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Introduction

The Argumentative Turn Revisited

The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning, edited by Frank Fischer and John Forester in 1993, set out a new orientation in policy analysis and planning: a shift away from the dominant empirical, analytic approach to problem solving to one including the study of language and argumentation as essential dimensions of theory and analysis in policy making and planning. The book was instrumental in stimulating a large body of work in policy research and planning in both the United States and Europe over subsequent years. Since its publication, the emphasis on argumentation has converged with other developments in the social sciences focused on discourse, deliberation, social constructivism, and interpretative methods. This new book takes stock of these developments in an effort to further advance the argumentative direction in policy studies.¹

Drawing heavily at the outset on Jürgen Habermas’s critical theory, in particular his critique of technocracy and scientism and his work on communicative action, the “argumentative turn” offered an alternative approach to policy inquiry. Fundamentally, it has linked postpositivist epistemology with social and political theory and the search for a relevant methodology. At the outset, the approach emphasized practical argumentation, policy judgment, frame analysis, narrative storytelling, and rhetorical analysis, among others (Gottweis 2006). From the early 1990s onward, argumentative policy analysis matured into a major strand in the contemporary study of policy making and policy theory development. As one leading policy theorist put it, this postpositivist perspective became one of the competing theoretical perspectives (Peters 2004).

Over these years the argumentative turn expanded to include work on discourse analysis, deliberation, deliberative democracy, citizen juries, governance, expertise, participatory inquiry, local and tacit knowledge, collaborative planning, the uses and role of media, and interpretive methods, among others.² Although these research foci are hardly syn-
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Anonymous, they share the special attention they give to communication and argumentation, in particular the processes of utilizing, mobilizing, and assessing communicative practices in the interpretation and praxis of policy making and analysis (Fischer 2003; Gottweis 2006).

First and foremost, argumentative policy inquiry challenges the belief that policy analysis can be a value-free, technical project. Whereas neo-positivist approaches embrace a technically oriented rational model of policy making—an attempt to provide unequivocal, value-free answers to the major questions of policy making—the argumentative approach rejects the idea that policy analysis can be a straightforward application of scientific techniques. Instead of a narrow focus on empirical measurement of inputs and outputs, it takes the policy argument as the starting point of analysis. Without denying the importance of empirical analysis, the argumentative turn seeks to understand the relationship between the empirical and the normative as they are configured in the processes of policy argumentation. It thus concerns itself with the validity of empirical and normative statements, but moves beyond this traditional empirical emphasis to examine the ways in which they are combined and employed in the political process.

This orientation is especially important for an applied discipline such as policy analysis. Insofar as the field exists to serve real-world decision makers, policy analysis needs to be relevant to those whom it attempts to assist. The argumentative turn, in this regard, seeks to analyze policy to inform the ordinary-language processes of policy argumentation, in particular as reflected in the thought and deliberation of politicians, administrators, and citizens (Linblom and Cohen 1979). Rather than imposing scientific frameworks on the processes of argumentation and decision making—theoretical perspectives generally designed to inform specific academic disciplines—policy analysis thus takes the practical argument as the unit of analysis. It rejects the “rational” assumptions underlying many approaches in policy inquiry and embraces an understanding of human action as intermediated and embedded in symbolically rich social and cultural contexts.

Recognizing that the policy process is constituted by and mediated through communicative practices, the argumentative turn therefore attempts to understand both the process of policy making and the analytical activities of policy inquiry on their own terms. Instead of prescribing procedures based on abstract models, the approach labors to
understand and reconstruct what policy analysts do when they do it, to understand how their findings and advice are communicated, and how such advice is understood and employed by those who receive it. This requires close attention to the social construction of the normative—often conflicting—policy frames of those who struggle over power and policy.

These concerns take on special significance in today’s increasingly turbulent world. Contemporary policy problems facing governments are more uncertain, complex, and often riskier than they were when many of the theories and methods of policy analysis were first advanced. Often poorly defined, such problems have been described as far “messier” than their earlier counterparts—for example, climate change, health, and transportation (Ney 2009). These are problems for which clear-cut solutions are missing—especially technical solutions, despite concerted attempts to identify them. In all of these areas, traditional approaches—often technocratic—have proven inadequate or have failed. Indeed, for such messy policy problems, science and scientific knowledge have often compounded problem solving, becoming themselves sources of uncertainty and ambiguity. They thus generate political conflict rather than help to resolve it. In a disorderly world that is in “generative flux,” research methods that assume a stable reality “out there” waiting to be discovered are of little help and prone to error and misinterpretation (Law 2004:6–7).

Nothing has contributed more to this uncertain, unpredictable flux than the contemporary transformation of the political and economic world into the one we now confront. One of the most important policy issues to signal these new characteristics has been the environmental crisis. Spanning local and global scales, it has made clear not only the interconnectedness of policy issues, but also the increasing levels of uncertainty and risk associated with them. In addition, the unpredicted collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War dramatically altered the international political landscape. With it came the spread of neoliberal capitalism and the promise of steady worldwide economic growth, coupled with the heralded spread of democracy. But this too brought a very different and unpredictable reality.

The failure of this new order to materialize has underscored the nonlinear and often contradictory nature of contemporary politics and policy making. Instead of the envisioned, all-encompassing new order
of global and liberal capitalism, the result is new and worrisome vari-
eties of capitalism (often statist in nature), the revival of nationalism, 
ethnic conflicts, destabilizing waves of migration, unanticipated forms 
of terrorism, new worries about both nuclear weapons and nuclear 
energy, rapidly accelerating threats of climate change, and the near 
collapse in 2008 of the worldwide financial system (Bremmer 2010). In 
short, such uncertainties, ambiguities, unpredictabilities, and unex-
pected consequences have become the defining features of our increas-
ingly turbulent times.

