B5. Analyzing political language
'H2': Hörsaal 2, Political Science NIG 2nd floor Room A 218

prof. dr. Dvora Yanow
Visiting Professor
Faculty of Social & Behavioral Sciences, Department of Sociology/Anthropology, University of Amsterdam
Faculty of Social Sciences, Communication Science Department, Wageningen University
d.yanow@uva.nl OR dvora.yanow@wur.nl

Course description
The 'interpretive turn' in late 20th century social science brought with it renewed attention to the role of language in social and political life. As researchers we work not only with language in a literal sense – that drawn from research-relevant documents, whether contemporary or archival, or from field conversations, including interviews – but also with language in the form of field note renderings of events, interactions, and the material world of research settings and artifacts in it, what Charles Taylor (1971) called 'text analogues' (see also Ricoeur 1971).

This course will explore several of the methods or approaches that have been developed to analyze language and politics: metaphor analysis, category analysis, narrative and storytelling analysis, framing analysis; the final session will take up text analogues in the material world, so to speak. The course will assume knowledge of interpretive methodological presuppositions, which are reflected in the central claim underpinning these approaches: that language does not mirror the world it (re-)presents (Rorty 1979), but instead constitutes it. It will be conducted as part-lecture, part seminar, and students will be expected to have done the readings for each day's session beforehand and to actively participate in discussion.

The field of politics and language is potentially huge, as is each of the planned topics. We will not cover recent work on rhetoric or discourse, and we will touch only on briefly on language and the politics of science. Moreover, each of the five topics planned itself has an enormous literature. Each day's session is intended to introduce at least one way of looking at the topic, theoretically; a set of empirical articles or papers that use that method; and a chance for students to work with the approach in a familiar research setting. To get the most out of the course, students should bring with them data from their own field research (including in archives) or a set of texts from some other source(s) (e.g., legislative or organizational documents, transcripts of interviews or conversations, observational notes on events) which they would like to practice with.

Dvora Yanow is a policy and organizational ethnographer and interpretive methodologist whose research and teaching are shaped by an overall interest in the communication of meaning in organizational and policy settings. Holder of the 2005-2010 term Strategic Chair in Meaning and Method in the Faculty of Social Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, she is presently Visiting Professor in the University of Amsterdam's Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and at Wageningen University's Faculty of Social Sciences, Communication Science Department. Her policy-focused research investigates state-created categories for race-ethnic identity, immigrant integration policies and citizen-making practices, policy frames and framing, and research regulation policies and practices; other projects engage science/technology museums and the 'doing' of science, and spatial and practice studies. She is co-editor of the Routledge Series on Interpretive Methods, with Peregrine Schwartz-Shea; their co-authored *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes* has just been published as volume 1 in that series. http://wur.academia.edu/DvoraYanow

