Critical Policy Studies

ISSN: 1946-0171 (Print) 1946-018X (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rcps20

A framing analysis of Canadian household food insecurity policy illustrates co-construction of an intractable problem

Lynn McIntyre, Patrick B. Patterson & Catherine L. Mah

To cite this article: Lynn McIntyre, Patrick B. Patterson & Catherine L. Mah (2018) A framing analysis of Canadian household food insecurity policy illustrates co-construction of an intractable problem, Critical Policy Studies, 12:2, 149-168, DOI: 10.1080/19460171.2016.1253491

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2016.1253491

CRITICAL POLICY STUDIES, 2018
VOL. 12, NO. 2, 149–168
https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2016.1253491

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

A framing analysis of Canadian household food insecurity policy illustrates co-construction of an intractable problem

Lynn McIntyre[a], Patrick B. Patterson[a] and Catherine L. Mah[b]

[a]Department of Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada; [b]Division of Community Health and Humanities, Faculty of Medicine, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada

ABSTRACT

Household food insecurity (HFI), lack of access to food because of financial constraint, is a persistent and growing problem in Canada. Framing theorists Donald Schön and Martin Rein explain that in 'intractable policy controversies', policy issues that are particularly stubborn or resistant to change, the frames policy actors apply permit them to talk past each other without resolution. This paper examines how HFI is framed in Canadian legislative sessions and how the framing process renders the problem 'intractable'. We assembled verbatim extracts from the legislative session records of the Canadian federal government and the provinces of British Columbia, Nova Scotia, and Ontario from 1995 to 2012. Our framing analysis found that legislators' use of symbolic devices illuminated a foundational dispute around partisan claims of moral authority. HFI has thus become so imbued with irreconcilable conflict that rival parties have co-constructed it as an intractable policy problem resulting in scant policy solutions.

KEYWORDS

Household food insecurity; policy; morality politics; Hansard; Canada

Household food insecurity (HFI), lack of access to food because of financial constraint, is a persistent and growing problem in Canada. Schön and Rein (1994), whose work remains among the enduring accounts of framing in the policy sciences, explain that in the case of policy issues that are particularly stubborn or resistant to change (also called 'intractable policy controversies'), a conflict in how the policy problem is framed is generally at the heart of the impasse. Political actors frame policies based on both moral and empirical dimensions (Schön and Rein 1994). Different actors produce their own accounts for the same issue, which can converge or diverge in a policy debate, affecting the direction of policy change (Stone 1989). Others have intensively interrogated the notion of policy problems as a matter of conflict and negotiation (Hajer and Laws 2006; Rein 2006). Interpretive policy analysis looks at the meanings created through social construction of policy problems and is well suited to investigating policy framing (van Hulst and Yanow 2014). In this paper, we draw on those ideas to examine whether or not a framing analysis is able to provide new insights into how debate in Canadian parliamentary and legislative sessions around a specific social policy problem, namely HFI, has rendered the problem 'intractable', thereby perpetuating inaction.

CONTACT Lynn McIntyre lmcintyr@ucalgary.ca

Frames, framing and moral arguments

Though the concept of a policy frame has a diverse disciplinary origin, Donald Schön and Martin Rein have been instrumental in theorizing about frames as central to how policy disagreements can be 'stubborn' (Rein and Schön 1991) or 'intractable' (Rein and Schön 1996). They define an intractable policy problem as a dispute between contending parties that is ultimately 'highly resistant to resolution by appeal to evidence, research, or reasoned argument' (Schön and Rein 1994, xi), a situation that arises from a conflict of frames. In contrast to the view that controversy arises because of direct conflict in policy actors' divergent interests, Schön and Rein (1994, 29) highlight how frames and interests form a reciprocal, but nondeterministic, relationship. The differing views and values that policy actors apply to a policy issue through frames permit them to talk past each other without resolution (Schön and Rein 1994). When policy actors define their intentions about a problem differently, then what seems a reasonable course of action diverges. This is a normative process, and a way of signifying, often through the medium of stories, that connects frames as representations of language (i.e. texts which often use metaphors and symbolic literary devices based on value-laden imagery)[1] to actionable beliefs (Hajer and Laws 2006; Schön and Rein 1994, 24). Frames are 'internally coherent' (Hajer and Laws 2006, 257); policy actors are agents that derive, hold, and draw upon frames, and analysts can critically construct them. In other words, frames can be understood in the form of frame-as-noun (van Hulst and Yanow 2014).

Schön and Rein (1994) also introduce a prescription for resolving frame conflict. By engaging in 'frame reflection', a method of policy analysis that focuses attention on these fundamentally divergent views and their origins, policy actors and analysts can reframe issues. Frame reflection and reframing can accordingly be used to develop pragmatic solutions to moving a formerly intractable policy controversy forward (Schön and Rein 1994). This approach typifies the postmodern era of policy studies' (Goodin, Rein, and Moran 2006, 6–7) focus on policy analysts' capacity to reflect on and interpret policies, how they are made, and how they ought to be (Wildavsky 1979).