Nowhere was this more evident and disturbing than in the nuclear 
disaster in Fukushima. Almost disbelieving the reports, the world 
watched the unfolding of a catastrophe resulting from an unforeseen 
interaction of earthquakes, a tsunami, and sociotechnical mismanage-
ment. The resulting nuclear meltdown and release of radiation were all 
products of technocratic strategies based on outdated modes of guid-
ance and control. Leading to devastating destruction and the death of 
thousands, these failures left the nation of Japan in a state of economic 
disarray, even disaster, for many.

In the economic sphere, the equally disastrous consequences of ra-
tionality failures could be observed in the near collapse of the world 
economy in 2008. Unforeseen by all but a very few economists, the real-
world behavior of bankers defied the logics of the economists’ models of 
rational behavior. From this perspective, the problem was as theoretical 
as it was practical. In what can be described as the Waterloo of the 
“rational model” of economic policy making, the economics profession 
largely failed to anticipate the possibility of—let alone predict—the 
breakdown of the Western banking system in 2008 and the near collapse 
of the world economic system, a crisis that only could be prevented by a 
bailout, unimaginable until then, from the governments of the United 
States and Europe. As leading economists have explained, economic 
understanding and prediction have rested on the assumption of rational 
extpectations, anticipating individual behavior to conform to the struc-
tures of the economist’s theoretical models rather than real-world activ-
ities (Colander et al. 2009; Friedman 2009). Based on a false belief that 
“individuals and the economist have a complete understanding of the 
economic mechanisms governing the world,” these models lead econo-
mists to “disregard key factors—including heterogeneity of decision 
rules, revisions of forecasting strategies, and changes in the social con-
text—that drive outcomes in asset and other markets.” Such models, as even the causal observer can see, fail to understand the real workings of the economy, both domestic and international. As these writers conclude, “In our hour of greatest need, societies around the world are left to grope in the dark without a theory.” It represents “a systemic failure of the economics profession” (Colander et al. 2009:2).

These concerns have spread beyond the economics profession to the other social sciences. Many political scientists busy themselves adapting this economic model to the explanation of noneconomic behavior. In the United States, the rational choice model borrowed from economics has in fact become the dominant theoretical orientation in political science, with many adherents in sociology as well. Bringing with it a neopositivist effort to supply empirical and deductive, value-neutral modes of political explanation, as best evidenced by the influential advocacy coalition model of policy change, it has largely failed on its own terms to provide significant, usable findings relevant to policy. And, in the process, it drives out an understanding of the essential role of the subjective and ideational components basic to social and political explanation.

But one doesn’t have to rely on a critique of the rational model to identify the failures of a technically oriented form of policy analysis. This is also clear from a more general neglect of the role of culture, values, and ideas. Easily at hand is the case of the Iraq War and its tragic consequences for both the Iraqi people and the foreign policy of the United States. Here one has to point to the failure of Bush administration policy makers to consider the cultural realities of that country, not to mention the Middle East as a whole; they simply looked at Iraq through American eyes and saw what they wished to see.

The tragedy that resulted from Hurricane Katrina in 2005 is yet another example. The destruction the hurricane wrought on the City of New Orleans was only in part a function of inadequately reinforced containment walls; in the aftermath, it also became clear that the failure to address the problem before and after the disaster was also rooted in widely held tacit beliefs about poverty and race.

Yet another tragic example is the catastrophic BP oil gusher in the Gulf of Mexico in the spring and summer of 2010. This was in significant part a failure to appreciate the risks and uncertainties of deep-sea drilling; policy makers either followed the ineffectacious regulatory advice of an outmoded administrative culture, relied on unreliable ecological
estimates, or accepted BP assurances based on self-serving motives. Each of these instances illustrates especially complex and uncertain problems that do not lend themselves to traditional models of policy making and the kinds of technical analysis that have sought to inform it. In all of these cases, the problem itself was in need of a new definition, one including first and foremost a process of normative interpretation rather than empirical analysis per se. Interpretive analysis, in this regard, needs to coexist and interact with empirical analysis. In recent years, there has been some progress in this direction; many now recognize the need for interpretive-oriented qualitative research. But interpretive modes of inquiry have to be accepted on their own terms, not just as an adjunct to empirical hypothesis testing and explanation (King, Keohane, and Verba 1994).

For these reasons, policy analysis can no longer afford to limit itself to the simplified academic models of explanation. Such methods fail to address the nonlinear nature of today’s messy policy problems. They fail to capture the typically heterogeneous, interconnected, often contradictory, and increasingly globalized character of these issues. Many of these problems are, as such, appropriately described as “wicked problems.” In these situations, not only is the problem wanting for a solution, the very nature and conceptualization of the problem is not well understood. Effective solutions to such problems require ongoing, informed deliberation involving competing perspectives on the part of both government officials and public citizens.

The argumentative turn literature has made a strong contribution toward bringing back the critical role of discursive reflection and argumentation to both the practices of policy analysis and an understanding of the dynamics of policy making today. On the methodological level, it contrasts the limits of hypothesis-driven neopositivist research with a grounded approach toward policy inquiry that is less characterized by the search for general laws and regularities of society and politics than by contextually situated, ethnographically rich analysis of policy constellations (Clarke 2005). This type of inquiry emphasizes the multifaceted nature of human action that cannot be reduced to empirical variables but views humans as culturally shaped, communicatively based, socially motivated, and emotionally grounded.