	* = instructor will provide; I reserve the right to modify this syllabus further
Monday **Metaphor analysis** **All sessions meet in 'H2': Horsaal 2, Polit. Sci. NIG 2nd floor Room A 218**	<u>Thought questions</u>: Are metaphors just decorations littering speech and writing? If you think so, what are the implications of that view for the role of analysis? Schon, Donald A. 1979/1993. Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy. In Andrew Ortony, ed., *Metaphor and thought*, 254-83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Also in 2nd ed.] Carver, Terrell and Pikalo, Jernej, eds. 2008. *Political language and metaphor*. London: Routledge, esp. chs. by Pikalo (metaphors in political theorists' language), van Hulst (metaphor in local planning), Yanow (how metaphors work), Cienki (on conceptual metaphor theory), Sormani/Benninghoff (on 'scientific expertise'). Yanow, Dvora. 1992. Supermarkets and culture clash: The epistemological role of metaphors in administrative practice. *American Review of Public Administration* 22: 89-109. Miller, Donald F. 1985. Social policy: An exercise in metaphor. *Knowledge* 7/2:191-215. Stone, Deborah A. 2002 [1988/1997]. *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making.* NY: WW Norton, ch. 6: 145-57 [synecdoche, metaphor]. Brown, Richard H. 1976. Social theory as metaphor. *Theory and Society* 3: 169-97. Gusfield, Joseph. 1976. The literary rhetoric of science: Comedy and pathos in drinking driver research. *American Sociological Review* 41: 16-34 [ch. 4 in 1981 book; see Friday readings] For a 'real world' fun reading (read comments, too): Brooks, David. 2011. Poetry for everyday life. *New York Times* (12 April), http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/12/opinion/12brooks.html (accessed 12 April 2011). <u>For further reading</u> Cienki, Alan and Yanow, Dvora, eds. Forthcoming. 'Politics and language', special issue; articles by Eric Blanchard, Paul Davidson, & Claudia Strauss; afterword by Alan Cienki. *Journal for International Relations and Development*. Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Miller, Donald F. 1992. *The reason of metaphor: A study in politics*. New Delhi: Sage.
Tuesday **Category analysis**	<u>Thought questions</u>: What makes something belong to one category and not another? Can you think of an item that fits into 2 [ore more] categories within the same taxonomy? What are the implications of that for political action? Yanow, Dvora. 2003. *Constructing American "race" and "ethnicity": Category-making in public policy and administration.* Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe, ch. 1. Yanow, Dvora. 1996. American ethnogenesis and public administration. *Administration & Society* 27: 483-509. *Yanow, Dvora and van der Haar, Marleen. Forthcoming. People out of place: Allochthony and autochthony in Netherlands identity discourse – metaphors and categories in action. *Journal for International Relations and Development*, special issue on Politics and Language, eds. Alan Cienki and Dvora Yanow. Keeler, Rebecca. 2007. Analysis of logic: Categories of people in US HIV/ AIDS Policy. *Administration & Society* 39 (5): 612-30. Rasmussen, Amy Cabrera. 2011. Contraception as health? The framing of issue categories in contemporary policy making. *Administration & Society* 43 (8): 930-53. <u>For further reading</u> Bowker, Geoffrey C. and Star, Susan Leigh. 1999. *Sorting things out*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wednesday
 	
Narrative, story-telling
	<u>Thought question</u>: If metaphors and categories also tell stories, how are they different from the kinds of stories engaged in this literature?
	
	Shenhav, Shaul R. 2005. Thin and thick narrative analysis: On the question of defining and analyzing political narratives. *Narrative Inquiry* 15 (1): 75-99.
	<u>2 of the following</u>, all by Shenhav:
	    2007**.** Detecting stories: Revealing the hidden "voices" in public political discourse. *Journal of Language and Politics* 6 (2): 177-200.
	    2004. Once upon a time there was a nation: Narrative conceptualization analysis, the concept of 'nation' in the discourse of Israeli Likud party leaders. *Discourse & Society* 15 (1): 81-104.
	    2009. We have a place in a long story: Empowered narratives and the construction of communities - The case of US presidential debates. *Narrative Inquiry* 19 (2): 199-217.
	    2006. Political narratives and political reality. *International Political Science Review* 27 (3): 245-62.
	Stone, Deborah A. 2002 [1988/1997]. *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making.* NY: WW Norton, ch. 6: 138-45.
	Hummel, Ralph P. 1991. Stories managers tell: Why they are as valid as science. *Public Administration Review* 51 (1): 31-41.
	Yanow, Dvora. 1999. Public policies as identity stories: American race-ethnic discourse. In Tineke Abma, ed., *Telling tales: On narrative and evaluation*, 29-52. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
	Throgmorton, James A. 1992. Planning as persuasive storytelling about the future: Negotiating an electric power rate settlement in Illinois. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 12: 17-31.
	Boje, David M. 1991. The storytelling organization: A study of story performance in an office-supply firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly 36:* 106-26.
	Polkinghorne, Donald E. 2007. Validity issues in narrative research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 13/4:471-86.
	Gabriel, Yiannis, Geiger, Daniel, and Letiche, Hugo. 2011. The marriage of story and metaphor. *Culture and Organization* 17/5: 367-71. [intro. to special issue; see articles]
	<u>For further reading</u>
	Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1988. *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany: SUNY Press.
	Schram, Sanford F. and Neisser, Philip T. 1997. *Tales of the state: Narrative in contemporary U.S. politics and public policy.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
	Patterson, Molly and Monroe, Kristen Renwick. 1998. Narrative in political science. *Annual Review of Political Science* 1: 315-31.
	Feldman, Martha S., Skoldberg, Kaj, Brown, Ruth Nicole, and Horner, Debra. 2004. Making sense of stories: A rhetorical approach to narrative analysis. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14/2: 147-70.
	Ospina, Sonia M. and Dodge, Jennifer. 2005. It's about time: Catching method up to meaning—the usefulness of narrative inquiry in public administration research. *Public Administration Review* 65/2: 143-57. [1st in series of 3 articles; see also issues 3 and 4.]
	Clark, Jack A. and Mishler, Elliot G. 1992. Attending to patients' stories: Reframing the clinical task. *Sociology of Health & Illness* 14/3: 344-72.
	Mishler, Elliot G. 1995. Models of narrative analysis: A typology. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 5/2: 87-123.

