Defining, Explaining and Testing the Role of Focusing Events in Policy Change: Using the Multiple Streams Framework

Megan K. Warnement
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Public Administration
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC, USA
mkwarnem@ncsu.edu

Abstract:

This paper proposes a study applying the Narrative Policy Framework to the Multiple Streams Framework. By doing this, it seeks to analyze both the agenda setting properties and the narrative elements following an event. I argue that in order for policy change to occur, you need the event to be large enough and rare enough that it generates agenda change on both the media and Congressional level. And you need the media to act as a conduit, allowing for groups and policy entrepreneurs to promote their ideas, instead of as a contributor in which the media backs a specific policy preference. When the media acts as a conduit, allowing for more ideas to enter the discourse, there is a greater likelihood for a "match" between media and Congressional narratives and greater likelihood for policy change to occur. However, to see the full policy change picture, a longitudinal study is necessary as event-driven policy change sometimes occurs after a series of events using narrative elements previously presented following earlier events.

Introduction

 Following a disaster, we as a society usually have many questions along the lines of first, wanting to know what went wrong and who was to blame. Second, we want to know what is going to be done so this never happens again. Answers to these questions are posed in the form of narratives by both the media and policymakers in government. The normative assumption is that once a disaster occurs, we should learn from it, and therefore make a change that either prevents or mitigates the next occurrence. However, we have seen far too often that this is not always the case with our system.

 This research is interested in two dynamics leading to policy change, the agenda setting properties of an event and the narratives surrounding the event. I argue that specific elements of both are necessary in order for policy change to occur. However, once the policy change takes place, it may include past ideas that relate to prior events. Therefore to fully capture the nature of event-driven policy change, a longitudinal study is necessary.

 My research studies event-driven policy change over several decades within the natural disaster policy domain. It seeks to understand whether one or more events in a domain, considered over time, had an influence on policy change, and if so, when. Conversely, when a series of events does not lead to policy change, this is also of interest as are a consideration of the relevant factors. Within the natural disaster policy domain, hurricanes and earthquakes will be compared. By studying focusing events over time in attempt to explain event driven policy change, the research is concentrated on the policy narratives that surround the event.

I rely heavily on Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework as it explains the agenda setting properties of the policy process. However, as previously stated, there exists a normative assumption that these agenda setting properties will lead to policy change. The model presented by this research seeks to test this assumption by arguing that agenda change serves as a mediator variable on policy change. This paper seeks to integrate Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework with the Narrative Policy Framework, thus allowing my to study both the agenda setting dynamics and narrative aspects of policy change. The purpose of this specific paper is to submit this proposed study and seek feedback before I venture on the data collection.

Scope of Research

This research seeks to understand event-driven policy change over several decades within the natural disaster policy domain. Prior research studying focusing events has analyzed the effect of a single event regarding agenda change or policy change (Kingdon 2003; Birkland 1997; Birkland 2006; Cobb and Primo 2003). Although this can be interesting in context, it is more worthwhile to consider focusing events within a policy domain in order to analyze their effect within a longitudinal study. In order to fully make sense of the event, it is necessary to put it into context by relating it to other events. Essentially, to comprehend policy change, research cannot analyze a single event at the event level, but instead it is necessary to look at the domain level and consider multiple events.

A reason for a multiple events approach is to understand cumulative effects of these events. This research seeks to understand whether one or more events in a policy

domain, considered over time, had an influence on policy change. In order to study this, the events are analyzed at the domain level within a longitudinal study allowing us to see the ebb and flow of ideas and the accumulation effect that multiple events can have on framing problems and solutions within the policy domain.

Ideas and opinions that emerge after an earlier event, even if they are not implemented into policy change, may contribute to outcomes following later focusing events. For example, Cobb and Primo (2003) state "many policy changes in aviation security were unprecedented in their scope and in the speed at which they were enacted [following 9/11], but none of the issues was new to the political agenda" (2003, 121). Birkland (2004) agrees with this assessment when he demonstrates that aviation security cases such as Pan Am 103 and TWA Flight 800 made it easier for the quickly adaptation of policy following the 9/11 attacks. Essentially, these prior events allowed for comprehensive debate of the ideas so that when the 9/11 attacks occurred many of these ideas were already "on the shelf" (Birkland, 2004). Birkland (2004) found that although 9/11 did provide the opportunity for sweeping change in terms of aviation policy, the prior events served in a sense as "precursors" in terms of raising ideas to the agenda (Birkland 2004, 356). Jones (2001) further confirmed this notion at the organizational level when he found that organizations are not easily adaptive and events can lead to mimicking and path dependency in terms of policy change.