The frame concept is now central to several forms of policy analysis. One empirical focus has been the ways in which frames determine policy actors' interpretations of issues and the consequences for advancing particular policy options, a type of (historical) analysis that explicitly removes consideration of whether and how particular actors frame/reframe (e.g. Rose and Baumgartner 2013, 25). A related set of concerns is about how this shapes the process of policy design as a whole (e.g. Schneider and Ingram 1990).

Others, particularly in the interpretive policy analysis tradition, have departed from the focus on defining frames to understanding the *act* of defining frames. Frames shift, and how and by whom this occurs is meaning laden. This is framing analysis with a focus on frame-as-verb (van Hulst and Yanow 2014). In this formulation, framing results from social interaction, in contrast to frames which are products of a cognitive process (Dewulf et al. 2009). Therefore, policy analysts need to pay attention to the sense-making work done when framing occurs. Recent work within the interpretive policy analysis community on framing processes treats frames as tools for simplifying complex problems in order to facilitate policy interventions (Wagenaar 2011, 223–224;

van Hulst and Yanow 2014). From that perspective, stories are one element within frames, where the storyteller gives events a point and brings them forward as subjects for policy action (Wagenaar 2011, 210–211). This is, as van Hulst and Yanow (2014) explain, a more 'dynamic and political' approach to analysis of frames, an approach we are sympathetic to, although this perspective has not been received without debate among other examinations of framing that fall at different points along a relativist continuum (Pierce et al. 2014; Wagenaar 2011).

The political actors' sense of morals, or right vs. wrong may be important in intractable conflicts. Two approaches have emerged that use the frame concept to look at how moral arguments feature in policy conflicts. The first treats 'morality policy' as a type with characteristics distinct from those of redistributive and regulatory policies (Knill 2013, 310; Mooney 1999, 675; Mooney and Schuldt 2008, 200). Although Mooney and Schuldt (2008, 201) acknowledge that, 'how an issue is framed, rather than its intrinsic content, leads to its classification as a morality policy', analysts using that approach tend to assume that such policies focus primarily on moral, or 'first principle', conflicts. In that view, certain topics, such as those related to 'sin', sexuality, human rights and religious values, are inherently prone to becoming morality policies (Knill 2013; Mooney 1999; Mooney and Schuldt 2008; Mucciaroni 2011).

A second stream of moral policy scholarship has emerged as researchers increasingly noted examples of 'sin' policies that did not trigger argumentation around first principles, and 'non-sin' policies where moral arguments were mobilized (Knill 2013; Majic 2015; Mucciaroni 2011; Wagenaar and Altink 2012). Analysts in this stream emphasize the social construction of policy and propose to treat moral argumentation as a strategy that political actors may use to frame *any* policy topic if it seems advantageous within the particular political context (Knill 2013; Majic 2015; Mucciaroni 2011; Wagenaar and Altink 2012). Although some policy theorists working in this vein, such as Mucciaroni (2011), do not explicitly cite the framing literature pioneered by Schön and Rein, this approach emphasizes the use of frames. Indeed, Mucciaroni (2011, 191) suggests that, 'we should probably speak of morality *framing* rather than morality *policy* [emphasis in original]'. The treatment of moral argumentation in policy formation as a matter of social construction is also closely aligned with the broader interpretive policy analysis approach described above, and some individuals, such as Hendrik Wagenaar, write in both fields (Wagenaar 2011; Wagenaar and Altink 2012). Mucciaroni (2011, 212) recommends that research into policies should examine the frames used by both policy proponents and opponents around particular issues, and should look at how policy advocates use moral reasoning to frame issues.

What seems to hold true in any empirical application of frame analysis, whether applied to moral argumentation or to strictly instrumental policies, is that frames and framing remain entangled. Regardless, frame or framing analysis begins with identification of frames. Identifying the framed substance of issues – the 'what' that gets framed – remains a necessary, if insufficient, starting point for empirical analysis of the work that frames do. It is a 'static' element, if 'momentary' (van Hulst and Yanow 2014, 11). As Wagenaar elaborates, even if framing is inextricably tied to action, frames remain 'provisional resting places in the ongoing process of negotiating a particular slice of reality' (2011, 89).

With this in mind, in this paper, we first situate our analysis of frames through the identification of HFI as a policy controversy or 'intractable policy problem'. Second, we examine frames (noun) elaborated within the metaphorical and image-laden text representations in a particular platform for political debate, the parliamentary Hansard records in the federal and three provincial jurisdictions in Canada. Third, keeping in mind the rhetorical context within which frames are deployed in the Hansard forum, we look at the framing (verb) work that is done by actors. Finally, we discuss how the controversy might have been (co-)constructed and reflect upon ways to resolve the intractability in the HFI policy debate.