Thursday **Framing analysis**	<u>Thought questions</u>: Metaphors and stories are also framing devices. How do these several concepts fit together? Do they? What are their similarities/differences? [If you are familiar with the social movement literature, how is the notion of frames as used there different from the notion of framing established in the policy literature?] *Rein, Martin and Schön, Donald A. 1977. Problem setting in policy research. In Carol H. Weiss, ed., *Using social research in public policy making*, 235–51. Lexington: Lexington Books.

	Schön, Donald A. and Rein, Martin. 1994. *Frame reflection.* NY: Basic Books, chs. 1-3, 6. Rein, Martin. 1983. Value-critical policy analysis. In Daniel Callahan and Bruce Jennings, eds., *Ethics, the social sciences, and policy analysis*, 83–111. New York: Plenum Press. Rein, Martin and Schön, Donald A. 1993. Reframing policy discourse. In Frank Fischer and John Forester, eds., *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning*, 145-66. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. Rein, Martin and Schön, Donald A. 1996. Frame-critical policy analysis and frame-reflective policy practice. *Knowledge and Policy,* 9 (1), 85-104. Schmidt, Ronald, Sr. 2006. Value-critical policy analysis: The case of language policy in the United States. In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*, 300-15. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. Linder, Stephen. 1995. Contending discourses in the electric and magnetic fields controversy: The social construction of EMF risk as a public problem. *Policy Sciences,* 28 (2): 209-30. Swaffield, Simon. 1998. Contextual meanings in policy discourse: A case study of language use concerning resource policy in the New Zealand high country. *Policy Sciences* 31: 199–224. Abolafia, Mitchell Y. 2004. Framing moves: Interpretive politics at the Federal Reserve. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14: 349-70. Review: Rasmussen, 2011, from Day 2.
Friday **Non-logocentric language**	Thought questions: Can you generate a taxonomy of non-logocentric modes of communication that are, or might be, central to understanding and analyzing political action? How would you analyze these? Do they need their own methods? Yanow, Dvora. 2006. How built spaces mean: A semiotics of space. In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn,* 349-66. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe. Yanow, Dvora. 1995. Built space as story: The policy stories that buildings tell. *Policy Studies Journal* 23: 407-22. Gamson, William A. and Lasch, Kathryn Eilene. 1980. The political culture of social welfare policy. Presented at the Pinhas Sapir International Conference on Development: Social Policy Evaluation: Health, Education, and Welfare, Tel Aviv University, Israel (December). http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/2027.42/50995/1/221.pdf [accessed 31 January 2012]. *Danjoux, Ilan. 2006. The political cartoon and the collapse of the Oslo peace process. Presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, San Diego, CA (22 March). Bellhouse, Mary L. 1991. Visual myths of female identity in eighteenth-century France. *International Political Science Review* 12/2: 117-35. Bellhouse, Mary L. 2006. Candide shoots the monkey lovers: Representing Black men in eighteenth-century French visual culture. *Political Theory* 34 (6):741 - 784. *Bellhouse, Mary L. 2011. Under the eaves of the Louvre: Political theory research in American and European art museums, art collections, and art libraries. Presented at the Western Political Science Association Annual Meeting, San Antonio (March *). Stone, Deborah A. 2002 [1988/1997]. *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making.* NY: WW Norton, ch. 7 [numbers as metaphors, stories,...]. Gusfield, Joseph R. 1981. *The culture of public problems: Drinking-driving and the symbolic order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, esp. ch. 3. [on numbers] Gusfield, Joseph R. 1976. The literary rhetoric of science: Comedy and pathos in drinking driver research. *American Sociological Review* 41: 16-34.

Try to look at at least one of the following, by Tufte:
Tufte, Edward R. 2001 [1983]. *The visual display of quantitative information*, 2nd ed. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
Tufte, Edward R. 1990. *Envisioning information.* Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
Tufte, Edward R. 1997. *Visual explanations: Images and quantities, evidence and narrative.* Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.