Another facet of policy change is having the "solution" to the problem. By defining the "problem" the policymaker is automatically assigning a solution or a set of solutions in the process of framing the problem. Jones (2001) states, "any decision-maker will harbor many prepackaged solutions to the multiple tasks facing him or her" as part of the deliberation-preparation trade-off (66). This refers once again to the

concept that it is important to consider events at the domain level since prior proposed solutions are used as the "prepackaged solutions" for future events.

Kingdon (2003), Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972), Jones (2001) and others recognize that the way a problem is defined and framed will ultimately determine which problems garner consideration and which do not. A consideration of these events over time at the domain level allows for a better understanding of how policymakers respond to problem framing, since past events help to provide framing for future events. The initial framing of any such event, of course, like the attempts to identify proper solutions to the issues that policy elites highlight, typically reflects political conflict and divergent understandings of causation. As Deborah Stone has argued:

> In politics, causal theories are neither right nor wrong, nor are they mutually exclusive. They are ideas about causation, and policy politics involves strategically portraying issues so that they fit one casual idea or another. The different sides in an issue act as if they are trying to find the "true" cause, but they are always struggling to influence which idea is selected to guide policy. Political conflicts over causal stories are therefore more than empirical claims about sequence of events. They are fights about the possibility of control and the assignment of responsibility (2002, 197)

The framing of previous events primarily drives policymakers' definitions of current events. Also, similar events will have similar frames, since policymakers will adopt "prepackaged solutions." In addition to the framing of an event, causal stories also assign blame, identify victims, legitimize certain actors as "fixers" and creates new political alliances (Stone 2002, 209).

Finally, the theory of bounded rationality is another reason why it is important to consider focusing events within a longitudinal study on the domain level. Decisions maker cannot know *every* outcome of *every* policy choice, and determine the "optimal

path" for policy. Instead, policymakers engage in "satisficing" (Simon 1957) in systems characterized by incremental decision-making (Lindblom 1959, 1979) or path dependency. It is proposed that boundedly rational decisions about events and responses should be studied at the domain level, rather than relating solely to individual events, so as to capture the full range of information gathering and decision-making.

Of interest in this study is not whether a *particular* event had an influence on policy change (although such a question is interesting, in context). Rather, the more fruitful question is whether one or more events in a domain, considered over time, had an influence on policy change, and if so, when. Conversely, when a series of events does not lead to policy change, it should raise the question of "why" and a consideration of the relevant factors. When considering the effects of event driven policy change over several decades, it is also very important to examine the emergence of policy ideas and the framing of these ideas.

To answer these questions, two different factors that effect policy change are considered. First, the agenda setting properties of the focusing events are analyzed. This is an extremely important feature of the study, as it is modeled that agenda change will serve as a mediator variable on policy change. However, the agenda setting properties of an event are not enough by themselves to determine policy change. Nohrstedt and Weible (2010) state, "it is insufficient to focus merely on agenda-setting effects of crises and contingencies. Recent efforts to explain political and policy impacts of crises therefore recognize the importance of interaction between societal and political actors representing diverging frames of interpretation" (6). Therefore, the second factor that effects policy change, that I seek to analyze, are the narratives of both the media and

Congress and how they frame the nature of the events, the problems identified and the solutions presented.

The natural disaster policy domain is used to understand event-driven policy domain over several decades. This policy domain provides ample focusing events for study, specifically in the areas of hurricanes and earthquakes. Hurricanes and earthquakes also serve as a way to compare and contrast the difference that exists depending on the type of disaster. It is proposed that the different event types will raise different policy ideas to the agenda, experience different framing for the problems and solutions and mobilize different groups. The reason that a difference may exist in the idea emergence, problem framing, and group mobilization between hurricanes and earthquakes is that hurricanes tend to be more salient to the public. Solutions surrounding the problems rising due to earthquakes, however, tend to be very technical in nature, which restricts its availability to the public, and are usually restricted to specific scientific communities. This can inhibit group mobilization and interest group involvement. Peter May classifies this as "policies without publics" (1991, 190).

Two central research questions are addressed y this study. As previously stated, the first one deals with event-driven policy change and the second refers to the narratives of both the media and Congress.

> *RQ1: When does policy change occur following an event, or a series of events? Why does it occur after certain events and not others?*

> *RQ2: Are there differences in the narrative elements, narrative strategies and policy beliefs used by the media and by Congress? Does the extent of these differences lead to policy stalemate?*

Agenda Setting and the Multiple Streams Framework

Many prior studies using the Narrative Policy Framework (NPF) integrate it with the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF). The reason for this is because the NPF is used to understand how narratives influence advocacy coalitions core beliefs and policy outcomes (see McBeth et al. 2005; McBeth et al. 2007; Shanahan and McBeth 2010; Shanahan et al. 2013; Heikkila et al. 2014). However, other studies focused on different aspects of the policy process. One specific study, Shanahan, et al. (2008) focused on the dynamics of the media and how it relates to policy change. Dovetailing off of that study, I want to further understand how the narratives presented in the media crosswalk to those presented by Congress. Since it is event-driven policy change that is being analyzed, it is necessary to consider the agenda setting properties of the event. Therefore, the main theory to integrate with the NPF in this study is Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework.

