lessons from Climate Policy Change in Canada

David Blair (Huron University College at the University of Western Ontario)

One of the central assumptions in the Advocacy Coalition Framework is that advocacy coalitions form around the shared policy core beliefs of political actors rather than being based primarily on their

overlapping interests. Some researchers (e.g. Nohrstedt 2010) have questioned whether this depiction of the nature of coalitions is always accurate and suggest that the ACF be modified to include interests among the possible motives behind the participation of certain political actors in advocacy coalitions. The focus of this paper is on the question of whether an alliance of political actors motivated by shared beliefs and actors motivated by calculations of self-interest can constitute an advocacy coalition and whether a coalition of this kind can effectively exercise influence over major policy changes. The case of the recent change in the climate policy of the federal government of Canada is presented to test the proposition that an effective advocacy coalition can combine actors with contrasting motivations. The research for the paper is based on process tracing, in which the connection between the evolution of the federal government's climate policy and changes in a carbon pricing proponent coalition is traced over a twenty-year period. Data was collected from official documents, media sources, public opinion surveys, secondary sources, interviews, and reports by NGOs, business associations and think tanks. The analysis reveals that a key development in the climate policy subsystem was the joining of a coalition of proponents of carbon pricing by important segments of the business community, brought about through a combination of shifts in extra-subsystem conditions and policy learning promoted by an influential epistemic community of economists. This change in coalition membership did not involve an alteration in the core beliefs of the business community and its traditional allies, but rather resulted from a revision of the community's perception of its self-interest which aligned with the goals of the pre-existing proponent coalition that was based on shared beliefs about the potential environmental effectiveness of carbon pricing policies. This important shift within the policy subsystem was followed by a major change in the federal government's climate policy with the adoption of a nation-wide carbon pricing strategy. This study has implications for a variety of research questions of interest to ACF scholars, including the conditions under which coalitions form and maintain themselves, the role of economic research in shaping learning, and the alignment of coalition structure with changes in policy.

Policy stasis within the Advocacy Coalition Framework: a causal mechanism of the Yasuni-ITT initiative

Daniel Jurado (FLACSO Ecuador)

What are the causal mechanisms driving policy change and policy stasis continues to be a fundamental focus within the Advocacy Coalition Framework research agenda. While most recent empirical applications have shown support for external shocks as the most frequent precursor of major policy change, further research is needed to explain why does in some scenarios, even apparently similar external perturbations and minority coalition mobilization, the process might result in failed policy change? To answer this question, we assess the ACF's overlooked role of interest and power of governmental authorities, and their decisions as a formal step previous to policy change and stasis.

This paper proposes an intensive qualitative research design that uses critical realism as a methodology combining two ontologies: mind-world dualism (causal explanations of the world are possible) with transfactualism (social processes can be understood beyond directly observable phenomena). Aligned with this methodology, process-tracing method is used to craft a comprehensive explanation of the policy process. Despite recent applications of the ACF claim using process-tracing when exploring the associations between primary pathways and secondary components to policy change and stasis, this paper argues that these studies rely on a minimalist understanding of causation where isolated propositions are tested independently (congruence analysis); thus, leaving the "black box" unopened. Conversely, this research builds on a systems understanding of causation where coalitions engaging in activities transmit causal forces through the interlocked entities of a mechanism.

The theorized causal mechanism of policy stasis operates as follows: an external shock triggers the redistribution of coalition resources (Entity A); this causes the mobilization of a minority coalition to advance its policy core beliefs into actual policy (Entity B); this activates the mobilization of bias of governmental authorities who feel threatened by the policy-core beliefs of the minority coalition (Entity C); thus, resulting in a policy stasis (Outcome). The causal mechanism is then tested empirically against a typology of coalition resources as expected empirical observations of the workings of the mechanism. Evidence found is formally evaluated using Bayes theorem which determines the posterior confidence of the theory being truth.

