

Framing as interest-driven exercise: the competing attempts of framing rural development policy

Lukas Giessen

Chair of Forest and Nature Conservation Policy
Georg-August-University Göttingen

Structure

- Objective: agency aspects of framing policy issues and resulting discourses
- Key concepts: Framing, frame production, strong frames, framing strategies, frames and discourse
- Empirical cases
- Discussion of on-going ideas (you are needed here!)

Objective

- Conceptualise framing and its strategies as conscious and agency-driven contribution to discourses
- Illustrate how different framings are produced by lead actors in a policy domain

Key concepts (1)

- Framing (Chong/Druckman 2007)
 - An issue can be constructed from a variety of perspectives
 - This has implications for different values and interests
 - Process by which people develop a particular conceptionalisation of an issue
 - Example: “Tiger” (Nazmus Sadath/Kleinschmit 2010)
- frame production and framing strategies (Entman 2004)
 - Elite strategies are behind frame production to find allies (Polletta/Ho 2006)
 - Elite actors influence and anticipate one another in the creation of frames
 - Framing hence is a conscious exercise
 - Public bureaucracies set out the main frames shaping the frames of others

Key concepts (2)

- strong frames, competing frames (Sniderman/Theriault 2004)
 - Frames are competing for the addressees value- or interest-based views on an issue and support of one frame or a set of frames
- frames make-up discourse (Olufunso et al. 2011)
 - Framing theory is strong on agency
 - Discourse theory strong on structure provided by language
 - Framing is closely linked to individual actors
 - Sum of strong frames make-up a discourse or competing discourses
- Related concepts in policy sciences (Downs, Lowi 1972, Kingdon 1984)
 - Agenda setting and problem definition
 - Issue attention cycle
 - Multiple streams

Empirical examples (SFM)

- Sustainable forest management (global)
 - SUSTAINABLE forest management by utilitarian coalition of interests
 - Pulp, paper and wood industries, banks
 - Interests: revenues / raw material
 - Frames: co-benefits, Kielwassertheorie
 - Sustainable forest MANAGEMENT by conservation coalition
 - Conservation NGOs and politicians
 - Interests: donations and votes from good reputation in western societies
 - Frames: critique of SFM; ecosystem approach as alternative

Empirical examples (RD)

- Rural development policy of EU
 - Subsidies in agriculture
 - Agrarian and utilitarian coalition (lobbyists and politicians)
 - Interests: keep levels of public spending as high as possible
 - Frames: co-benefits, Kielwassertheorie
 - “Greening” (diversifying) agricultural policy
 - Adding integrated measures into agricultural policy advocated by conservation groups and politicians
 - Interests: getting an own budget share from the EU agricultural funds at all levels
 - Frames: critique of utilitarian policy, rural development as cross-cutting issue across sectors

Empirical examples (The tiger)

- A Tiger kills a person and consequently is killed
 - Interests:
 - Conservation groups: donations from good reputation in western societies
 - Basic needs, security
 - Frames:
 - Loss of biodiversity
 - Tiger killer

Discussion

- Who are the **lead actors** in making powerful frames and discourses ???
- Conscious or un-conscious process of framing ?
- Hence, **conscious or un-conscious creation of discourses?**
- **Sum of frames + X = discourses ???**
- Discursive power driven by interests
- Which arguments valued higher in biodiversity?