Kingdon (2003) developed the Multiple Streams Framework. Multiple Streams is based upon Cohen, March and Olsen's (1972) "garbage can model" of organizational behavior. It is used to explain agenda setting in the policy process and is comprised of three streams that operate interdependently of each other. The problem stream contains ideas about various problems. The politics stream contains the electoral process and the public opinion. The policy stream contains all the ideas and solutions to possible problems and how they can be addressed. Kingdon states that a "window of opportunity" opens in order for issues to reach the policy agenda. For the window to open, two or more of these streams must come together at the same time. Thus, the problems are matched with solutions and politics align to promote this occurrence. Zahariadis (2007) explains, "During open policy windows persistent policy

entrepreneurs, who constantly search for solutions to important problems, attempt to couple the three streams. Success is more likely when all three streams are couple, conditioned on the type of window that opens, and the skills, resources, and strategies of entrepreneurs to focus attention and bias choice" (78-79).

Agenda setting is a powerful part of the policy process. Schattschneider (1975) stated, "the definition of the alternatives is the supreme instrument of power" (66) where alternatives can mean issues, events, problems, and solutions. Individuals and groups have limited information processing capacity. Therefore, group competition is fierce because the agenda space is limited by these constraints on information processing, so that no system can accommodate all issues and ideas (Walker 1977; Baumgartner and Jones 1993; Cobb and Elder 1983).

The competition in agenda setting is both about raising an issue on the agenda *and* about propagating the preferred story about how a bad condition came to be and how the problem might be prevented or mitigated in the future (Stone 2002). This is why this study argues it is necessary to study *both* the agenda setting dynamics of the policy process *and* the narratives that exist following these events. This story telling is important because stories of problem definition compete with other problem definitions, and strongly signal pre-existing preferences for particular policies (Hilgartner and Bosk 1988; Birkland and Lawrence 2009). The agenda setting process is therefore a system of sifting issues, problems and ideas and implicitly assigning priorities to these issues. This process involves a process of identifying the most prevalent problems and selecting appropriate solutions (Birkland and Lawrence 2009; Hilgartner and Bosk 1988; Lawrence and Birkland 2004). It is essentially a triage process.

Kingdon argues that agenda setting is driven by two broad phenomena: changes in indicators of underlying problems, which lead to debates over whether and to what extent a problem exists and is worthy of action; and *focusing events*, or sudden shocks to policy systems that lead to attention, agenda change, and potential policy change.

When a focusing event occurs, it has a "bowling over" effect on the agenda setting process. Kingdon states that these events "simply bowl over everything standing in the way of prominence on the agenda" (2003, 96). Also, the focusing events highlight a policy failure and the opportunity is present for policy change, to correct this failure.

Kingdon adopts a very broad definition of focusing events. His definition is used within his multiple "streams metaphor." For Kingdon, there are three conceptual streams present within the policy process: the "problem" stream which contains ideas about various problems; the "politics" stream, containing the electoral process and the public opinion; and the "policy" stream which contains all the ideas and solutions to possible problems and how they can be addressed (Kingdon 2003).

Kingdon states that a "window of opportunity" opens allowing an issue to reach the policy agenda. For the window to open, two or more of theses streams must come together at the same time. Thus, problems are matched with solutions and politics align to promote this occurrence. A focusing event can help open this window since they highlight the policy failure with their "bowling over" effect (Kingdon 2003).

As previously stated, Kingdon uses a very broad notion of focusing events, which include events, crises and symbols. He stated that a focusing event was a "little push" "like a crisis or disaster that comes along to call attention to the problem, a powerful symbol that catches on, or the personal experience of a policy maker" (Kingdon 2003, 94–95). Kingdon highlights that the power behind focusing events lies in the

aggregating of their harms. A plane crash that kills 200 people will get more attention than 200 automobile accidents. This once again refers to the "bowling over effect."

Birkland applies this "bowling over" effect when he narrowed Kingdon's definition in order to empirically test Kingdon's work. Kingdon's definition as it stands alone is insufficient to develop a testable model. Therefore Birkland (1997) defines a *potential focusing event* as an event that is:

> sudden, relatively rare, can be reasonably defined as harmful or revealing the possibility of potentially greater future harms, inflicts harms or suggests potential harms that are or could be concentrated on a definable geographical area or community of interest, and that is known to policy makers and the public virtually simultaneously (1997, 22)

I am applying Birkland's definition in this study, specifically studying the events that occur within policy domains that are prone to focusing events. The natural disaster policy domain provides the opportunity to compare and contrast hurricanes and earthquakes and what occurs in the agenda setting and narrative aspects of the policy process with these two types of events.