The theoretical causal mechanism of policy stasis is applied to the environment and energy subsystem in Ecuador. In particular, the Yasuni-ITT initiative where despite skillfully achieving a moratorium to exploit oil in the Ecuadorian Amazon in return for a payment from the international community, a conservationist coalition could not avoid the withdrawal of the initiative promoted by the developmentalist coalition lead by the president. Finally, the paper aims to contribute to the ACF research agenda in three ways: first, by casting doubts about the usefulness of the meso-level belief-based approach to policy change and stasis of the ACF when applied to less pluralist regimes. Second, by incorporating a sound methodology that explicitly unpacks the causal mechanism linking external shocks and policy stasis. Third, to expand the empirical applications of the ACF outside Western Europe and North America.

Key words: Policy stasis, process-tracing, South America.

Understanding policy change using simulation of the advocacy coalition framework

Klein Raphael (EPFL)

This paper presents the simulation of the policy process to study what drives changes within the advocacy coalition framework. The model used for this is a two steps model of the policy process constructed in part from concepts of the advocacy coalition framework coupled to a Schelling segregation model.

The aim of this paper is to look at the mechanisms that drive policy change within the theoretical case of a segregation model. The paper focuses on three different policy change pathways: policy learning, external events and negotiations. This policy change can be driven by changes in the policy network, the coalitions, their strategies and the beliefs of the actors. Changes in these different parameters can lead to policy learning, and can be triggered by external events or actor negotiations.

To study the policy change, an agent based model of the policy process is used. This is a two steps model where first an agenda is created by the actors within the policy subsystem. This is followed by a policy formulation step where the same actors select a policy instrument that would best fit their respective goals and decide whether to implement that said instrument. Four agent-types are considered for the decision making process: policy entrepreneurs who push for their own interests, policy makers which have decision making power, external parties (media, NGOs, ...) which inform other agents of the states of the world and the electorate which influence the policy makers' goals.

To compare the different pathways to policy change, the same simulation is run a number of times with different assumptions. As a benchmark test, the simulation is first run without any path to policy change. Interactions are removed to prevent policy change, no external events are used and negotiations are not removed as well. The model is then run separately with the inclusion of actor interactions – for policy learning, external events and negotiations. The results are compared to explore which pathway is more effective, to achieve what goal and why.

This simulation approach helps us test different hypothesis for policy change within a policy subsystem. For this paper, this is done for a hypothetical segregation model but it could also be done with a real life case study in the future. In the future, changes to the actors' interaction algorithms could also help us better understand how policy change can be different within different cases.

Cultural Theory and Party Identification – Investigating a Link in ACF Research

Johanna Hornung (University of Lausanne)

Nils Bandelow (Technische Universität Carolo-Wilhelmina Braunschweig)

The existence of belief systems is a core assumption of the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) to explain individual actors' values, attitudes, and behaviour in policy processes. While the operationalization and measurement of policy core beliefs in surveys mostly draws on specific questions on policy-related opinions (Weible 2005; Leach and Sabatier 2005; Vogeler and Bandelow 2018), the assessment of deep normative core beliefs remains contested (Sabatier and Brasher 1993; Ripberger et al. 2014; Sotirov and Winkel 2016). When transferring the ACF to European democracies, the role of parties in presenting and producing individual actors' beliefs has been only addressed marginally, although existing research in political science establishes a link between core values and party identification (Goren 2005). Instead, cultural theory has been applied frequently to measure deep normative core beliefs, which then are depicted as cultural worldviews (Jenkins-Smith et al. 2014). With regard to parties, Ripberger et al. (2014) postulate that the application of cultural worldviews and associated deep normative core beliefs is rather suitable for two-party systems due to the unidimensional scale on which party competition usually takes place.

The proposed paper aims at providing empirical evidence for the measurement of deep normative core beliefs and cultural theory by using the widely acknowledged and extensive European Social Survey dataset of 2018. By conducting a factor analysis of the items reflecting the two dimensions of cultural theory, the paper reveals the underlying worldviews and cross-checks them with the party identification of individuals. As a consequence, the analysis allows for answering the question how different political systems enable different cultural worldviews and how these relate to the respective party systems in European countries. Its results therefore provide guidance for future empirical research on the ACF and cultural theory.