The issue of HFI

The substantive issue that we examine is HFI. HFI is an economic condition at the household level that is policy-sensitive. It occurs when the members of a household have insufficient income to obtain adequate food (Anderson 1990). HFI is monitored at the national level in Canada through the Canadian Community Health Survey and in 2012, these data show that 12.6% of the population faced some level of food insecurity during the previous year (Tarasuk, Mitchell, and Dachner 2014). Households that report HFI in Canada are similar across time and jurisdictions, and are typically the most disadvantaged (Che and Chen 2001; Ledrou and Gervais 2005; Health Canada 2007; Tarasuk, Mitchell, and Dachner 2014; McIntyre, Bartoo, and Emery 2014). Exposure to HFI is associated with a range of adverse health consequences for both children and adults (Bhattacharya, Currie, and Haider 2004; Fuller-Thomson and Nimigon 2008; Galesloot et al. 2012; Gucciardi et al. 2009; McIntyre et al. 2013; Perez-Escamilla and Pinheiro de Toledo Vianna 2012; Seligman, Laraia, and Kushel 2010), and stress is a prominent feature of the experience (Carter et al. 2011; Hadley and Crooks 2012).

HFI is sensitive to public policy interventions, particularly those related to addressing low income and income shocks (Emery et al. 2012), as well as other policies targeted toward vulnerable groups (McIntyre, Bartoo, and Emery 2014; Tarasuk, Dachner, and Loopstra 2014). In other words, what actors in government choose to do or choose not to do, as well as how they choose to act, makes a difference in moving HFI rates up or down (Loopstra, Dachner, and Tarasuk 2015; Emery, Fleisch, and McIntyre 2013).

Canada signed the 1996 Rome Declaration on Food Security (FAO 1996) and since the mid-1990s, there has been considerable talk about HFI, but little action by the Canadian federal or provincial governments to address the problem (Mah et al. 2014). Our program of research has studied how HFI is socially constructed as a policy problem in Canada. Using the parliamentary record of the federal government and three provincial jurisdictions, benchmarked against the year leading up to the date of the Rome Declaration, we have articulated how HFI is defined as a policy problem and what solutions are proffered to address it (McIntyre, Patterson, et al. 2016). We have also examined political rhetoric on HFI in accordance with legislators' alignment across the political spectrum (Patterson et al. 2016), and traced a robust political airing of the issue through to negligible legislative action (McIntyre, Lukic, et al. 2016). The intent of this paper is to apply framing analysis to the parliamentary record to discern how HFI

might have been co-constructed as an 'intractable policy problem' in Canada in the ensuing years since the Rome Declaration.

HFI as an 'intractable policy problem'

In Canada, HFI has some, but not all, features of an intractable policy problem. HFI has not been resolved over a long period of time by administrative, legal, or political means, which characterizes Lewicki and colleagues' understanding of an 'intractable' dispute (Gray, Lewicki, and Elliott 2003). Indicators of HFI meeting this definition of intractability include its high and increasing prevalence (Tarasuk, Mitchell, and Dachner 2014), the absence of legislative solutions at the provincial or federal levels despite governments' mandates for citizen protection (Mah et al. 2014; McIntyre, Lukic, et al. 2016), agreement on the health and social burden of the problem (Tarasuk, Mitchell, and Dachner 2015; Fitzpatrick et al. 2015; McIntyre et al. 2013), a robust countrywide charitable sector that attends to emergency feeding of those with the most severe level of food insecurity (Tarasuk, Dachner, and Loopstra 2014), and high levels of public awareness of the problem (Rock et al. 2011) driven by a vocal nongovernmental activist community (e.g. see Food Secure Canada 2015, http://foodsecurecanada.org/). However, as we will elaborate in this paper, the discussion of HFI has lacked the essential feature of conflict among parties whose values, views, and representations of interests make the problem intractable, recalling intractability as a 'symbolic contest over social meaning of an issue domain' among 'institutional actors who sponsor conflicting frames' (Schön and Rein 1994, 29), and a 'dispute that cuts across scientific paradigms [representing agreement]' (Schön and Rein 1994, 30). Because conflict is at the core of policy controversy, in order to label HFI an intractable policy problem, our analysis needs to uncover a foundational dispute; otherwise other reasons for lack of action such as disagreement about which jurisdiction the policy problem falls within, might be reasonable explanations.