In sum, it seems today to be more obvious than ever that the still dominant empiricist orientation in the social and policy sciences can-
not adequately grasp this much more complex, uncertain world defined by interconnected networks that blur the traditional boundaries that organize our social political spaces and political arenas. By focusing on argumentation, processes of dialogic exchange, and interpretive analysis, we need to discover how competing policy actors construct contending narratives in order to make sense of and deal with such uncertain, messy challenges. Only through a dialectical process of critical reflection and collective learning can we develop new and innovative policy solutions that speak to contemporary realities. Toward this end, the process must also be supported by a constructivist understanding of the ways in which interpretation and argumentation function in science and scientific expertise. Such understandings, both empirically valid and normatively legitimate, are required to build consensuses capable of moving us forward in the deliberative process of public problem solving.

The contributions in this book build on and supplement the themes developed in 1993 in *The Argumentative Turn*, with contributions based on discourse analysis, deliberative democracy, collaborative planning, interpretive frame analysis, discursive institutionalism, new media, performativity in rhetorical argumentation, narration, images and pictures, semiotics, transformative policy learning, and more. These chapters further develop the perspective against the background of a more complex, ever more connected and networked, heterogeneous, turbulent, and increasingly globalized world. Before presenting the contributions of this book, however, it is useful to clarify some of the key notions used in the following pages.

Communicative Practices: From Argumentation to Discourse—and Back Again

The argumentative turn begins with the realization that public policy, constructed through language, is the product of argumentation. In both oral and written form, as Majone (1989) has reminded us, “argument is central in all stages of the policy process.” Policy making is fundamentally an ongoing discursive struggle over the definition and conceptual framing of problems, the public understanding of the issues, the shared meanings that motivate policy responses, and criteria for evaluation (Stone 2002). Whereas this view was relatively new in 1993, there has
 since been an outpouring of activities—books, articles, conferences, and workshops—related to the argumentative turn, as originally understood.

After its publication, *The Argumentative Turn* became a much discussed and cited book, establishing itself in a relatively short period of time as important orientation in policy studies. Today, it is a contending theoretical and methodological direction with a well-articulated policy research agenda. Much of what emerged took its initial cues from the issues set out in 1993, especially in the interlinking of epistemology, methodology, policy theory, politics, and policy practices. Offering an epistemologically grounded pluralistic agenda for an argumentative and discursive approach to policy analysis and planning that is more sophisticated, the range of contributions now stretches from Frankfurt-style critical theory and Foucauldian poststructuralism to a Bourdieu-influenced emphasis on institutional practices and a neo-Gramscian study of hegemonic discourse. In more specific terms, it includes work on social constructivism, practical reason, deliberation, discourse analysis, interpretive frame analysis, rhetorical analysis, semiotics, performativity, narrative storytelling, local and tacit knowledge, the role of expertise, and participatory policy analysis. Examples of these new tendencies can be found in the chapters of this book.

Fundamentally, the argumentative turn is founded on the recognition that language does more than reflect what we take to be reality. Indeed, it is constituent of reality, shaping—and at times literally determining—what we understand to be reality. A view grounded in the epistemological contributions of philosophers such as Ludwig Wittgenstein, J. L. Austin, and Jacques Derrida, it is reflected in the theories of phenomenology, symbolic interaction, and ethnomethodology, among others. It largely entered policy analysis and planning through an interest in the writing of Jürgen Habermas, giving rise to an argumentative policy turn. This was followed by later developments that often took their cue from the poststructuralism of Foucault and postmodernism, coupled with influences in social constructivism emerging from sociology of science and science studies more generally. Theory and research along these lines have thus focused on the role of interpretation in analyzing policy agenda setting, policy development and implementation, the use of narratives in policy discourse, the social construction of policy findings, citizen participation and local knowledge, participatory policy analysis and collaborative planning, gender and feminist epistemology, identity
politics in policy discourse, the analysis of deliberative processes, a return to the role of rhetoric, performativity and dramaturgy, and discourse analysis more broadly conceived. And, not least important, many of those who started with Habermas have continued their project by exploring more closely issues of policy deliberation and discursive democracy (Dryzek 2000). Other Habermasians turned to a focus on the more micro aspects of language and deliberation in policy and policy-oriented work in planning (Forester 1999, 2009). A large number of research projects were inspired by this turn to argumentation and discourse, demonstrating the usefulness of the approach for policy research.

Given the diversity and spread of orientations, however, there is now some variation in terminology. There is, in short, a need for clarification, in particular as it pertains to argumentation. Today, terms like “discourse,” “deliberation,” “rhetoric,” and “argumentation” are frequently used somewhat indiscriminately. These concepts are interrelated yet different. They are all forms of communication but have different characteristics and functions. Insofar as the concept of argumentation has tended to take a backseat to the emergence of discourse, we seek to clarify and revitalize its essential importance. That is, it is not now an outmoded concept that can be replaced with the more fashionable concept of discourse. The focus here is thus primarily on argumentation and its relationship to discourse, deliberation, and rhetoric.

“Argumentation” traditionally refers to the process through which people seek to reach conclusions through reason. Although influenced and shaped by formal logic, the study of argumentation has also turned to informal logic and practical reason. As such, it explores the way people communicate in civil debate and engage in persuasive dialogue and negotiation as well in ordinary conversation. It focuses on the way that people—including opponents—reach and justify mutually acceptable decisions. It thus includes the ways policy analysts and planners seek to advise their clients, politicians, and the public of their conclusions and recommendations.

There is no firm distinction between deliberation and argumentation. This is because deliberation is itself a form of argumentation. We set it off as a procedurally governed form of collective argumentation, as it is mainly employed in the literature of policy and planning. It is used to denote formally structured processes, such as citizen juries and con-
sensus conferences, in which people are brought together to discuss and decide a particular issue by carefully considering the available evidence and competing perspectives. Although it need not be the case, deliberation usually connotes a more moderate, less impassioned approach to reaching conclusions. It is not that there is no passionate engagement, but that the overall process is seen to be governed by pre-agreed-upon understandings about what constitutes appropriate lines of communications. For example, manipulative persuasion and distortion, common to everyday argumentation, especially in politics, is ruled out.