- Goren, Paul. 2005. "Party Identification and Core Political Values." *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (4):881-96.
- Jenkins-Smith, Hank, Carol L. Silva, Kuhika Gupta, and Joseph T. Ripberger. 2014. "Belief System Continuity and Change in Policy Advocacy Coalitions: Using Cultural Theory to Specify Belief Systems, Coalitions, and Sources of Change." *Policy Studies Journal* 42 (4):484-508. doi: 10.1111/psj.12071.
- Leach, William D., and Paul A. Sabatier. 2005. "To Trust an Adversary: Integrating Rational and Psychological Models of Collaborative Policymaking." *American Political Science Review* 99 (4):491-503. doi: 10.1017/S000305540505183X.
- Ripberger, Joseph T., Kuhika Gupta, Carol L. Silva, and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. 2014. "Cultural Theory and the Measurement of Deep Core Beliefs Within the Advocacy Coalition Framework." *Policy Studies Journal* 42 (4):509-27. doi: 10.1111/psj.12074.
- Sabatier, Paul A., and Anne M. Brasher. 1993. "From Vague Consensus to Clearly Differentiated Coalitions: Environmental Policy at Lake Tahoe." In *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*, edited by Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, 177-208. Boulder Colorado: Westview Press.
- Sotirov, Metodi, and Georg Winkel. 2016. "Toward a Cognitive Theory of Shifting Coalitions and Policy Change: Linking the Advocacy Coalition Framework and Cultural Theory." *Policy Sciences* 49 (2):125-54. doi: 10.1007/s11077-015-9235-8.
- Vogeler, Colette, S., and Nils C. Bandelow. 2018. "Mutual and Self Perceptions of Opposing Advocacy Coalitions: Devil Shift and Angel Shift in a German Policy Subsystem." *Review of Policy Research* 0 (0). doi: 10.1111/ropr.12299.
- Weible, Christopher M. 2005. "Beliefs and Perceived Influence in a Natural Resource Conflict: An Advocacy Coalition Approach to Policy Networks." *Political Research Quarterly* 58 (3):461-75. doi: 10.1177/106591290505800308.

T01P09 / Advocacy Coalition Framework: Advancing Theory and Evidence about Phenomena of Policy Processes

Chair : Christopher Weible (University of Colorado Denver)

Second Chair : Metodi Sotirov (Chair of Forest and Environmental Policy, School of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Freiburg)

Third Chair : Tim Heinmiller (Department of Political Science, Brock University)

Session 2 Agenda Setting and Policy Change Innovations in the ACF

Friday, June 28th 10:30 to 12:30 (MB 5.255)

Discussants

Metodi Sotirov (Chair of Forest and Environmental Policy, School of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Freiburg)

HOW AND WHO DECIDES THE MARITIME SHIPPING POLICY IN BRAZIL? An ACF study using DNA.

Henrique Oliveira (Universidade Salvador - Unifacs)

Problem: This text addresses the political actor's performance over the Brazilian Maritime Shipping Policy since the 1985 re-democratization. Institutional changes in the rules in force in the national port policy have brought constraints, without structural changes in the Brazilian port policy (DOCTOR, 2017). So which and how did the status quo advocacy coalitions spread thru the policy subsystem in these almost 30 years?

Operationalization: We set two objectives: a) outline the composition of advocacy coalitions; b) point out the external political variables that influence the policy subsystem. As analytical model, we combined the theory of international regimes with the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF). Three paradigms were identified in the formation of maritime shipping limestones: The productive paradigm; the political paradigm and the commercial paradigm. Those paradigms were useful to come up with eight possibilities of beliefs coalitions. We have been using the Discourse Network Analysis (DNA) to coding the data collected from the actor's statements available at congress comities minutes. The actors are our primarily unit of analysis. As variables to capture the levels of actors cluster we use: organization (parties, social movements, associations, enterprises); performance sector (government, opposition, port sector, shipping sector, foreign commerce); level (local, state, national and international); and the 8 possibilities of coalitions beliefs (used as the Boolean variable concept on the DNA sheet coding).