Narrative Policy Framework

Narratives are a particular form of communication, which includes a story with a timeline and other elements that helps shape its particular organization (Jones and McBeth 2010). Different forms of narratives exist, such as the political narrative. What this research is interested in is the *policy narrative*, which needs to have a setting, a plot, characters, and a preferred policy outcome (Shanahan, Jones and McBeth 2011; Jones and McBeth 2010). Shanahan et al. (2013) states that for a narrative to be

considered a policy narrative, it must meet the following criteria. "First, a policy narrative must contain a policy stance or a judgment on a policy-related behavior…Second, a policy narrative must contain at least one character who is cast as a hero, villain or victim…In sum, policy stance or judgment of policy related behavior + story character = policy narrative" (Shanahan et al. 2013, 457).

By breaking the policy narrative down to these specific elements, along with other components, such at the evidence presented, casual mechanism used, moral of the story and different narrative strategies used, researches can gain useful variables that help us better understand the policy process. Therefore, the NPF provides an empirical manner of studying narratives in the policy process allowing "postivists and postpositivists to engage in more productive debates over how stories influence public policy" (Jones and McBeth 2010, 330).

The Narrative Policy Framework is relatively new, with its beginnings and central questions found in McBeth and Shanahan's (2004) article about "policy marketing". Since then, many applications of the NPF have produced fruitful research. Some examples include McBeth et al. (2007) work regarding narrative elements of interests groups in both the ACF and Punctuated Equilibrium Theory (McBeth et al. 2007). Jones (2010) also used the NPF with Cultural Theory to determine the role of the narrative on mass opinion regarding climate change. Shanahan et al. (2011) found that narratives that used different frames and policy core beliefs and this had effect on public opinion regarding environmental issues. Quantitative content analysis is the most common method used with the NPF, especially when dealing with the meso-level study of policy narratives (Shanahan et al. 2013). However, the NPF is expanding methodological speaking into other areas. Jones (2010) used an experimental design for his study while

Shanahan et al. (2011) used survey research and quasi-experimental design. Finally, recent studies have moved from cross-sectional analysis to longitudinal analysis of policy narratives (McBeth, Shanahan, et al. 2010).

For my study, I am interested in the meso-level study of policy narratives. At the meso-level, scholars study the links between the policy narrative and the policy outcome (Shanahan et al. 2013). Shanahan et al. (2008) used this level of analysis in their study of media policy beliefs and strategies, which I am using as a model for my own study. The meso-level analysis also works well with content analysis and a longitudinal study, both of which I plan to use. The policy narrative, in my study, will serve as an input (independent variable). Shanahan, Jones & McBeth (2011) states as a hypothesis in need of further testing "variation in policy narrative elements helps explain policy learning, policy change, and policy outcomes. The NPF thus proposes that narratives are an important independent variable to the dependent variables associated with policy change and outcomes" (549). When they propose this hypothesis, they are relating it to the ACF and its elements. However, I argue that it can also be applied to the Multiple Streams Framework and this way its application will broaden the use of the NPF even more.

Role of the Media in the Policy Process

There is disagreement within the policy change theories regarding the role of the media in the policy process. Two roles that the media can play are either as a conduit or a contributor. The media serves as a conduit when they present many different policy preferences. When the media acts as a contributor in the policy process, they present a particular policy preference. Shanahan et al. (2008) states that that "if indeed the media

is a contributor of policy stories, such a situation most likely increases divisiveness, conflict, and policy stalemate and the ideals of democracy based on discourse, information, and rational persuasion are lost. In this regard, the media is a policy marketer contributing to policy intractability, with policy solutions that offer no long-term resolution of the issue" (117).

Scholars in the policy process field disagree on whether the media acts as a conduit or a contributor in the policy process. Both Baumgartner & Jones (1993) and Kingdon (2003) find the media to be a conduit. Kingdon argues, "the media report what is going on in government, by and large, rather than having an independent effect *on* government agendas" (2003, 59 emphasis original). Stone (2002) also believes the media to be a conduit, as it is used by other groups in the policy process to promote their casual stories. Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993) also argue that groups use the media as a conduit to promote various policy preferences. However, they also find that the media can also act as a contributor. Shanahan et al. (2008) test this question regarding the role of the media and whether it "serves as a conduit for policy actors reporting multiple policy preferences in newspaper accounts or as a contributor in a policy debate, constructing policy stories that harbor consistent policy beliefs ad narrative framing strategies" (116). They found mixed results. They expected the media to be either a consistent contributor or a consistent conduit across the three policy beliefs they tested instead, it depended on the nature of the policy belief (Shanahan et al. 2008).