“Rhetoric” and “rhetorical argument” refer to both a field of study focused on the methods of argumentation and particular features of the argumentative process. Although it unfortunately came to have negative connotations in everyday language, rhetoric is an essential and unavoidable aspect of argumentation. Beyond its identification with distortion and manipulation, it deals with the way arguers focus on the relation of the argument and the audience. As such, it hone in on the dialogic of an “argumentative situation.” In this type of argumentation, the arguer pays special attention to those he or she is speaking to, their beliefs, backgrounds, intellectual styles, and communicative strategies. Rhetorical argumentation thus seeks to combine logical, propositional argumentation with an appreciation of the speaker and the audience, as well as the role of emotion in the persuasive process. Unlike standard forms of logical argument, which focus on a “given” reality, a rhetorical argument seeks to construct particular representations of reality. The arguer attempts to persuade the audience to see and understand something—an event, relationship, process, and the like—one way as opposed to another.

“Discourse” is employed here more formally to mean a body of concepts and ideas that circumscribe, influence, and shape argumentation. Often the word “discourse” is used casually to refer to argumentation. One of the reasons for this has to do with a negative connotation associated with argumentation, in just the same way that rhetoric is often seen pejoratively. In ordinary communication, arguing is often seen to be impolite. But argumentation, like rhetoric, has also a long formal history related to the advance and appraisal of knowledge. This is the understanding employed here.

“Discourse,” by contrast, is seen here to be the broadest and most encompassing of these terms and also serves a different function related
in particular to social meaning. For Hajer (1995), discourse is “a specific ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categorizations that are produced and reproduced and transformed to give meaning to physical and social relations.” Similarly, Howarth (2000:9) writes that discourses refer “to historically specific systems of meaning which form the identities of subjects and objects.” A discourse, in this view, circumscribes the range of subjects and objects through which people experience the world, specifies the views that can be legitimately accepted as knowledge, and constitutes the actors taken to be the agents of knowledge. Discourse analysis thus starts from the assumption that all actions, objects, and practices are socially meaningful and that these meanings are shaped by the social and political struggles in specific historical periods.

Discourse, in this sense, operates at the sociocultural macro level, transmitting basic values and giving cohesion to shared beliefs. Among other things, it supplies society with basic stories and narratives that serve as modes of behavior, both positive and negative. Discourses are thus different in different cultures. The broad discursive framework of Western Christian culture, for example, differs from that of the Islamic world. Both offer different stories and illustrative principles that illustrate how one should behave. There are points of commonality, but there are also essential differences.

Discourses, as such, provide the materials from which argumentation, including deliberative argumentation, can be constructed. Within a discourse there will be conflicting, unresolved elements that emerge from the historical struggles that have shaped the discourse. Discourses will also identify who has the right to speak authoritatively on specific matters. For example, workers and managers will typically subscribe to different goal values; managers and owners will see and understand things differently than labor unions and workers. To take another illustration, the church no longer has the authority to pronounce on matters related to medicine. And laypeople are usually not accepted to be knowledgeable about legal matters requiring judicial judgments. But these understandings change over time. Even though certain lines of argument will be considered out of bounds, there is thus a great deal of room for argumentation within a cultural discourse. Because of unresolved conflicts and even contradictions in a discourse, coupled with the need to always interpret the meaning of new circumstances in light
of given social meanings and values, a society will always contain an argumentative struggle that typically becomes the stuff of politics. While such discourses structure the struggles that ensue among conflicting groups, it is important to understand that social agents are not altogether determined by the social positions afforded by the dominant discourses. Over time, there is a dialectical interaction between social actors—as arguers—and discourse structures that is inherent in the processes of social and political change. In the process, social agents can themselves influence the content of the dominant discourses. Indeed, social struggles are generally related closely to the meanings established and perpetuated by such discourses and their communicative practices. In relatively stable societies, agents—often in the form of discourse coalitions—can manage to bring about change in discursive practices, albeit gradually. But revolutionary situations can give rise to rapid and dramatic changes. Social actors need to be understood both as the products of these preexisting discursive relationships and as the agents of their change. The degree to which agents can cause such discursive change is an empirical question that needs to be examined in the context of the specific circumstances.

Within this overarching conceptualization of discourse and discursive struggle, there are also subordinate discourses that structure specific realms. Because society is differentiated and complex, specific discourses govern the various sectors and subsystems of society. There are political, economic, and environmental discourses, among others. A political discourse, for instance, covers all of the topics that would come up in matters political—concepts, terms, theories, relevant policy issues, and the like. The discipline of political science, an academic discourse, seeks to refine these concepts for the purpose of more precise explanation and understanding. These discourses, as such, are anchored to specific institutional realms, such as the ministries of foreign and economic affairs and a national political science association. In these domains, discussions will be circumscribed and constrained by the terms and concepts of the discourse embedded in institutional processes.

Narration and discourse are often used together, especially by postmodern theorists. Discourses contain narratives, which are essentially stories, either in oral or written form. Fundamentally, narrative storytelling reveals or conveys an experience structured as a sequence of
events or occurrences (e.g., a beginning, middle, and ending) through which individuals relate their experiences to one another. In policy inquiry, narrative story lines in the everyday world draw on the vocabularies of the macro epistemic discourses to which the inquiry belongs. The specific role of the story is to furnish communication with particular details that provide the material out of which social meaning is created. They are not arguments as such, but arguments are often included as part of the story. Arguments can also be based on a story or drawn from them. They often are the source of the propositions of arguments and frequently provide evidence for claims.

Finally, the concept of practices requires attention. The term “communicative practices” is used rather loosely to cover various acts of discourse, deliberation, and argumentation. In most formal definitions, in particular those related to language and linguistics, communicative practices involve reaching conclusions through reason rather than intuition. Argumentation, as such, is a communicative practice.