We worked with two dimensions to reach the objectives. The temporal dimensions in four periods: 1) the end of autocratic military government; 2) the constituent, between 1986 and 1988; 3) the first reform attempt in the 1990s; 4) and the second attempt to reform in the year 2010. Moreover, a sectoral dimension, three thematic axes of the policy: port activity; maritime shipping lines regulation; integrated port and naval mercantile activity.

Provisional findings: We reach two coalitions present in the policy: privatization industrial and corporate industrial. The status quo maintenance followed by incrementalism is related to the corporate industrial coalition dominance. They have strong permeability and coordination in the political party system since the constituent. The participation of the privatizing industrial coalition was intense starts from the first attempt of reform in the 1990s, which generated incrementalism in regulation and implementation. However, it was insufficient to break with the traditional paradigm of the policy-oriented process, without impacting on more substantial transformations in politics. Besides the closed political system, the predominance of corporate industrialists can be explained due to the weak participation of the other coalitions evidenced by the belief-actors net. Just the same, among the last reform attempt was able to identify the corporative post-industrial coalition emergence. The international dimension, apparently, affected through external variables to the specific policy subsystem, that is, came through the international regime, but not necessarily through the permeability of international actors on the domestic policy subsystem. This work is may be able to detail the findings of the main references on the subject and to understand the difference outcomes of an

economic policy from a corporative political system using the theory of international regimes associated to ACF.

Investigating ACF Policy Change Theory in Canadian Gun Control Policy

Tim Heinmiller (Department of Political Science, Brock University)

The period 1989-2012 was a tumultuous one for Canadian gun control policy. The Montreal Massacre in December of 1989 sparked a movement for stronger gun control measures, culminating in the passage of the Firearms Act in 1995. This legislation established universal firearms registration in Canada but, after its scandalous implementation, universal registration was repealed through the Ending the Long-Gun Registry Act of 2012. These two major policy changes make Canadian gun control policy a useful diachronic case study for investigating ACF policy change theory and that is the task taken up in this paper. Using congruence methods, the two ACF policy change hypotheses are investigated in the adoption of both the Firearms Act and the Ending the Long-Gun Registry Act. The results show strong empirical support for the second ACF policy change hypothesis, as there is clear evidence of power shifts between advocacy coalitions prior to both policy changes. The results also support the first ACF policy change hypothesis but raise questions about internal and external shocks and how temporally remote they can be while still having causal effects. Finally, this case raises larger questions about the two ACF policy change hypotheses and their respective causal roles in bringing about major policy change.

The gender regime in politics. Strategies of the Advocacy coalitions in the setting agenda processes in Central America for the decriminalization of abortion demand

Jeraldine del Cid Castro (FLACSO México)

This Project has the main purpose of identify the gender regimes that constitute the practices and strategies of the actors involved in the agenda setting process for the case of the for the decriminalization of abortion's demand in the nation-states Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala in the last two decades. The research question is: What type of strategies do coalitions engage in to influence the agenda setting process of the decriminalization of abortion's demand in Central America and is the gender regime an essential element in the resources that coalition apply?

The gender regime, understood as a position regarding the "behavior and sexual character of the people" (Connell, 1987) that constitute the practices, subjectivities and discourses of the actors and institutions involved in the agenda setting process for the demand for the decriminalization of abortion in Central America has been predominantly based on a perception of the role of women as mothers so the abortion is consider a crime that has to be penalized, therefore this demand has not reached the decision agenda in the Legislative Assemblies. Even though, there has been presented some bills to change the current policies.

The hypothetical argument is that the advocacy coalitions consider as the entrepreneurs of the demand for the decriminalization of abortion develop strategies to achieve politics promoting coalitions with government actors. However, the alliances that are against this demand have greater influence in the state arena, which is associated with the historically close relationship between the State and Churches in these contexts.

This is a qualitative study with comparative cases method (George & Bennett, 2005). The cases to compare are: Guatemala, El Salvador and Nicaragua, countries in where sexual and reproductive rights and, particularly, the demand for decriminalization of abortion, are part of the issues that do not show dynamism in the decision-making agenda. Based on semi- structured interviews with the main actors of the process and newspapers review, we apply an analysis of the actors and networks with network analysis techniques.