Drawing from this work, I want to study the role of the media as either a conduit or a contributor and how this leads to either policy change or policy stalemate. I hypothesize that when the media serves as a conduit, and many policy preferences are presented, allowing for an increase in discourse, there is a greater likelihood that a

match or linkage is present between the media narrative elements and the congressional elements. When this match or linkages is present, between these two groups, I hypothesize that policy change is more likely. Normatively this makes sense. The greater the amount of ideas generated, the more likely policy change will occur. It speaks not only to a demand that *something* must be done, but also provides a larger selection of what should be done, allowing for compromise and selection. Conversely, when the media acts as a contributor in the policy process and limits the discourse by narrowing the policy preferences, there is a greater likelihood of policy stalemate and intractability.

This is based off of Shanahan et al. (2013) study that analyzed the intercoalitional differences in the use of narrative elements and strategies of different advocacy coalitions. They found that the extent of the differences in the narrative elements and policy beliefs reflected on the level of policy intractability (Shanahan et al. 2013). I want to see if the same premise could be applied to the media and Congress.

The scope of the event will also play a role in terms of the number of groups involved in the narrative process and number of policy preferences presented. Larger events discredit the status quo and allow for more policy entrepreneurs to promote ideas (Baumgartner 2013; Hall 1993). Therefore, the focusing events that larger in scope in terms of damage, death and rarity are more likely to discredit the status quo allowing more policy preferences will be presented. However, these policy preferences are not likely to be "new" in nature. As stated before, they will most likely be re-packaging of old ideas that served as dress rehearsals following previous events. This is why a longitudinal study is needed, in order to capture the framing of these prepackaged solutions.

Methods

Therefore, in my model, in order for policy change to occur consideration of both the agenda setting properties of an event and the narrative elements of the media and Congress following the event must be considered. Considering this, I propose the following two groups of hypotheses:

Agenda Setting – Policy Change Hypotheses
  Hypothesis 1: Focusing Events increase Media Attention

  Hypothesis 2: Focusing Events increase Congressional Attention
  Hypothesis 3: As news agenda activity increases, following a focusing event, the greater the likelihood that Congressional agenda activity will also increase

  Hypothesis 4: Focusing events exhibiting greater amount of damage will increase Congressional agenda activity

  Hypothesis 5: Focusing events exhibiting greater amounts of death will increase Congressional agenda activity

  Hypothesis 6: Focusing events that are rare will increase agenda activity

  Hypothesis 7: As Congressional agenda activity increases, following a focusing event, the greater the likelihood that policy change will occur

These agenda setting hypotheses are supported by the agenda setting literature, especially Birkland's works (1997; 2006). This study extends previous work done by Birkland studying the policy change that occurs following a focusing event.

The next groups of hypotheses to be considered are the narrative policy framework hypotheses. The addition of the testing of these hypotheses, with the agenda setting properties of the event in a longitudinal study is another way this works is extending and adding on to Birkland's previous studies (1997; 2006).

Narrative Policy Framework Hypotheses
  H8: When the Media acts as a conduit, the more likely there will be a match between policy options presented by the Media with those presented by Congress.

H9: When the Media acts like as contributor, the less likely there will be a match with the policy ideas presented by the Media and those presented by Congress.

H10: When the Media acts as a conduit, the greater likelihood policy change will occur.

H11: When the Media acts as a contributor, the greater likelihood policy stalemate will occur.

H12: Larger events discredit the status quo and mobilize policy entrepreneurs to promote new ideas

H13: The larger the number of ideas generated, the more likely policy change will occur

H14: There are few truly novel ideas in the process – rather, events induce the revisiting and repacking of ideas.

The narrative policy framework hypotheses are supported in the literature (see

Shanahan 2008; Baumgartner 2012; Hall 1993; McBeth and Shanahan 2004; Shanahan

et al. 2013), however they have been applied to the Advocacy Coalition Framework and

not the Multiple Streams Framework. This study is testing the properties of NPF with

the agenda setting properties of the Multiple Streams framework. By doing this, it will

broaden our use of the NPF and our understanding of the Multiple Streams Framework.

To test these hypotheses, I plan to do content analysis based on the narrative

policy elements of key sources of policy discourse in the natural disaster policy domain

from 1970-2104. As previously stated, I am interested in comparing media narratives

with Congressional narratives to determine the role of the media (conduit or

contributor) and how the narrative elements of both match up. This will allow me to

code for main policy preferences, which emerge and recede from the agenda following

events. This longitudinal approach, according to Baumgartner and Jones (2010) is "best

suited to studying rise and fall of individual issues from public agenda" (43).