Ginger, Clare. 2006. In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn.* Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe [on documents and the ways in which they persuade; documents telling stories, tho' I don't recall that she used that language]
For further reading
Berger, John. 1972. *Ways of seeing.*
Danjoux, Ilan. Forthcoming 2012. *Political cartoons and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Danjoux, Ilan. Forthcoming 2013. Analyzing the meaning of political cartoons. In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and method*, 2nd ed. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.
Morris, R. 1993. Visual rhetoric in political cartoons: A structuralist approach. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 8(3): 195-210.
Goodsell, Charles T. 1988. *The social meaning of civic space.* Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
Goodsell, Charles T., ed. 1993. Architecture as a setting for governance. Theme issue, *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 10/4.

Prior knowledge
Knowledge of interpretive methodological presuppositions is crucial for understanding these methods, as there may not be enough time to go into the methodological background in depth. For background, read:

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures.* NY: Basic Books, esp. ch. 1.
Hawkesworth, M.E. 1988. *Theoretical issues in policy analysis*. Albany: SUNY Press, chs. 1-4.
Hiley, David R., Bohman, James F., and Shusterman, Richard, eds. 1991. *The interpretive turn*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1983. *Methodology for the human sciences*. Albany: SUNY Press.
Rabinow, Paul and Sullivan, William M., eds. 1979, 1985. *Interpretive social science*, 1st and 2nd eds. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Ricoeur, Paul. 1971. The model of the text: Meaningful action considered as text. *Social Research* 38: 529–62.
Rorty, Richard. 1979. *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Taylor, Charles. 1971/1979. Interpretation and the sciences of man. In Paul Rabinow and William M. Sullivan, eds., *Interpretive social science: A reader*, 25–71. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora. 2012. *Interpretive research design: Concepts and processes*. New York: Routledge.
Yanow, Dvora and Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine, eds. 2006. *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe, esp. introduction, chs. 1-5, 21-22.

For further reading on course topics

Brown, Richard Harvey. 1990. Rhetoric, textuality, and the postmodern turn in sociological theory. *Sociological Theory* 8/2: 188-97.
Dallmayr, Fred R. 1984. *Language and politics*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
Edelman, Murray. 1977. *Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail*. NY: Academic Press.
Edelman, Murray. 1985. Political language and political reality. *PS* 18/1: 10-19.
Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 1985. The relationship between political language and political reality. *PS* 18/1: 20-26.
Gamson, William A. 1992. *Talking politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McCloskey, Donald N. 1994. How to do a rhetorical analysis of economics, and why. In Roger Backhouse, ed., *Economic methodology*, 319-42. London: Routledge.
McCloskey, Donald N. 1985. *The rhetoric of economics*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Merelman, Richard M., ed. 1992. *Language, symbolism, and politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Roe, Emery. 1994. *Narrative policy analysis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. [application of Michael Riffaterre's theories of narrative/counter-narrative to empirical cases]
Schmidt, Ronald, Sr. 2000. *Language policy and identity politics in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
White, Jay D. 1987. Action theory and literary interpretation. *Administration & Society* 19/3: 346-66.
White, Jay D. 1992. Taking language seriously. *American Review of Public Administration* 22/2: 75-88.
Yanow, Dvora. 1996. *How does a policy mean? Interpreting policy and organizational actions*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, esp. chs. 5-7.
Yanow, Dvora. 2000. *Conducting interpretive policy analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, esp. ch. 3.

Writing and reading as method:
Richardson, Laurel. 1994. Writing: A method of inquiry. In *Handbook of qualitative research*, ed. Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 516–29. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Yanow, Dvora. 2009. Dear author, dear reader: The third hermeneutic in writing and reviewing ethnography. In Edward Schatz, ed., *Political ethnography: What immersion brings to the study of power*, 275-302. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora. 2009. Reading and writing as method: In search of trustworthy texts. In Sierk Ybema, Dvora Yanow, Harry Wels, and Frans Kamsteeg, eds., *Organizational ethnography: Studying the complexities of everyday life*, 56-82. London: Sage.

On writing as a way of worldmaking*
[*Goodman, Nelson. 1978. *Ways of world-making*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.]