This paper fits in this panel because it contributes with information about three different cases where the coalitions involved in the policy process have very different and interesting strategies because the type of issue that we are studying. Abortion gets the attention and interest of a big variety of official and non-official actors.

Tracing Coalition Composition and Behavior during Negotiated Policy Change

Elizabeth Koebele (University of Nevada Reno)

Stephanie Bultema (University of Colorado Denver, School of Public Affairs, Center on Network Science)

Ashlyn Maher (University of Nevada, Reno)

Christopher Weible (University of Colorado Denver)

According to the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), one major pathway to policy change in collaborative policy subsystems is negotiated agreement among opposing coalitions of policy actors. The ACF and collaborative governance literatures offer guidance about how to effectively foster the development of negotiated agreements, such as by designing policymaking institutions that promote trust-building and utilize consensus norms. However, gaps remain in our understanding of how policy actors' beliefs, policy positions, and coordination patterns shift during the development, adoption, and execution of negotiated agreements. Put differently, scholarly knowledge of the mechanisms underlying negotiated policy change in collaborative subsystems, particularly as they relate to the composition and behavior of coalitions, is incomplete.

This study seeks to advance the ACF literature on policy change in collaborative subsystems by posing the following research question: *how do the composition and behavior of advocacy coalitions shift throughout the process of negotiated policy change?* To answer this question, we examine the case of a major policy change in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Lake Tahoe, one of the most pristine alpine lakes in the world, saddles the border between Nevada and Northern California in the western United States. In 2012, the Basin's major governance agency adopted a revised Regional Plan that was developed through collaboration with multiple public and private entities. However, conflict among coalitions – largely related to whether the Basin should prioritize economic development or environmental protection – both delayed plan development and stymied implementation, eventually leading to several significant lawsuits from both sides.

To analyze coalition composition and behavior during this process of negotiated, yet contested policy change in the Lake Tahoe Basin, we use a mixed-method approach. We collect data from newspaper articles drawn from three local publication outlets that discuss the Regional Plan between 2005-2014. We then use Discourse Network Analysis (DNA) to quantitatively analyze actors' policy positions, beliefs, and coordination patterns across the major phases of negotiated policy change: policy design (2005-2011), adoption (2012), and implementation (2013-2014). We also qualitatively code the newspaper articles and the Regional Plan itself using NVivo software to gather evidence for why observed shifts in coalition composition and behavior occurred, as well as how conflicts and compromises among coalitions are reflected in the final policy document. By combining DNA with qualitative analysis, this study advances our theoretical understanding of coalition dynamics during the process of negotiated policy change and presents an innovative methodological approach for analyzing such dynamics.

This study resonates with the themes of Panel T01P09 by contributing to the advancement of ACF theory, concepts, and data collection/analysis methods, specifically related to negotiated policy change in collaborative subsystems. In doing so, it directly addresses Research Questions #2 (regarding how coalitions are maintained or shift) and #10 (how changes in coalition structure are reflected in policy). Gaining a better understanding of how the ACF can be applied in collaborative policymaking contexts is crucial as the use of such approaches grows across policy domains and countries.

Climate and water policy integration in Brazil's semiarid region: insights from an ACF perspective

Carolina Milhorange (CIRAD)

Eric Sabourin (CIRAD & University of Brasilia)

Climate change governance relies on complex structures that span across global, national, and sub-national levels, comprising both formal and informal policy networks. In these multilevel systems, public action includes a multitude of closely intertwined domestic and international institutions. Moreover, the causes and vectors of climate change and adaptation are embedded across a number of policy sectors, each of which show different priorities and involve distinct sets of actors with varying interests. These challenges showcase a complex cross-sectoral and cross-level nature.

