P01 / Narrative Policy Discourse

Topic : POLICY DISCOURSE AND CRITICAL POLICY RESEARCH

Chair : Hugh Miller (Florida Atlantic University)

Second Chair : Jennifer Dodge (Rockefeller College, University at Albany)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

Why is narrative analysis important in the study of public policy? One good answer is that policy goals are contestable and the facts of the matter are contestable. Narrative analysis can reveal schisms, competing world views, and pluralistic competition in policy discourse. This panel seeks to highlight the dynamics of narrative struggle for meaning capture in policy discourse. Alternatively, in what conditions do narratives not compete for dominance? -- possibly in situations where facts are stable and goals are widely shared, or in authoritarian regimes unaccustomed to pluralistic democracy.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Policy scholars and researchers interested in narrative policy inquiry are requested to submit paper proposals for inclusion in the Narrative Policy Discourse panel, which appears under the topic heading T08 Policy Discourse and Critical Policy Research. Approaches that borrow from linguistics, semiotics, literary theory, critical theory, social constructionism, neopositivism, poststructuralism, historical analysis, postmodern thought, and qualitative inquiry are invited. Case illustrations or case studies o that make a theoretical contribution are also welcome.

P01 / Narrative Policy Discourse

Chair : Hugh Miller (Florida Atlantic University)

Second Chair : Jennifer Dodge (Rockefeller College, University at Albany)

Session 1Narrative Rules

Wednesday, June 26th 16:30 to 18:30 (MB 9 B)

Discussants

Hugh Miller (Florida Atlantic University)

Hugh Miller (Florida Atlantic University)

Artificial Intelligence as a tool for Discourse Analysis

Angelina Espejel Trujillo (Consorcio para el Estudio de Zonas Metropolitanas (CentroMet))

Ángeles Ortiz Espinoza (Consortium for the Study of Metropolitan Areas - CentroMet)

The proposed work aims to highlight the usefulness of data mining and natural language processing tools in the discursive analysis of public policy. Through AI algorithms, a neural network was trained with the government reports of the ex-president Enrique Peña Nieto as input, to evaluate the National Development Plan discursive monitoring. Likewise, the relationship of government reports' content with what was published in the official accounts of the social networks was evaluated in order to determine the similarities and differences in the discursive tools used by decision makers. The results show that of the N-grams that were tested, the 3-grams stood out as the most effective in recognizing priorities in the implementation of public policy programs. Also, we found that the information contained in social networks at most presents a 30% of similarity with the government reports, noting the lack of correlation between government reports and what is published on social networks.

Urban Policy Experts and the Failure Narrative. Theoretical Conclusions from a Comparative Study of Montréal and Toronto in the 1960s

Frédéric Mercure Jolette (Université de Montréal)

In the early 1990s, when the argumentative turn appeared in policy analysis, one of the main areas of concern was urban planning (Fischer et Forester 1993). For the avant-garde of this movement, the narrative nature of public policy is never as salient as in planning since planning is turned towards the future and is always performed through stories (Sandercock 2003, Throgmorton 1996). Building on those studies, we want to interrogate the surprising pervasiveness of the failure narrative in planning and urban policy and its mixed results. Indeed, since Jane Jacobs innovative writing, a lot have been made about the failure of post-war urban planning, but reactions to these critics have varied considerably according to local contexts (Ward 2002, Klemek 2011). Fallowing this, we will ask two different questions: 1) why is the failure narrative so important in planning and urban policy and 2) what is its impact on experts' authority who used it? The paper will be in two parts. First, we will propose a theoretical analysis of the failure narrative and then we will illustrate our thesis with the results of an ongoing comparative case study of Toronto and Montréal in the 1960s.

The failure narrative has three important features. First, contrary to the decline or the natural disaster narratives, it gives predominance to public policy because it puts the emphasis on the policies that have failed. Second, it institutes a normative evaluation of the past that justifies a request for change. Third, it gives special authority to those who can explain why a failure happened. For those reasons, we argue that speaking of failures is a way for planners to justify their propositions for reorienting city development and to claim a renewed authority. But the failure narrative can also have a negative impact on urban policy experts. In failure stories, experts are often considered unreliable, or, as a former mayor of Toronto said, quacks (Sewell 1993). In short, in this narrative, their tradition looks devoid of any solid foundations, and, for that

reason, it can disserve experts' authority as much as it can serve it.