The news source of discourse that I plan on analyzing is *The New York Times*. To gather these articles I will search only *The New York Times'* National Desk with the word "earthquake" or "hurricane" appearing in the subject index. For the Congressional source of discourse, I will analyze narratives from Congressional testimony and the Congressional Record. I am interested in the narratives that are discussed surrounding hurricanes and earthquakes once a bill is introduced, however I measure policy change to occur when policy enactment takes place.

As previously stated, for a narrative to be a policy narrative it must contain a stance or judgment related to policy behavior and at least one character (Shanahan et al. 2013). However, there are several secondary components that are not necessary in terms of the NPF and the narrative to be a policy narrative, but can provide more variables and understanding for your research questions. The NPF groups these components in to three parts of the narrative: narrative elements, narrative strategies, and policy beliefs. They are detailed in the Shanahan et al. (2013) Table 1.

For my study, I definitely plan on including the statement of a problem, the characters, and the moral of the story, since these are the main components of a policy narrative. An example of a character in my study could be Mother Nature as a villain, since I am studying natural disasters. I had originally thought of excluding the causal mechanism, since the majority of my relationships would be framed as accidental. However, extremely large and rare events, such as Hurricane Katrina, raise discussion of different causal relationships and the problem is framed not just as an accidental natural event. Therefore, I think it would be worthwhile to see if once again the scope and rarity of an event changes this dynamic and, in return, generates more policy preferences.

Table 1. Policy Narratives

	Definition	Cape Cod Example
Narrative Elements		
Statement of a Problem	A policy narrative is always built around some stated problem.	The people of Massachusetts deserve a clean, affordable, and renewable energy source. (Pro-Wind)
Characters	The participants in a policy narrative.	
Victim	The entity hurt by a specified condition.	Native American Tribes whose sacred lands would be desecrated. (Anti-Wind)
Villain	The entity responsible for the damage done to the victim.	The Koch Brothers, who only care about their view and not clean energy for the rest of us. (Pro-Wind)
Hero	The entity designated as fixing or being able to fix the specified problem.	Cape Wind and Associates, who wish to site the wind farm in Cape Cod. (Pro-Wind)
Evidence (setting)	Support offered with the intention of demonstrating a problem, usually pertaining to real world fixtures in the problem environment.	"The wind turbines could provide up to 468 megawatts of power." (Williams & Whitcomb, 2007, p. xiii) (Pro-Wind)
Causal mechanism	A theoretical relationship denoting a cause and effect relationship between one or more independent variables and a dependent variable. Common causal relationships include intentional, mechanical, inadvertent, and accidental (Stone, 2012).	"The placement of the wind farm will result in the wholesale destruction of the American landscape." (Senator Alexander, Inadvertent CM) (Williams & Whitcomb, 2007, p. 247)
Moral of the story	A policy solution offered that is intended to solve the specified problem.	The construction and placement of Cape Wind. (Pro-Wind)
Plot	A story device linking the characters, evidence (setting), causal mechanism, and moral of the story (policy solution). Common plots include decline and control (Stone, 2012).	By helping us get off fossil fuels, Cape Wind will allow Americans to control their energy future. (Pro-Wind)
Narrative Strategies		
Expansion	A policy story depicting concentrated benefits and diffuse costs that is intended to draw in more participants and expand the scope of conflict.	By siting Cape Wind, one multinational corporation stands to make a lot of money while Massachusetts ratepayers, ocean life, and tourists pay the costs. (Anti-Wind)
Containment	A policy story depicting diffused benefits and concentrated costs that is intended to dissuade new participants and maintain the status quo.	By siting Cape Wind, a few people will lose their views of the ocean, but the rest of society will benefit from lower energy prices. (Pro-Wind)
Devil shift	A policy story exaggerating the power of an opponent while understating the power of the narrating group or coalition.	Cape Wind is using backroom deals to ram through a "transparent" regulatory process as well as pushing misinformation about our rate costs to lull us into thinking everything is going to be OK. (Anti-Wind)
Angel shift	A policy story that emphasizes a group or coalition's ability and/or commitment to solving a problem, while de-emphasizing the villain.	Cape Wind can lead us to a cleaner world and free us from our addiction to foreign oil. (Pro-Wind)
Policy Beliefs	A set of values and beliefs that orient a group and/or coalition.	Ideology, environmentalism, etc.

Table from Shanahan et al. (2013) Table 1. Policy Narratives (459).

I also plan on coding for evidence (setting) as Shanahan et al. (2008) did. They coded whether the evidence that was presented came from a scientific expertise or from "source cues – interest groups, elected officials, judges, governmental agencies, and business/individual citizens" (Shanahan et al. 2008, 131). They found that in the media,

there was an extreme lack of evidence presented by scientific sources. Instead the main source of public policy information was the source cues.