Hansards as a platform for framing analysis

Canada follows British parliamentary traditions of government, where the political party that holds the most seats in the federal parliament, or in a provincial legislative assembly, forms the government and drafts most of the policy proposals that are tabled as bills. Within that system, debates in the legislature, and particularly in Question Period where opposition legislators have an open opportunity to question the governing party about its actions, are important venues for researchers to analyze policy formation processes (Fenton-Smith 2008; Penner, Blidook, and Soroka 2006). Legislative debates and Question Period signal the attentiveness of legislators toward particular topics (Penner, Blidook, and Soroka 2006) and reveal strategies that legislators use for promoting their agendas (Fenton-Smith 2008). Interactions between legislators during Question Period and legislative sessions provide some of the only places where researchers can consistently access political argumentation and other symbolic aspects of public policy making (Fenton-Smith 2008; Penner, Blidook, and Soroka 2006).

As in the United Kingdom and other Commonwealth countries, the Canadian parliament and provincial legislative assemblies maintain Hansard records, which are publicly accessible near-verbatim records of parliamentary debates (Ward 1980). The Hansard records can be used by researchers to provide bodies of data on legislative debates over long periods of time, which can reveal how elected representatives argue for or against particular policy positions (e.g. see Neff 2012; Penner, Blidook, and Soroka 2006; Quinlan 2012). As such, they constitute a valuable resource for studying representations of interests and values as they are put forward for symbolic and agenda-setting purposes.

Qualitative analysis

The analysis we present in this paper builds upon earlier work we did (McIntyre, Patterson, et al. 2016; McIntyre, Lukic, et al. 2016; Patterson et al. 2016) using a conventional qualitative content analysis approach (Hsieh and Shannon 2005) to examine Hansard records of legislators' debates related to HFI. Our dataset is the result of a systematic search of the Hansard records spanning an 18-year period, from 1995 to 2012, in four Canadian jurisdictions: the federal government, and the provinces of British Columbia, Nova Scotia and Ontario. Using our search protocol, we collected 1895 extracts from statements by legislators that comprised the debate over time. The four jurisdictions were selected for their particular characteristics: the federal government for its broad representation of Canada; British Columbia for its long-standing engagement with relationships between food and public health; Ontario because it is Canada's most populous province and has the largest number of food insecure households; and Nova Scotia as an example of a small and relatively impoverished jurisdiction, which has also paid attention to food insecurity issues within its poverty reduction initiatives. Because Canadian legislators did not begin using the term 'food (in)security' in legislative debates until 2003, and used it only rarely afterward, we designed the Hansard record search protocol to capture extracts that were likely to be closely related to HFI. We operationalized relevant extracts as those where discussions of household-level food availability and discussions of inadequate income intersected. Further details on the search and selection protocol are published elsewhere (McIntyre, Patterson, et al. 2016). The study did not require research ethics board approval because Hansard records in Canada are in the public domain.

The methodology used for this analysis extended conventional qualitative methods to examine legislators' frames including metaphors and value-laden imagery constituting symbolic devices, and then to framing processes as described by van Hulst and Yanow (2014). It is recognized that many aspects of frames are understood tacitly by participants in the situation (van Hulst and Yanow 2014, 5) and are not available to researchers for direct observation. Metaphors, being concepts that have previously been established by participants in other situations, are brought into new contexts to help interpret them (van Hulst and Yanow 2014, 8), and serve as valuable indicators of frames (Rein and Schön 1996). We draw attention to the imagery that legislators often used in their arguments such as the image of hungry seniors.

The framing processes we uncovered examined how the policy problem was elucidated from the perspective of policy actors who apply their own priorities, focus on particular aspects, name and categorize phenomena (van Hulst and Yanow 2014, 8).

Findings

Frames: metaphors and symbolic devices

We found that legislators consistently used a range of metaphors and symbolic devices in their discussions of HFI. Throughout the four Hansard records we examined, legislators often used common cliché phrases, such as 'keeping food on the table' when discussing the topic. For example:

> We have removed many of those *[social program]* supports over the years, so families become more and more isolated. More and more people live below the poverty line. They struggle to make ends meet every month. They struggle to keep food on the table and feed their kids. It is within that environment in my community and I know in many communities across the country that we need to address these fundamental health issues. (Libby Davies, NDP,[2] Opposition, federal Hansard, 2005)

References to HFI in the Hansard records also emphasize the instrumental value of food for maintaining productivity and capability. For example:

> We strongly believe that every child needs a healthy and filling breakfast in order to succeed at school. Kids who are hungry at school don't learn well. That's why we strongly encourage government to fully adopt and implement the committee's recommendations on food security, in particular, funding to expand community kitchen and school hot meal programs, agriculture and classroom studies and additional programs to enforce healthy eating habits among B.C.'s students. (David Cubberley, NDP, Opposition, British Columbia Hansard, 2007)

With such statements legislators frame pursuing specified policy directions as simply a matter of common sense.