This paradox is well illustrated by what happened in Toronto and Montréal in the 1960s. In both cities, major urban renewal projects were realized in the late 1950s and faced important criticisms in the mid-60s. Experts and activists then used the failure narrative to request a new approach. But, if this resulted in new policies and a regime change in Toronto in 1972, in Montréal, on the contrary, the same mayor remained in place from the late 1950s to the mid 1980s and changes came at a much slower pace (Filion 1988). This difference is explained by the fact that, in Toronto, a new class of planners and urban policy experts was able to separate itself from the experts and administrative agents responsible for the failure and diffuse their narrative to the civil society and elected officials, when, in Montréal, they were not. In conclusion, this comparison will show that, as long as the failure narrative will be a build-in feature of urban planning discourse, experts' authority will remain highly contested.

Filion Pierre, 1988. "The Neighbourhood Improvement Plan: Montreal and Toronto: Contrasts between a participatory and a centralized approach to urban policy making » Urban History Review, 17:1, 16-28.

Fischer, Frank, John Forester (eds.), 1993, The Argumentative Turn in Planning and Policy analysis, Duke University Press.

Klemek, Christopher, 2011. The Transatlantic Collapse of Urban Renewal. Postwar Urbanism from New York to Berlin, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Sandercock, Leonie, 2003. "Out of the Closet: The Importance of Stories and Storytelling in Planning Practice", Planning Theory & Practice, 4:1, 11-28.

Sewell, John, 1993. The Shape of the City. Toronto Struggles with Modern Planning, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

Throgmorton, James A, 1996. Planning as Persuasive Storytelling. The Rhetorical Construction of Chicago Electric Future, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Ward, Stephen V., 2002. Planning the Twentieth-Century City. The Advanced Capitalist World, Chichester, John Wiley & Sons.

Policy Discourse vs Institutionalism in Gulf Cooperation Council Crisis

Noof ALDosari (University of Essex)

Arabian Gulf crisis is a Saudi –led blockade on Qatar started in June 2017 and still not resolved yet. There are so many questions, predictions and concerns looming over it, like is this crisis going to be the first domino for the dismantle of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC).Leaders of the blockade against Qatar have shifted their foreign policy decisions tremendously. Nonetheless, history has a different story on the characteristics of the blockade leaders, their foreign policy decisions framework which may help in reading their foreign policy decisions against Qatar today. During the crisis, the policy discourse of Gulf leaders put the institutional framework of the GCC into question. There is a contradiction between Gulf leaders' policy discourse and the institution's frameworks and policy goals. This leads to raise the question of whether or not GCC is an institution of cooperation? Therefore, my paper using discourse analysis will discuss GCC institutional problem and its relation to Gulf crisis by trying to determine the role of policy discourse and its influence on institutionalism.

The analysis of arguments as an elucidative key for the construction of Metropolitan Educational Policies

Renata Santos (Universidade de Brasília)

This work is the result of the author's Doctorate thesis and, therefore, part of a larger work which had the intent of analyzing the constitution of an educational public policy for the metropolitan territory of Brasilia/Brazil. It is a developing territory, considering the specificities and characteristics of an actual metropolis as well as the legislation which has regulated the area in question. For urban planners, such territory cannot be construed as a metropolitan region, due to the absence of legal parameters to do so. For legalists, however, the region is part of an urban area subjected to planning policies, seeking proper development and, for that reason, should be understood as metropolitan territory, especially considering that Brasilia is a metropolis by formal standards. Conflicts aside, the law which has defined the region under study has reproduced, to a large extent, the legal prerogatives that institutionalized several other Brazilian metropolitan regions. The governance of such the area, however, does not resemble actual metropolitan management. The law defines Education as a public service to be offered in a cooperative and communal manner by the government. However, this process, since 1998, is yet to be materialized in practical acts in

order to solve educational problems of the region. This article, therefore, seeks to present the arguments of the actors responsible for planning and executing Education in the area. To analyze those arguments, the theoretical-methodological foundation arises from the fields of Public Studies and Linguistics, based on a post-positivist proposal which, in turn, is supported by social constructionism and contemporary pragmatist theory. The study of the arguments was developed from Sacrini's method of analysis (2016: 15), which recognizes discourse as being composed by arguments divided into three parts: premise, inference and conclusion. Afterwords, the theory of Argumentative Turn, by political scientists Frank Fischer and John Forester, was used to analyze the inferences or assumptions as logical passages that justify the positions of the authors' arguments. The importance of the argument is its ability to act as an articulator of values that support the deliberation of the actors involved in the constitution of public policies. It was, therefore, sought to understand these same actors' thesis that could explain the absence of compliance to the legislation or the possibility of dialogue amongst them for the sake of political action and resolution of educational problems in the region.