Finally, I plan on coding for the policy beliefs. Since I am not looking at advocacy coalitions that are aligned around specific policy beliefs, I am instead going to code for specific themes within the natural disaster literature. Students who study disasters divide the cycle into four phases: preparedness, response/relief, recovery, and mitigation. These phases receive much attention throughout disaster policy literature (see Haas, Kates, and Bodon 1977; Burby 2006; Haddow et al. 2007; Miskel 2008). By limiting my policy beliefs to these phases, I can track which ideas emerge in news narratives and how they relate to the Congressional narratives. Furthermore, the phases provide a means of operationalizing and measuring the ideas that emerged following the events. Concepts explaining how we interpreted these phases can be found in Table 2.

Table 2: Disaster Cycle Coding Scheme

Phase of Cycle	Concepts used within a phase
Preparedness	Continuity of government; planning; public/private relationships; vulnerable areas or populations; pre-disaster; insurance
Relief/Response	Getting aid to people – money, food or shelter; reports on deaths or saving lives
Recovery	Sustainability; resilience; short range vs. long range; reverse vulnerability post-disaster; restoring; rebuilding; reshaping
Mitigation	Engineering; building codes; risk analysis; land use practices; building construction practices

Conclusions

This paper proposes a study applying the Narrative Policy Framework to the Multiple Streams Framework. By doing this, it seeks to analyze both the agenda setting properties and the narrative elements following an event. I argue that in order for policy change to occur, you need the event to be large enough and rare enough that it generates agenda change on both the media and Congressional level. And you need the media to act as a conduit, allowing for groups and policy entrepreneurs to promote their ideas, instead of as a contributor in which the media backs a specific policy preference. When the media acts as a conduit, allowing for more ideas to enter the discourse, there is a greater likelihood for a "match" between media and Congressional narratives and greater likelihood for policy change to occur. However, to see the full policy change picture, a longitudinal study is necessary as event-driven policy change sometimes occurs after a series of events using narrative elements previously presented following earlier events.

This study adds to the Multiple Streams Framework, as the dominant theory the NPF is used with is ACF. Since I am trying to understand how the agenda setting properties of policy change *and* the narrative elements related to policy change work together, I argue that the Multiple Streams Framework is the best framework to use with the NPF. Furthermore, since the NPF is still relatively new, by testing it with the Multiple Streams Framework and not ACF or Punctuated Equilibrium, it will promote the growth and usage of the NPF and help us explicitly understand the Multiple Streams Framework better.

References

Baumgartner, Frank R. 2013. "Ideas and Policy Change" *Governance* 26 (2) (April): 239–258. doi:10.1111/gove.12007.

Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

———. 2010. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Birkland, Thomas A. 1997. *After Disaster: Agenda Setting, Public Policy, and Focusing Events*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

———. 2004. "Learning and Policy Improvement After Disaster: The Case of Aviation Security." *American Behavioral Scientist* 48 (3) (March 1): 341 364. doi:10.1177/0002764204268990.

———. 2006. *Lessons of Disaster*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Birkland, Thomas A., and Regina G. Lawrence. 2009. "Media framing and policy change after Columbine." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52(10): 1405-1425.

Burby, Raymond J. 2006. "Hurricane Katrina and the Paradoxes of Government Disaster Policy: Bringing About Wise Governmental Decisions for Hazardous Areas." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 604 (1): 171–191. doi:10.1177/0002716205284676.

Cobb, Roger W., and Charles D. Elder. 1983. *Participation in American Politics: The Dynamics of Agenda-Building*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University   Press.

Cobb, Roger W., and David M. Primo. 2003. *The Plane Truth: Airline Crashes, the Media, and Transportation Policy*. Washington: Brookings Institution.

Cohen, Michael D., James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. 1972. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17 (1) (March 1): 1–25. doi:10.2307/2392088.

Haas, J. Eugene, Robert W. Kates, and Martyn J. Bowden, eds. 1977. *Reconstruction Following Disaster*. MIT Press Environmental Studies Series. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Hall, Peter A. 1993. "Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policy Making in Britain." *Comparative Politics* 25 (275-96).

Haddow, George D., Jane A. Bullock, and Damon P. Coppola. 2007. "The Disciplines of Emergency Management: Preparedness" in Introduction to Emergency Management. 3rd ed. Boston: Elsevier.

Heikkila, Tanya, Jonathan J. Pierce, Samuel Gallaher, Jennifer Kagan, Deserai A. Crow, and Christopher M. Weible. "Understanding a period of policy change: the case of hydraulic fracturing disclosure policy in Colorado." *Review of Policy Research* 31, no. 2 (2014): 65-87.