In social theory, the emphasis on practice usually refers to activities that have become routine, regularized, and habitual. Much of this work is based on the contributions of Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu. In their contributions, “practice” refers to modes of communication that appear as unified, with rules about who can use these ways of speaking and boundaries specifying which kinds of issues and topics are a part of them and which are not. “Practice” here typically refers to the construction and reflection of social realities through actions that invoke beliefs, ideologies, identity, ideology, and power. Studying communicative practices not only involves paying attention to the production of meanings by participants as they employ the verbal, nonverbal, and interactional resources that they command, but also requires paying attention to how the employment of such resources reflects and creates the processes and meanings of the community in which local actions occur. Although a practice is goal-oriented, people who participate in a communicative practice may not be consciously goal-oriented, since their goal is built into institutional activities in ways that are no longer immediately available for their conscious examination.

Finally, the power of pictures, images, film, and, in general, visual representation in political discourse, often referred to as indicating a “pictorial turn,” is obvious and much-debated (Mitchell 1994). How-
ever, the conceptual and theoretical challenges of studying aspects of visual representation in social and political context have only slowly been taken up in empirical social science. Integrating strategies for the study of practices of visual representation into argumentative policy analysis is an important challenge for future analysis and has been taken up also by a number of authors in this book. Especially when controversial and emotional questions are at stake, actors choose innovative ways of communicating their interests, and images function as a powerful rhetorical tool.

All of these communicative practices have a role to play in the focus presented in this book. In the view here, however, it is argumentation that constitutes the primary consideration in the world of policy making. It is through argumentation, identified by the actors, that actors in the political process advance their goals and objectives. Argumentation, from this perspective, draws on discourses, but it also encompasses other essential aspects of communicative practices that are basic to policy politics, such as political rhetoric, structured policy deliberation, performativity, images, and emotional expression. The focus is thus how actors in the public sphere argue, rhetorically and deliberatively, within and across discourses, especially those embedded in the discursive practices of institutions.

The emphasis is important, especially given the traditional—and still prevalent—attempt on the part of many social scientists to eliminate or reduce argumentation and discourse in social and political explanation. They are rejected as being anchored to nonscientific, subjective processes. Explanation, according to conventional social science methodology, particularly in the United States, should be based on objective (particularly material) interests that can be identified, carefully observed, and deductively analyzed. Indeed, it is an approach still today advocated by rigorous rational choice theorists in the social sciences.

But in more contemporary times, it has become clear that ideas, discourse, and argumentation matter. It is not that the point is new. Indeed, a classic statement of this understanding is by Max Weber, who recognized the importance of ideas and argumentation long before modern-day postmodern theorists, among others, turned to discourse and argumentation. Weber formulated the relationship between ideas and material interests this way: “Not ideas, but material and ideal inter-
ests, directly govern men’s conduct. Yet very frequently the ‘world images’ that have been created by ‘ideas’ have, like switchmen, determined the tracks along which action has been pushed by the dynamic of interest” (Weber 1948:280).

There is no better example of this in modern politics than Thatcherism in Britain and its counterpart in the United States, Reaganism. Both political leaders introduced new ideas about governance and economy that switched the political tracks to neoliberalism. Indeed, President Reagan’s lasting influence, despite his many policy failures, was his impact on political discourse in the United States. Whereas for more than forty years the Democratic Party forged the dominant political paradigm around economic regulation and social assistance in the name of the “public interest” or “common good,” Reagan reshaped the contours of public discourse by replacing government regulation and public assistance with deregulation, free markets, and the interests of the individual, especially the individual as entrepreneur. In the process, the normative terminology of public interest was replaced with an emphasis on self-interest and personal gain. Today, it is scarcely possible to discuss new policy proposals in the United States without first explaining and legitimizing them in terms of the economic language of costs and benefits, a formulation that does not easily admit the traditional concept of the public interest. The public interest, based on values and ideas related to the larger common concerns of society, cannot be easily discussed in terms of cost and benefits; indeed, it is generally understood as morally transcending such narrow economic criteria. When a public interest claim attempts to satisfy a cost-benefit test, it is usually difficult—or impossible—to measure the outcome in terms of monetary value.

Looking closely at the enactment of historically significant legislation, we nearly always discover that shared values are the forces behind the interest groups and social movements that struggled to achieve them—the end of slavery, women’s right to vote, anticommunism, civil rights, environmental protection, and antismoking campaigns, to name some of the more obvious examples. More specifically, consider the passage in the United States of the Voting Rights Act of 1964. Only two years before this landmark legislative achievement for the civil rights movement, the prospects for the passage of such legislation looked very doubtful. In just a couple of years, views about equality of opportunity
changed so dramatically that they cleared away the long-standing en-
trenched political opposition that had blocked the path of such legisla-
tion for more than a century.

Beyond the broad sweeps of historical change, moreover, there is
plenty of evidence to show the importance of ideas in the ordinary
course of public affairs. Research shows, as Orren writes, “that people
don’t act simply on the basis of their perceived self-interest, without
regard to aggregative consequences of their action” (1988:13). They are
motivated as well “by values, purposes, ideas, and goals, and commit-
ments that transcend self-interest or group interests.” Indeed, over the
past thirty or forty years a good deal of research has steadily accumu-
lated to support the contention that ideas and values can be relatively
autonomous of interests and institutions. Although it is never easy to
sort out these influences, such research makes clear that the values of
individuals can arise quite independently of their life experiences and
can exert an independent influence on their political behavior (Verba
and Orren 1985).