P01 / Narrative Policy Discourse

Chair : Hugh Miller (Florida Atlantic University)

Second Chair : Jennifer Dodge (Rockefeller College, University at Albany)

Session 2Narratives in Violence and Peace

Thursday, June 27th 08:00 to 10:00 (MB 9 B)

Discussants

Jennifer Dodge (Rockefeller College, University at Albany)

Cohesive Policy Narratives on Domestic Violence Victim Advocacy

Kimbelry Wiley (University of Illinois Springfield)

The purpose of this study is to determine how nonprofit organizations engage with public policy advocacy over time and how it translates into activities within the organizations themselves. I analyze historical documentation of U.S. policy advocacy by a subsector of nonprofit organizations, domestic violence advocacy organizations (DVAOs), from 1978 to 2018. Beginning in 1978, the Battered Women's Movement formalized their activities with the creation of the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV). This longitudinal study explores the activities of this association over its 40-year existence, more specifically records of their biannual meetings. The author explores the following questions, how does each stage of the policy process influence an advocate's language and behavior? How can policy advocacy activities explain shifts in narratives when the narratives cohesive rather than in competition?

The administration of services to victims of domestic violence, like those authorized by the Violence Against Women Act, is conducted by nonprofit organizations and public agencies who are self-designated or authorized by either local or state government to support victims of domestic violence before, during, and after a crisis. These DVAOs are charged with implementing policy from numerous federal departments that regulate and distribute funding related to each policy. The complexity of the public policy funding and regulating these nonprofit organizations requires nonprofit staff and volunteers to be highly educated and skilled in policy advocacy at the federal, state, and local level.

The NCADV biannual meetings serve as a centralized place to plan and engage in policy advocacy activities. Records of the 18 national meetings spanning the history of the NCADV are examined for the presence of policy activism and themes in the policy content. These conference programs are rich sources of data as they provide a looking glass into a tool used by NCADV to establish the agenda that advocates on Capitol Hill and in the DVAOs classify as current and relevant. Qualitative directed content analysis is applied to identify specific and broad policy issues and explain the temporal shifts in the language of the narratives used to define these issues.

This research study challenges an assumption that policy narratives compete for dominance and conflict with one another. The NCADV participates in the policy process by engaging in numerous cohesive policies. These cohesive policies build a holistic public policy approach to the wicked problem of domestic violence. These cohesive policies do not compete with each other in ways that make one more valid or more appropriate than the other; they instead work to build a comprehensive policy response. Examples of policy solutions resulting from these cohesive narratives include state statutes designating domestic violence a crime, administrative rules establishing privilege for domestic violence advocates, legislative amendments regulating corporate responses to victimized employees and providing special exemptions to welfare rules. This study articulates how advocacy coalition engage with the policy process through the use of cohesive policy narratives.

Narrative Policy Inquiry: Legalizing Weed

Hugh Miller (Florida Atlantic University)

Narrative inquiry is a highly useful approach to studying public policy when 1) the facts are in dispute and/or 2) the goals are in dispute. In politically contestable policy domains, this condition is the rule and not the exception. Moreover, narratives competing in any policy domain evolve, yielding a dynamic of change rather than fixity. This adds complexity to narrative inquiry. The necessity to make room for emergent narratives is accompanied by a need for researchers to realize when old, institutionalized narratives have lost their resonance. The changing discourse on legalizing cannabis illustrates how narrative inquiry can accommodate change and competition over the career of a policy narrative.

Anticipating the Future in a Violent Institutional Field: A Community's Struggle for Sustainable Development and Peace in Macarena, Colombia

Jennifer Dodge (Rockefeller College, University at Albany)

Diana Trujillo (University of Los Andes)

This article explores the ways diverse actors construct anticipatory public policy narratives in a "violent institutional field" (Trujillo & Nigam, working paper). It brings into critical policy studies recent theorizing in social movement research on "anticipating the future" (Mische 2009, Tavory & Eliasoph 2013), which seeks to explain the complex ways actors coordinate future action. The paper applies this framework to a case in which policy actors are contesting oil extraction in La Macarena, Colombia. These actors often contrast two futures: one a nightmare of oil extraction associated with continued violence and marginalization, the other a utopia with ecotourism that brings shared prosperity to the local community and is associate with the prospect of peace. These anticipatory policy narratives are often accompanied by strong calls to action to bring about a peaceful future, some of which, paradoxically, include references to the possibility of ongoing violence as a political strategy against extraction. This case illuminates the different ways actors may anticipate the future in a violent field.

Mische, A. (2009). Projects and possibilities: Researching futures in action. Sociological Forum, 24(3), 694-704.
Tavory, I. & N. Eliasoph (2013). Coordinating futures: Toward a theory of anticipation. American Journal of Sociology, 118(4), 908-942.
Trujillo, D. & A. (working paper). Enabling Collective Action in Violent Institutional Fields.