Hilgartner, James, and Charles Bosk. 1988. "The Rise and Fall of Social Problems: A Public Arenas Model." *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (1): 53–78.

Jones, Bryan D. 2001. *Politics and the Architecture of Choice : Bounded Rationality and Governance.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jones, Michael D. 2014. "Cultural characters and climate change: how heroes shape our perception of climate science." *Social Science Quarterly* 95, no. 1: 1-39.

Jones, Michael D., and Mark K. McBeth. 2010. "A narrative policy framework: Clear enough to be wrong?." *Policy Studies Journal* 38, no. 2: 329-353.

Kingdon, John W. 2003. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies.* 2nd ed. Longman Classics in Political Science. New York: Longman.

Lawrence, Regina G., and Thomas A. Birkland. 2004. "Guns, Hollywood, and School Safety: Defining the School-Shooting Problem Across Public Arenas*." *Social Science Quarterly* 85(5): 1193-1207.

Lindblom, Charles E. 1959. "The Science of 'Muddling Through'." *Public Administration Review* 19: 79–88.

Lindblom, Charles E. 1979. "Still Muddling, Not Yet Through." *Public Administration Review* 39: 517–526.

May, Peter J. 1991. "Reconsidering Policy Design: Policies and Publics.*" Journal of Public Policy* 11 (02): 187–206. doi:10.1017/S0143814X0000619X.

McBeth, Mark K., and Elizabeth A. Shanahan 2004. "Public opinion for sale: The role of policy marketers in Greater Yellowstone policy conflict." *Policy Sciences* 37, no. 3-4: 319-338.

McBeth, Mark K., Elizabeth A. Shanahan, and Michael D. Jones 2005. "The science of storytelling: Measuring policy beliefs in Greater Yellowstone." *Society and Natural Resources* 18, no. 5: 413-429.

McBeth, Mark K., Elizabeth A. Shanahan, Ruth J. Arnell, and Paul L. Hathaway 2007. "The intersection of narrative policy analysis and policy change theory." *Policy Studies Journal* 35, no. 1: 87-108.

McBeth, Mark K., Elizabeth A. Shanahan, Paul L. Hathaway, Linda E. Tigert, and Lynette J. Sampson 2010. "Buffalo tales: interest group policy stories in Greater Yellowstone." *Policy Sciences* 43, no. 4: 391-409.

Miskel, James F. 2008 "Disaster Response in the United States: How the System is Supposed to work" in Disaster Response and Homeland Security: What Works, What Doesn't. Stanford: Stanford University Press, Chapter 1.

Nohrstedt, Daniel, and Christopher M. Weible 2010. "The logic of policy change after crisis: Proximity and subsystem interaction." *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 1, no. 2: 1-32.

Sabatier, P. A., and H. C. Jenkins-Smith 1993. "Policy change and learning: an advocacy coalition approach." *Theoretical lenses on public policy*

Schattschneider, E.E. 1975. *The Semisovereign People*. Hinsdale, Ill.: The Dryden Press.

Shanahan, Elizabeth A., Mark K. McBeth, Paul L. Hathaway, and Ruth J. Arnell 2008. "Conduit or contributor? The role of media in policy change theory." *Policy Sciences* 41, no. 2: 115-138.

Shanahan, Elizabeth A., and Mark K. McBeth 2010. "The Science of Storytelling: Policy Marketing and Wicked Problems in Greater Yellowstone."

Shanahan, Elizabeth A., Michael D. Jones, and Mark K. McBeth 2011. "Policy narratives and policy processes." *Policy Studies Journal* 39, no. 3: 535-561.

Shanahan, Elizabeth A., Mark K. McBeth, and Paul L. Hathaway. "Narrative policy framework: The influence of media policy narratives on public opinion." *Politics & Policy* 39, no. 3 (2011): 373-400.

Shanahan, Elizabeth A., Michael D. Jones, Mark K. McBeth, and Ross R. Lane. "An angel on the wind: How heroic policy narratives shape policy realities." *Policy Studies Journal* 41, no. 3 (2013): 453-483.

Simon, Herbert A. 1957. *Models of Man: Social and Rational; Mathematical Essays on Rational Human Behavior in Society Setting*. New York: Wiley

Stone, Deborah A. 2002. *Policy Paradox : the Art of Political Decision Making*. New York: Norton.

Walker, Jack L. 1977. "Setting the Agenda in the U.S. Senate: A Theory of Problem Selection." *British Journal of Political Science* 7: 423–445.

Zahariadis, Nikolaos. 2007. "The Multiple Streams Framework: Structure, Limitations, Prospects." In *Theories of the Policy Process*, edited by Paul A.Sabatier, 2nd ed., 65–91. Boulder, Colo.: Westview