In Brazil's northeastern semiarid region, climate change superimposes an additional layer of challenge in a region that historically faces water scarcity and water struggles. Rainfall variability is expected to increase, which—along with the process of vegetation degradation—has been accelerating the process of desertification and soil salinization. In addition to reduced agricultural and livestock production and a

decrease in the reservoir levels for drinking water, continuous reduction of precipitation affects hydropower generation in the region, particularly after the most recent episode of extreme drought, which began in 2011.

Drawing on semi-direct interviews and documentary research, this paper aims to analyze the processes of agenda-setting and implementation of climate adaptation policies in Brazil's semiarid region. It sheds light on the role of particular advocacy coalitions in facilitating or hindering the integration and local implementation of policies and on the key role that actors play in connecting levels and sectors. Using network analysis, the paper also addresses the interactions across and within coalitions that extend to multiple levels, from international to local. In addition to the sharing of ideas and interests among actors, it is also important that the distinct positions and social characteristics of members in structuring the coalitions be examined. This involves an understanding of power differentials across policy subsystems, the potential for integrating decision-making spaces, and additional tests brought about by the effects of climate change on a region already dealing with drought management challenges.

T01P09 / Advocacy Coalition Framework: Advancing Theory and Evidence about Phenomena of Policy Processes

Chair : Christopher Weible (University of Colorado Denver)

Second Chair : Metodi Sotirov (Chair of Forest and Environmental Policy, School of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Freiburg)

Third Chair : Tim Heinmiller (Department of Political Science, Brock University)

Session 3 Theoretical Innovations in the ACF

Friday, June 28th 14:00 to 16:00 (MB 5.255)

Discussants

Tim Heinmiller (Department of Political Science, Brock University)

Using Cultural Theory to Specify Stability and Change in Core Beliefs, Coalitions, and Policy Learning in the Advocacy Coalition Framework: A Theoretical Synthesis with Empirical Examples from European Regulation of the Global Timber Trade

Metodi Sotirov (Chair of Forest and Environmental Policy, School of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Freiburg)

Abstract

This paper uses the cultural theory (CT) developed by Mary Douglas, Aaron Wildavsky, and others to specify underspecified aspects of the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF). Our theoretical synthesis of CT and the ACF provides, first, an exhaustive typology of four distinct sets of policy actors' values, beliefs and social relations that entail four coherent, but different packages of regulatory core beliefs. They are expressed by myths about human and physical nature that entail, guide and stabilize normative policy core beliefs. Second, linking CT and the ACF allows for the conceptualization of cognitive mechanisms for shifting coalitions and cross-coalitional alliances. They are made by strategic overlap and complementarity in empirical policy core beliefs, and are broken when cognitive threats to normative core beliefs arise. Third, our synthesis provides an explanation for exploitive coalitions that take advantage of policy issues and respond to power struggles triggered by disruptive events. In this new context, coalitions make policy change possible through issue (re-)framing and strategic alliances. Fourth, CT helps specify the mechanisms, possibilities and limits of policy learning in the ACF. This is based on CT's notion of cultural-cognitive surprises, which aligns well with the ACF in that policy core beliefs that involve empirical elements can change over time with the gradual accumulation of evidence and when actors' experience reveals serious anomalies to their core beliefs. To illustrate our theoretical arguments, we draw empirical examples from policy analysis related to the multi-level policy process of designing and implementing the EU Timber Regulation that governs environmental and socio-economic risks in global timber trade. In so doing, we study stability and change in beliefs, coalitions, and policy learning, and link them to explain policy change outcomes at the EU level as well as in Germany and the UK. The results are informed by more than 60 key informants' interviews and content analysis of more than 50 policy documents.

Key words

Cultural Theory, Advocacy Coalition Framework, Cultural Biases, Deep Core Beliefs, Policy Beliefs, Advocacy Coalitions, Exploitive Coalitions, Shifting Coalitions, Policy Learning, Policy Change, Risk Regulation, Timber Legality

Changes in public policies for low-income families in Brazil: the role of control body

Jeniffer Carla de Paula Nóbrega Chaves (Universidade de Brasília)

In Brazil, there are more than thirty federal public policies for low-income families that use the instrument

“Cadastro Único” to select target public and maintain the benefits and services offered by their actions. The “Cadastro Único” (single registry) was created in 2001 and its main objective is to identify and characterize the poorest Brazilian families (family income per person of up to half a minimum wage: approximately US\$ 4 per day) in a decentralized way (the 5,570 municipalities carry out the interviews, fill the forms and enter the data in the online and national system). Currently, there are more than 27 million registered families (almost 40% of the Brazilian population), and the main program used by the “Cadastro Único” is the “Bolsa Família”, one of the largest cash transfer programs in the world.