The legislators also framed the economic conditions resulting in HFI in ways that convey the sense that poverty is a normal state. For example, a member of the leftist NDP party governing Nova Scotia in 2011 said:

> The question of the situation of the poorest among us is a very important, very sensitive topic. That is why this government has paid so much attention, through things like the Disability Tax Credit, the Poverty Reduction Tax Credit, the Affordable Living Tax Credit, taking the provincial portion of the HST *[harmonized sales tax]* off home heating fuel and, unlike the Progressive Conservative Party, keeping it off. All of these things are important ways that we have of supporting those among us who are least advantaged. Mr. Speaker, on that score we can never do too much, but we are doing what we can. (Graham Steele, NDP, Government, Nova Scotia Hansard, 2011)

Such statements imply that elimination of poverty is beyond the scope of government and it is a condition to be managed. This impression is reinforced when legislators discussed the causes of HFI and sometimes reified 'the economy' as a policy actor or independent force causing inadequate incomes. For example:

> To me, all these facts point to a rising tax burden on people. It makes it extremely difficult for them to cope today. It causes tremendous stress on families.
>
> I wonder if any of the witnesses have any comments on the role high taxes play in creating stress on families, in some cases pushing people into food banks[3] and making it extremely difficult for *the economy* [emphasis added] to create the long-term permanent jobs that are the best social program of all. (Monty Solberg, REF, Opposition, federal Hansard, 1996)

The legislators' statements reflect their assumptions about the government's proper relationship to vulnerable citizens.

We have previously reported that legislators basically agree that HFI is associated empirically with insufficient household resources to purchase food. They also agree that this is a shameful occurrence in a country as rich as Canada (Patterson et al. 2016). As MP Solberg's comment in the extract above illustrates, even when legislators attributed suffering to the state of the economy, the subtext was that the problem of inadequate incomes and HFI was the responsibility of an incumbent or previous ruling party. Accordingly, legislators overwhelmingly attributed HFI to government failure:

> It is very true we have witnessed under this government an increase in the incidence of child poverty that has added 500,000 more children to the ranks of poverty in the country. It is a disgrace …. It is not that the government does not know what can be done and what must be done to address the problem of poverty. It gutted the unemployment insurance system. Many families are not receiving the income replacement for which they have paid insurance premiums. (Alexa McDonough, NDP, Opposition, federal Hansard, 1999)

In their criticisms aimed at governing parties, legislators often implied, or stated explicitly, that problems were the result of recklessness or incompetence. For example:

> This government is in a financial mess. Our health care is near collapse; our unemployment is at an all-time high. Yet we have a government which can't seem to understand what is happening in this province. They continue their reckless behaviour without any thought for the people living in this province. The members opposite are either wearing blinders or else they just don't care about the people who are affected by this legislation. Maybe they pretend that the people that are hurting aren't real, because if they were real, this government might actually see some suffering. They might see the suffering that happens when you don't have a job, and you have hungry children to feed and a mortgage to pay. How much suffering do the people of this province have to go through before the NDP will take any action? (Bonnie McKinnon, LIB, Opposition, British Columbia Hansard, 1998)

This consistently expressed idea, that the persistence of HFI is shameful, moves the frames used by Canadian legislators beyond applying clichés and instrumental assessment and introduces moral judgment to the way that Canadian legislators frame the problem.

The use of intensely emotional imagery by legislators throughout the study period is also part of the claims they made. One such image that legislators from all parties drew on is that of children going hungry. For example:

> Let's keep a focus on the children who are on welfare in this province and who are going hungry. The number of children who are hungry has gone up by 50% …. We're talking about children who don't have proper clothes. We're talking about children who go to school and can't learn properly because they are hungry and they are cold …. Your government has offered these children absolutely no hope at all that their lives will be

> better. You've made them this ridiculous promise that if you give people in the province a massive cash bonanza that goes to the wealthiest citizens, somehow, some day, the children of the poor are going to benefit. … Just tell them that they have to go to bed hungry, that they have to do their part so you can deliver your tax cut to the wealthy Ontarians. (Lyn McLeod, LIB, Opposition, Ontario Hansard, 1996)

Legislators drew on the related image of families struggling to provide adequate food. For example:

> One of the first things the government did when it was elected – it was just a couple of months after it was elected in October 1995 – was to cut social assistance rates by almost 22%–21.7% to be exact …. Some 400,000 children were affected by those particular cuts … the government, in trying to get welfare moms off the system, forgot that those very same moms are also responsible for all of those children …. If the government really cared at all … then this government would have a strategy to respond to that poverty, to bring those kids and their working families out of that poverty (Shelley Martel, NDP, Opposition, Ontario Hansard, 2000)

Legislators also mobilized images describing hungry senior citizens, in their arguments around HFI. For example:

> I already said that in my work I have done checks in seniors' residences. There were no pets in these apartments, but in their cupboards were boxes of cat food. These seniors had no choice but to pay for their medication and eat cat food. This is unacceptable.