Clifford, James and Marcus, George E., eds. 1986. *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of*

ethnography. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Geertz, Clifford. 1988. *Works and lives*: *The anthropologist as author*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. [looking at the writing tactics of older, central works, e.g., Levi Strauss, Malinowski]
Van Maanen, John. 1988. *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Golden-Biddle, Karen and Locke, Karen. 1993. Appealing work: An investigation of how ethnographic texts convince. *Organization Science* 4/4: 595-616.
Golden-Biddle, Karen and Locke, Karen. 1997. *Composing qualitative research*. Sage.
Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Yanow, Dvora. 2002. 'Reading' 'methods' 'texts': How research methods texts construct political science. *Political Research Quarterly* 55: 457-86.

Related: On exhibits as worldmaking
Karp, Ivan and Lavine, Steven D., eds. 1991. *Exhibiting cultures: The poetics and politics of museum display*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

In addition, Prof. Fred Schaffer's syllabus for his politics and language course at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst is a superb resource:
www.concepts-methods.org/Files/Syllabus/Schaffer_-_The_Language_of_Politics_-_G_-_syllabus.pdf

Supplemental reading list [as of 8 February]

General
Fierke, K. M. 2002. Links across the abyss: Language and logic in international relations. *International Studies Quarterly* 46: 331-54. [Wittgenstein meets Waltz and Wendt; can be read for insights into other fields]

Polkinghorne, Donald E. 2005. Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 52/2: 137-45.

Rhetoric
Gusfield, Joseph R. 1992. Listening for the silences: The rhetorics of the research field. In R. H. Brown, ed., *Writing the social text: Poetics and Politics in Social Science Discourse*, 117-34. NY: Aldine de Gruyter. [rhetoric and scientific writing]

Peters, John Durham. 1990. Rhetoric's revival, positivism's persistence: Social science, clear communication, and the public space. *Sociological Theory* 8/2: 224-31. [language of science]

Throgmorton, J. A. 1991. The rhetorics of policy analysis. *Policy Sciences* 24: 153-79.

Metaphors
Jacobs, Claus D. and Heracleous, Loizos Th. 2006. Constructing shared understanding: The role of embodied metaphors in organization development. *Journal of Applied Behavior Science* 42/2: 207-26.

Miller, Don. 2006. The politics of metaphor. *Theory, Culture, and Society* 23/2-3: 63-65.
[*eds. Mike Featherstone, Couze Venn, Ryan Bishop and John Phillips, with Pal Ahluwalia, Roy Boyne, Chua Beng Huat, John Hutnyk, Scott Lash, Maria Esther Maciel, George Marcus, Aihwa Ong, Roland Robertson,

Bryan Turner, Shiv Visvanathan and Shunya Yoshimi]

Narrative

Bruner, Jerome. 1991. The narrative construction of reality. *Critical Inquiry* 18/1: 1-21.

Burke, Kenneth. 1989. *On symbols and society*. Ed. and Introduction by Joseph R. Gusfield. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Czarniawska-Joerges, Barbara. 1995. Narration or science? Collapsing the division in organizational studies. *Organization* 2/1:11-33.

Herman, Luc and Vervaeck, Bart. 2005 [2001]. *Handbook of narrative analysis*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Kaplan, Thomas J. 1986. The narrative structure of policy analysis. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 5/4: 761-78.

White, Hayden. 1987. The value of narrativity in the representation of reality. In *The content of the form*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Stories

Brooks, Peter and Gewirtz, Paul, eds. 1996. *Law's stories: Narrative and rhetoric in law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gabriel, Yiannis. 2005. Review of Stephen Denning, *The leader's guide to storytelling* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005). *Organization Studies* 26/9: 1426-32.

Hendriks, Carolyn M. 2005. Participatory storylines and their influence on deliberative forums. *Policy Sciences* 38: 1-20.

Minow, Martha and Bellow, Gary, eds. 1996. *Law stories*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

van Hulst, Merlijn. Forthcoming. Storytelling, a model of and a model for planning. *Planning Theory*.

Cartoons

Danjoux, Ilan. 2007. Reconsidering the decline of the editorial cartoon. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40/2: 245-48.

Gamson, William A. and Stuart, David. 1992. Media discourse as a symbolic contest: The bomb in political cartoons. *Sociological Forum* 7/1: 55-86. [includes cartoons as framing devices]

Maggio, J. 2007. Comics and cartoons: A democratic art-form. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40/2: 237-39.

Moss, Dori. 2007. The animated persuader. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40/2: 241-44. [draws on Kenneth Burke]