Throughout the 17 years of existence of the “Cadastro Único”, many changes have occurred in the institutional, technological and operational aspects that have affected the path of the “Cadastro Único”. Using the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), the study objective is to identify the mechanisms and resources used by a group of specific actors, the control bodies (the Federal Court of Accounts and Comptroller General of the Union), to promote changes in “Cadastro Único” and consequently in public policies that use it.

The study of this panel is part of the research of my doctoral thesis, in development, whose theme is the decision process involving the implementation of the “Cadastro Único” (permanence and change) and analyzes the subsystem of the public policies for low-income families in Brazil, based on the use of technical information by the advocacy coalitions and the image of the target public.

The research question that guide the study developed for this panel is: What are the mechanisms, resources and strategies used by the control bodies to influence changes in “Cadastro Único” and in the public policies for low-income families, at the period of 2008 and 2018? In order to answer this question, by the documentary analysis method, will be analyzed the reports, technical and operational notes, of the control bodies directed to the “Cadastro Único” and the public policies that use it, and the information available on the websites of these control bodies and the responses by the federal manager of the “Cadastro Único”, Ministry of Citizenship, to these determinations and recommendations[1].

With this research, we intend to contribute to the studies of policy process from the analysis of the pressure system to influence government used by internal and external control bodies.

[1] The control bodies send determinations and recommendations to the Ministry of Citizenship to propose specific changes, such as a normative or operational change, to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, cost-effectiveness and risks of public policies.

The Slow Road to Big Change: Extending the Advocacy Coalition Framework with the Theory of Gradual, Institutional Change

Leanne Giordono (Oregon State University)

The Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) developed by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993) is a well-known policy process framework primarily intended to explain non-incremental and “major” policy change. In contrast, the Theory of Gradual Institutional Change (GIC), developed by Streeck and Thelen (2005) and Mahoney and Thelen (2009), is a more recent theory that posits pathways to incremental, and transformative, change. This article integrates the two frameworks and presents new propositions derived from both frameworks, thus expanding the scope and relevance of the ACF. The article uses process tracing methods (Beach and Pedersen 2016) in the context of a disability services subsystem in Washington State to illustrate how a quarter-century of policy “layering” set the stage for coalition defection and a more traditional case of ACF-style (i.e., disruptive) policy change. The article is aligned with recent calls to integrate concepts and approaches from the policy process and comparative politics traditions (John 2018; Tosun and Workman 2017). In addition, the panel presentation is expected to spark dialogue about policy change measurement (non-incremental vs. incremental), causal attribution (endogeneity vs. exogeneity) and the capacity of the ACF to accommodate evidence of increasing returns and path dependence.

If the UK government is ‘all out for shale’, how can the Scottish Government prohibit fracking? A two-level ACF explanation

Irina Timonina (University of Stirling)

Paul Cairney (University of Stirling)

The UK government is responsible for UK energy policy and it has signalled a firm commitment to hydraulic fracturing for shale gas as part of its energy strategy. Yet, the Scottish Government announced an indefinite moratorium (effectively, a ban) in 2017. To explain this puzzling outcome we describe the flexibility of Scottish devolution and use the Advocacy Coalition Framework to show that Scotland possesses a separate

fracking subsystem, with its own actors and coalitions, 'nested' in a UK subsystem. We identify key actors and their stated beliefs. The Scottish Government is pivotal. It initially expressed a reluctance to declare support or opposition to fracking until it announced a temporary moratorium in 2015 and an indefinite moratorium in 2017. We combine documentary analysis with a new media coding method to capture and explain this major shift.