> I do not understand why the government refuses to give seniors what they have earned. I do not understand. This is beyond comprehension. It must not have any understanding of poverty, or human dignity. I hope that one day it will have an epiphany, that it will see the light and understand that we owe seniors complete respect and dignity. I hope we will give them the money they deserve. (Nicole Demers, BQ, Opposition, federal Hansard, 2007)

In their statements around the plight of hungry senior citizens, legislators often emphasized the moral indebtedness of younger generations for past contributions and care.

As the quotes above illustrate, legislators used images of vulnerable families, children, and senior citizens throughout the study period. In fact, while members of low income families, including children, are vulnerable to HFI, seniors in Canada consistently have among the lowest HFI rates of any demographic due to the income stability provided by the Canada-wide Old Age Security program, (Tarasuk, Mitchell, and Dachner 2014). Regardless of the accuracy of the images, they were not critically evaluated by speakers or challenged by members of the government. Indeed, members of governing parties used the same imagery to criticize proposals by opposition parties. Legislators' consistent reference to families, children and senior citizens regardless of accuracy, suggests that, rather than providing accurate information for policy formation, images of those populations were used to metaphorically represent HFI in claims around the legitimacy of rival policy positions.

Citizens using food banks is another powerful image that legislators often mobilized, citing examples of families and hardworking people waiting in long lines to obtain basic groceries:

> Who's looking out for the 13,500 children who use our food banks in the GTA *[Greater Toronto Area]*, who don't have enough to eat? Many of them come from working families.

> Who's looking out for the front-line workers who line up at the food banks, many of them women who head single-parent families and who work at minimum wage? Imagine how safe your life is if you earn minimum wage, which is a mere $7.75 *[per hour]*. (Cheri DiNovo, NDP, Opposition, Ontario Hansard, 2006)

Legislators in all of the jurisdictions and from across the political spectrum referred to the expansion of food banks in a similar way, using it as a metaphor to frame the policies or proposals made by members of other parties as failures.

At the same time, legislators' statements positioned food banks and similar charities as taking action to help people in need, which was described approvingly. Legislators' statements displayed consensus in their widespread use of the image of the 'heroic volunteer' working at food charities, and especially in food banks. For example:

> Mr. Speaker, today I recognize and thank the many volunteers who are responsible for running our local food banks. Last week I visited the eight food banks in my riding. It is sad to see that the government is still turning its back on the less fortunate of the country and is leaving them with no choice but to rely on food banks to feed their families. Without the hard work of many volunteers working in our local food banks many families would go hungry. (Angela Vautour, PC, Opposition, federal Hansard, 2000)

In effect, legislators often framed food banks as the *de facto* answer to Cheri DiNovo's question rhetorical question above, 'who's looking out for the front-line workers?'.

The legislators' positive treatment of food banks reflects another aspect of how legislators framed the governmental response to HFI. Within that frame legislators tacitly accept that there is a changing role for government in relation to new institutional actors, two examples being food banks and student nutrition programs. An example of this perspective is:

> Yesterday I asked the Minister of Finance whether the government would consider implementing a tax credit for farmers who donate surplus crops to food banks. For every dollar that the tax credit costs, $7 of fresh food will make it on to the tables of low-income families – 140,000 children. That's an excellent return on investment … millions of pounds of fresh food are wasted every year in Ontario. At the same time, food banks lack healthy produce to provide to an increasing number of Ontarians forced to turn to them for help. Tax credits for crop donations to food banks have been successfully implemented in Oregon, Colorado and North Carolina. (Michael Prue, NDP, Opposition, Ontario Hansard, 2009)

While these food banks and student nutrition programs may have been precipitated into being because of government erosion of social safety nets, legislators emphasized the potential for partnership with these 'helping hand' types of charitable organizations.

Legislators extended their support for food charities and volunteers beyond pure symbolism; this was enough to take action by linking the well-regarded charitable imperative with instrumental support to provide meals. One set of proposals was based on providing food for children at schools. Public education is a provincial responsibility in Canada and all three of the provinces included in our study have school-based meal provision programs. There is no direct delivery of student meal programs. Student feeding programs receive some public funding typically in the form of grants-in-aid from municipal or provincial government agencies, but for the most part rely on private contributions and a substantial volunteer staff, both coordinated by nongovernmental foundations (Tarasuk, Dachner, and Loopstra 2014). Legislators from

across the political spectrum in all of the jurisdictions we studied promoted school and community-based programs to provide food to children. Canadian legislators from across the political spectrum also made proposals to provide support for food charities, mainly in the form of tax relief. Several of those proposals were tabled as bills, such as the 2010, Taxation Amendment Act (Food Bank Donation Tax Credit for Farmers) in Ontario (McIntyre, Lukic, et al. 2016). Food charity assistance programs were established or were in place in British Columbia, Nova Scotia, and Ontario during the study period. The sense-making for these diverse policy instruments was congruent and reflected common frames, including consensus among legislators around managing the effects of poverty, rather than eliminating it.