There are two levels of analysis that such research brings into play.
One has to do with the broad, overarching discourses that structure our
ways of thinking and thus communicating. Following theorists such as
Foucault and Antonio Gramsci, this turns our attention to concerns
about hegemonic discourses such as capitalism and contemporary neo-
liberalism. By shaping basic social meanings that come to be taken as
given—that is, as natural to the social world—they typically operate
under the radar. Generally, most people do not even recognize that they
themselves are shaped socially and politically by these discourses.

The second level, the level of institutions and action, has to do with
argumentation within these accepted discourses. Vivien Schmidt (2001;
chapter 3 in this volume), in her theory of “discursive institutionalism,”
has usefully illustrated the ways in which policy discourses can shape
the communicative interactions among political actors who translate
problems into policy issues. Analysis of communication within these
interactions, as she writes, “can provide insight into the political dy-
namics of change by going behind the interplay of interests, institutions,
and cultures” to explain how change is brought about by “an interactive
consensus for change through communication among the key political
actors” (2001:3).

This is not to suggest that discursive argumentation can be under-
stood without the variables of interests, institutions, and culture. Indeed, discourse and argumentation are not easily separated from the interests that are expressed through them, the institutional interactions that shape their expression, or the cultural norms that frame them. Communicative interaction can (and often does) exert a causal influence on political change, although the influence tends to be that of an intervening rather than an independent variable. For this reason, discourse and argumentation based on it cannot be the cause, but it is often a cause of political change (Schmidt 2002). Argumentative communication is only one of a number of multiple causes or influences, although it can at times be the very variable or added influence that makes the difference, especially in the explanation of change (Fischer 2003). It can do this in a variety of ways, including through the conceptual reframing of interests to facilitate consensual agreement or through the reframing of institutional rules and cultural norms governing the play of power.

The reconsideration of ideas and beliefs in political and policy research at this second level owes much to the “new institutionalists” or “neoinstitutionalists,” especially those in comparative politics and policy. Long concerned that the existing theoretical approaches to inquiry are insufficient for dealing with the variety and complexity of social and political change in modern societies, these scholars have argued that the analysis of variations in public policy outcomes should more broadly examine the interplay of political elites, interest groups’ demands, institutional processes, and ideas in political and policy analysis.

It is not that institutions cause political action; rather, their communicative practices shape the behaviors of actors, causing political action. Supplying them with regularized behavioral rules, standards of assessment, and emotive commitments, institutions influence political actors by structuring or shaping the political and social interpretations of the problems they have to deal with and by limiting the choice of policy solutions that might be implemented. The interests of actors are still there, but they are influenced by the institutional structures, norms, and rules through which they are pursued. Such structural relationships give shape to both social and political expectations and the possibility of realizing them. Indeed, as Weick (1969) and others have shown, it is often the institutional opportunities and barriers that determine people’s preferences, rather than the other way around, as is more commonly assumed (Fischer 1990:282–83).
Such research requires a qualitative orientation, but it means moving beyond the standard approaches to include a stronger form of interpretive analysis, or “interpretive policy analysis” as it has emerged in the literature (Yanow 2000; Wagenaar 2011). Interpretive policy analysis goes behind the existing beliefs and their communication to examine how they came to be adopted. This requires an examination of the power relations behind particular argumentative struggles. A critical interpretive analysis emphasizes the political role of communicative activity in both constituting and maintaining power relations. As Kee noy, Oswick, and Grant put it, critical analysts examine “dialogical struggle (or struggles) as reflected in privileging of a particular discourse and the marginalization of others” (1997:147). In the process, such analysis recognizes that discourses “are never completely cohesive, without internal tensions, and therefore able to determine reality” (Phillips 2003:226). As such, they are often partial and inconclusive with crosscutting contradictions and inconsistent arguments. For this reason, they are seldom wholly uncontested.

Part I of this book, “Deliberative Policy Argumentation and Public Participation,” begins with the chapter by John Dryzek and Carolyn Hendriks on deliberation. Basic to policy argumentation is deliberation. The emergence and focus on deliberation has in fact been one of the most significant developments in the argumentative turn since the concept was first proposed and includes work in political theory on deliberative democracy. Deliberation and deliberative democracy are topics to which both of these writers have made important contributions. After introducing the conceptualization of society as a deliberative system, Dryzek and Hendriks explore the concept of deliberation and its relationship to other forms of political communication. Drawing on emerging empirical studies, they consider how the quality of deliberative argumentation can be affected by different features of forum design. Rather than compare different types of deliberative forums, they look more broadly at how the authenticity, inclusivity, and effectiveness of deliberation can be shaped by various design attributes such as the structure of the forum, its participants, and the authority and legitimacy of the forum. While design is important for facilitating deliberation, Dryzek and Hendriks also acknowledge the limits of “the forum” and recognize that deliberation occurs in a diversity of spaces including
legislatures, courts, social movements, the media, and particular practices such as activism or justification. They conclude that political systems need to facilitate multiple deliberative spaces such that policy making can be informed by a diverse range of argumentation and communication. At the same time, they also argue that variety is not enough; consideration also needs to be given to how different spaces connect to constitute an effective deliberative system.

Moving from the forum to local governance and planning, Patsy Healey takes up the communicative practices involved in collaborative planning processes. Although the role of participation was not new in 1993, its importance in policy and planning has steadily evolved since then. With the development of new techniques and practices, it has come to be widely considered part of good governance practices. Building on her earlier focus on communicative action in planning in *The Argumentative Turn*, she explores here the ways that communicative participatory interaction supports and facilitates the processes of collaborative planning. Based on a relational, constructivist, and pragmatic understanding of social and communicative dynamics, collaborative interactions between planners and citizens emphasize the situated, context-dependent nature of social life. Focusing in particular on problems involved in governing urban places, she illustrates the ways that ideas and practices associated with collaborative planning should be understood as participatory communicative processes rather than technical procedures designed to achieve specific goals. The qualities of these situated communicative interactions and techniques are seen to play an important role in raising awareness among those involved with issues of place, as well as in the need to feed the results of such exercises into the wider deliberative processes through which policy decisions are made. The situated use of these discursive practices, as “art and craft,” is essential for the future governance of sustainable urban places.