Framing: elucidating the foundational dispute

The moral claims legislators made constituted the frames of the policy controversy over HFI, and not the actual metaphor or symbolic device invoked on its own. As we detail elsewhere (Patterson et al. 2016), throughout the Hansard records we analyzed, Canadian legislators took partisan stances on HFI which aligned broadly with positions on the ideological spectrum. Legislators' partisan stances implied, or stated, particular moral arguments in relation to potential HFI policies.

As would be expected, we found that legislators from politically conservative traditions that dislike 'big government' typically made claims about governmental moral authority based on protecting the private control of wealth, primarily through taxation system reforms. They challenged the authority of rival parties by attributing inadequate income and its consequences, including HFI, to failures in financial management by government. In contrast, legislators from the socially progressive parties argued that the moral authority of governments rests on providing support or protection for their constituents. They implied in their arguments that policies from other parties abrogate that responsibility. Finally, Canadian legislators in the political center based their arguments around moral authority on claiming to represent the public interest and they justified their policy suggestions in term of pragmatic action. They criticized rival parties by claiming that the others' policy proposals were simplistic, too expensive, or utopian.

Notwithstanding that partisanship was apparent and framing emphases differed when legislators were in government or in opposition across and within the four jurisdictions and across the full-time period under study (Patterson et al. 2016), we suggest that it is the overarching moral taint legislators applied to the HFI policy problem that, through framing, provides the grounds for the foundational dispute. Framing in the foundational dispute between legislators on issues related to HFI took the form of judging policy proponents or opponents. The expression of moral outrage is captured in the following extract:

> It is shocking to see families bringing their kids to breakfast clubs and community kitchens in Parkdale – High Park. It breaks one's heart to have kids coming for a free breakfast because they do not have any food at home. It is a real *betrayal to our communities* that this is happening.

> We are struggling in Parkdale – High Park. A food bank recently closed. We are struggling to try to get another one up and running. We do not want to have food banks that people rely on. People need a decent income. They want to go to work. They want to support themselves and their families, and the *government is betraying them* [emphasis added] by not giving them the opportunity to do so. (Peggy Nash, NDP, Opposition, federal Hansard, 2008)

By framing their responses to the HFI issue in terms of morality, legislators from all parties moved the debate away from the details of policy proposals and toward fundamental principles. Within such framing, as the quote, and many others above, illustrates reference to specific metaphors, such as families, children and use of food banks, come to stand for moral, as well as instrumental, failure.

One of the outcomes from legislators' framing HFI in terms of fundamental moral reasoning is that within that logic policy initiatives are discreditable unless they completely eliminate the problem. This criticism leveled by Nelson Riis illustrates that polarized framing:

> For bankers and those holding bank stock today, man alive, this is as good as it gets. The stock market is skyrocketing. A lot of people are saying that exports are up and they have never done better …. The chartered banks are booming with historically high profits. Another set of banks are doing a booming business, the nearly 1,000 food banks across the country. We should be embarrassed this afternoon, speaking in the House of Commons and knowing that there are nearly 1,000 food banks. In fact they have serious problems because there is not enough food for hungry people. There are 1.4 million children living in poverty. (Nelson Riis, NDP, Opposition, federal Hansard, 1997)

Within that moral framing, the legislator implied that the presence of *any* food banks or children living in poverty indicates failure. Such framing renders every proposal too little, or too reckless, or ill conceived because they are unable to meet conditions that are defined in ideal terms.

Our analysis has identified common frames as well as conflicting frames, and framing constructed for different purposes that can be used by policy actors to support divergent actions. These constitute the foundational dispute among policy actors about HFI, which consistently revolves around claims and counterclaims of moral authority. We would argue that the framing for all of these well-established positions creates intractable policy divergence when policy responses are labeled inherently moral or immoral. This is despite relatively universal applicability of particular frames and the framing work they do, and despite policy agreement that poverty reduction rather than elimination is the goal. If there were no foundational dispute around moral authority, it might be possible to come to some weak consensus or to grudgingly let the governing party implement weak policies in support of their idea of what might be done to reduce poverty and thereby HFI in Canada. Instead, all action leads to moral outrage from at least one set of political rivals; inaction results and HFI policy intractability is co-constructed.