Part II, “Discursive Politics and Argumentative Practices: Institutions and Frames,” begins with Vivien A. Schmidt’s chapter on her theory of “discursive institutionalism.” Discursive institutionalism is an umbrella concept for approaches that concern themselves with the substantive content of ideas and the interactive processes of discourse and discursive argumentation in institutional contexts. This chapter considers not only the wide range of ideas in discourse, which come in many different forms and types at different levels of generality with different rates of
change, but also the ways in which “sentient” (thinking and speaking) agents articulate such ideas by way of a “coordinative discourse.” Through these processes, policy actors construct their ideas and a “communicative discourse” through which they make their ideas accessible to the public for discussion and deliberative argumentation, as well as contestation. The chapter also elaborates on the dual nature of the institutional context. This refers not only to the ways external formalized institutions constrain action, but also to the ways constructs of meaning internal to agents enable them to communicate for the purposes of collective action.

Chapter 4 turns to the role of policy frames. In this light of various approaches to frames that have been advanced—from positivist and value-neutral to hermeneutic and interpretive—Mary Hawkesworth sees the need for a critical poststructural analysis of frames. Toward this end, she undertakes a discursive analysis of development policies and planning to show that contrary to explicit claims, the central project of development has not been poverty reduction, but the production, circulation, and naturalization of hierarchical power relations that configure the political economy of the North as the telos of economic development for the global South. In particular, the chapter contrasts standard accounts of development policy and planning with several policy frames drawn from feminist political economy to reveal the hidden power dynamics omitted from dominant development discourses. By contesting the presumption that development benefits everyone, these feminist frames demonstrate the dynamics of class, gender, race, culture, and region that differentially distribute the benefits and burdens of development within and across global sites. In conclusion, Hawkesworth demonstrates the importance of feminist discursive politics in addressing structures of inequality integral to development processes, in both policy research and real-world practical argumentation.

In part III, “Policy Argumentation on the Internet and in Film,” Stephen Coleman’s chapter on the Internet turns to a new development in policy argumentation. He analyzes the Internet as a relatively new space for policy deliberation. In the process, he considers how the emergence of the deliberation on the Internet reconfigures ways of defining policy problems; how the Internet changes the ways of gathering, organizing, and making sense of knowledge that underpins policy; and ways it facilitates particular modes of policy argumentation. The argument
rests on the potential of the Internet to facilitate multivocal policy narratives that surpass the univocal ascriptions of public opinion produced by opinion polling or a national census. Coleman also examines the way it generates collaboration among dispersed policy thinkers, often brought together through uncoordinated policy networks emanating from casual hyperspatial relationships. He then analyzes the Internet’s ability to enable forms of public debate and, moreover, knowledge sharing that transcends the talk-based rationalism of traditional argumentation. The chapter concludes by arguing that all of this potential depends on the capacity of the Internet to reshape political efficacy, which, in turn, raises critical questions about how policy scholars understand political sense making.

In chapter 6, Leonie Sandercock and Giovanni Attili bring images and pictorial analysis into argumentative research by exploring important applications of multimedia for urban policy and planning. Raising both epistemological and pragmatic considerations related to the capacities of multimedia as a mode of inquiry, they begin with an account of their postpositivist epistemological orientation, particularly an emphasis on polyphonic narrative analysis through the medium of film as an antidote to the typically bidimensional, cartographic, and quantitative biases of urban policy and planning research. In particular, they examine film as a mode of meaning making, as a tool of community engagement, and as a catalyst for public policy deliberation and argumentation. Exploring what they call a new “digital ethnography,” they seek to create a new polyphonic narrative as it relates to Canada’s national multicultural philosophy and its translation from the national policy-making level to the streets and neighborhoods where diverse cultures face the daily challenges of coexistence. What kinds of sociological and political imagination at the local level, they ask, could make for peaceful coexistence? Toward this end, they offer a thick description of the role of one local institution in a culturally diverse neighborhood in Vancouver, asking “how do strangers become neighbors?” Interwoven with this inquiry is the account of the making of their documentary Where Strangers Become Neighbours and an evaluation of its effectiveness as a catalyst for policy dialogue.

In part IV, “Policy Rhetoric, Argumentation, and Semiotics,” Herbert Gottweis takes up the role of rhetoric in policy studies. Though often evoked in political discussion, the concept of rhetoric is still only finding
its way into policy making as a conceptual framework. Toward this end, Gottweis introduces the concept of rhetoric as developed in the French “New Rhetoric” tradition of Chaïm Perelman, Ruth Amossy, and Dominique Maingueneau. The concept of rhetoric directs our attention to the centrality of persuasion in policy making and the interplay of what Aristotle called logos, pathos, and ethos as core moments of the process of persuasion. Using stem cell policy making in the United States as a case, he offers a framework for the rhetorical analysis of policy making and argues that processes of persuasion in policy making involve not only arguments but also arguers, images, and the presentation of a self in a process of interaction in which arguing takes place through words and emotions. With persuasion, people try to influence and change one another’s mind by appealing not only to reason but also to passions or even prejudice. The politics of persuasion is a politics of disagreement and controversy that goes beyond the exchange of arguments, a politics that counts on the free play of persuasion rather than on the taming of judgment though the imposition of rules of deliberation.

In his chapter on the deservingness in welfare policy, Sanford Schram provides a semiotic analysis on how the unsaid of an underlying discourse allows the said metaphors of policy narratives and the arguments in which they are embedded to indicate points of reference, especially privileged identities that are deeply established in the culture of the broader society. He shows how the metaphors used in contemporary policy narratives about welfare frame their objects of concern in ways that point to implied understandings and arguments found elsewhere. Being on welfare today is assumed to be a sign of not being a “good mother” who is practicing “personal responsibility,” demonstrating that the “dependency” associated with taking welfare is analogous to other bad dependencies, for instance, a chemical dependency. These framing metaphors of welfare policy narratives are simultaneously moralizing and medicalizing the problem of welfare dependency as well as immediately suggesting that its treatment be undertaken in ways similar to the treatment of drug addictions. A semiotic analysis enables us to see the deeply embedded cultural biases for political argumentation and social change, for better or for worse. He concludes by arguing that the transformation of social welfare policy for dispossessed single mothers begins with the discursive transformation of how we talk about the problem.
In part V, “Policy Argumentation in Critical Theory and Practice: Communicative Logics and Policy Learning,” Hubertus Buchstein and Dirk Jörke return to one of the basic contributions that motivated the argumentative turn, namely, the critical theory of Jürgen Habermas and his theory of communicative action. Since then, the work of Michel Foucault emerged to challenge basic propositions advanced by Habermas, particularly those related to ideal speech and public deliberation. In the chapter, they seek to sort out the debates to which these disagreements have given rise and suggest ways in which these two diverging perspectives might be seen to constructively complement one another. First, they look back to the developments in Habermasian critical theory and their impact on the social sciences, in particular the communicative approach to policy analysis. Habermas’s early criticisms of positivism as well as his theory of communicative action have been a crucial steppingstone to bridge the gap between language philosophy and public policy analysis. In the second part, the authors examine the impact of the rise of Foucauldian poststructuralism on critical theory. After reviewing the controversies between Habermasians and Foucauldians, the authors reconstruct and discuss the implications of Foucault’s later writings about governmentality for a critical analysis of deliberative policy and politics. Finally, Buchstein and Jörke offer a suggestion about how these perspectives on politics and policy making might be seen as complementing each other.

In their chapter on poststructural policy analysis, David Howarth and Steven Griggs explain how a poststructuralist approach, when combined with elements of critical discourse analysis and rhetorical political analysis, can contribute important tools and concepts to policy studies. Going beyond a minimal and cognitive conception of discourse, in which discourses are simply empirical variables whose impacts can be measured by observation and testing, they offer a constitutive conception of discourse that actively forms practices and social relations. In this approach, discourses do not merely describe, reflect, or make known a preexisting or underlying reality; instead, they are articulatory practices that bring social reality into being for social actors and subjects by conferring meaning and identity on objects and processes. Toward this end, they first set out the ontological assumptions of poststructuralist discourse theory and then show how these assumptions inform their analysis of policy change as an ongoing political and hege-
monic struggle. Specifically, they offer a poststructuralist reading of the Gramscian concepts of hegemony and power while employing the Lacanian logic of fantasy to focus attention on the enjoyment subjects procure from their identifications with certain signifiers and figures. Finally, with respect to the methodology, they outline a logic of critical explanation that is composed of five interconnected elements: problematization, retroduction, logics, articulation, and critique.

Finally, Frank Fischer (with Alan Mandell) takes up the topic of transformative learning in planning and policy deliberation. After a presentation of the primary theories of policy learning, focused primarily on technical learning, they turn to the implications of more fundamental policy paradigm learning, as introduced by Peter A. Hall. They thus seek to show the ways that these underlying paradigm beliefs and values have to be part of the work of the planners and policy analysts. Toward this end, the chapter turns to the theory of transformative learning as it has emerged in progressive adult educational theory, in particular as it has developed around the work of Paulo Freire. By focusing on the underlying social assumptions that inform policy formulations, this work offers assistance in bringing these often hidden dimensions of deliberation out into the open and submitting them to a critical assessment. In the process, it helps us to better understand the processes of attitudinal and cognitive change and the ways that they can be facilitated. Two brief examples of facilitation are offered: one concerning participatory planning and the other urban policy development. The chapter closes with a discussion of the implementation of the transformative learning for professional education and practice.

We believe that this book’s chapters demonstrate the evolution of argumentative policy analysis from basic concepts built on a range of selected theoretical approaches such as those of Habermas and Foucault toward a more elaborated conceptual framework for systematic analysis. While argumentative policy analysis has gone a long way since it originated in the late 1980s, it continues to grow and further develop today through a process of theoretical refinement and by continuously engaging with the current developments in social theory and responding to the real-life challenges of the ever complex, unpredictable, and messy world of policy making.
Notes

1. This book focuses on public policy rather than policy and planning per se, as was the case with the edition in 1993, in part because policy analysis, as an interdisciplinary mode of inquiry, has been fully taken over by planners as well. Although years ago there were discussions about what distinguishes planning from policy analysis, planners today focus on policy as well. Policy analysis is widely seen as one of the analytical tools of the planner.

2. The orientation has also drawn in some cases on work on discourse and social constructivism in international relations theory. There, too, discourse and argumentation have been important challengers to mainstream orthodoxies.

3. The implicit view behind standard models is that markets and economies are inherently stable and that they only temporarily get off track. The majority of economists thus failed to warn policy makers about the threatening system crisis and ignored the work of those who did. Ironically, as the crisis has unfolded, numerous economists have begun to rethink the need to abandon their standard models and to think about approaches that include more sophisticated behavioral assumptions, including the role of beliefs, argumentation, and emotion (Loewenstein 2007). Some have turned, in the process, to more commonsense advice (Roubini and Mihm 2010). This, in the view of some, is an improvement, but it remains a poor substitute for an underlying model that can provide much-needed guidance for developing policy and regulation. It is not enough to put the existing model to one side, observing that one needs “exceptional measures for exceptional times.” What we need are models capable of envisaging such “exceptional times.”
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