Discussion

In our analysis of HFI legislative policy debates in Canada between 1995 and 2012, we followed the suggestion from van Hulst and Yanow and others (deWulf et al. 2009;

Wagenaar 2011) to focus on the 'processes through which frames are constructed' (van Hulst and Yanow 2014, 2). As we articulated at the outset of this paper, in this form of frame analysis the empirical question is how policy actors use frames to arrive at their understandings as they interact with others in policy fields (van Hulst and Yanow 2014, 7); resulting conflicts are the products of interaction (deWulf et al. 2009). Specifically, 'conflict is neither a state of the world nor a state of mind, but a phenomenon that resides in the social interaction among disputants' (deWulf et al. 2009, 161). Moral judgments may enter into conflict over policy (Knill 2013; Majic 2015; Mooney 1999; Mucciaroni 2011; Wagenaar and Altink 2012), and we were interested in how such framing might relate to HFI debates. In this analysis, legislators were the policy actors engaged in social interaction, and we worked with Hansard data from Question Period and legislative debates, where they employ rhetorical frames in their efforts at justification or persuasion (Rein and Schön 1996, 90–91).

We discerned that the foundational dispute in political posturing around HFI is driven by moral claims or moral condemnation. Wagenaar and Altink (2012, 283) point out that morality policy may be part of wider ideological causes and the moral argumentation we documented can be explained in part by the institutional sponsoring of frames by rival political parties. The frames within the debates on HFI were often shared across party boundaries, however. Meta-communication in framing consists of the signals that let participants understand what kind of conversation they are involved in (van Hulst and Yanow 2014, 3). Similarly, Rein and Schön (1991, 273) point out that interpersonal contexts influence framing and actions by one person trigger actions on the part of others; institutional settings create contexts where competition is likely to generate conflict. In the case of government-level HFI policy development, legislative sessions form an important part of the interpersonal context. Researchers who have examined political interaction in Canada and Australia note that there are very few limits during Question Period, where any member in the House can be asked nearly any question (Penner, Blidook, and Soroka 2006, 1008) and there is strong pressure on legislators to ensure that the questions asked serve partisan ends (Fenton-Smith 2008, 115). This institutionalized debate is part of the prior sense-making assumptions, the existing 'model of the world', that Canadian legislators bring to parliament and the legislative assemblies. In the framing dynamics around HFI in Canadian legislatures, the institutions label such interactions as 'Question Period' or 'Debate', which signals to elected representatives that they should expect confrontational rhetoric.

The values that political actors purport to hold, or which are attributable to their opponents, may be drawn upon instrumentally as a strategy to maximize the impact of arguments (Knill 2013, 313; Mucciaroni 2011, 209). As such, statement on topics are often, 'an opportunity to demonstrate the correctness of the speaker's position in the face of much allegedly wrongheaded opposition' (Wagenaar and Altink 2012, 284). We found that in their debate-oriented setting, interactions in Canadian legislative sessions revolved around claiming moral authority when presenting new initiatives, and in responses to questions from members of rival parties. Legislators argued that their party was taking, or would take if they were in power, the morally supportable approach to the policy problem. Statements where they challenged rivals' authority were not necessarily the opposite of those that highlighted the legislator's own stance. Instead, challenging rivals' moral authority was important when posing questions. van Hulst

and Yanow (2014, 11) note that differences in stances reflect social actors' positions and views in relation to policy issues. In their challenges to rivals' authority on issues related to HFI, Canadian legislators pointed out failures. Sometimes they argued that their rivals were taking a fundamentally wrong approach in specific proposals, but, equally important, at a general level, such challenges served to differentiate the legislators' perspectives from the others.

There was a remarkable convergence on specific frames such as the image of 'hungry children' to justify widely different policies. This convergence is understandable within a framing analysis of moral argumentation. Wagenaar points out that, 'our concern with a character when we listen to a story always points to a concern with the larger issues at hand, usually a breach of or threat to the accepted order of obligations and responsibilities' (Wagenaar 2011, 213). The purpose of the 'sad story' rhetorical device, an argument grounded in a tale of a single example, which is implied to be representative of the population, is to make a moral point and incite action (Wagenaar and Altink 2012, 286). Such images are useful to legislators from across the policy spectrum, yet despite that broad consensus on some points, the rhetoric was embedded in claims and counterclaims of condemnation.

Lest we think that all political rhetoric is emotionally charged and polarizing in Canada, the recent political history of Canada is instructive. Historically, in Canada ideology played a relatively small part in politics. Here, we refer to ideology as one term within a general taxonomy of group-based social characteristics that structure policy discourse, namely that associated with a system of belief (Wagenaar 2011, 54), and more multifaceted than a principle of action (Rein 1976, 103–104, in; Wagenaar 2011, 81). Cross and Young (2002) have analyzed ideology specifically in relation to the function of the Canadian political party system. Where party ideology might be expected to play a role in politics, there was instead a brokerage system where minimally differentiated political parties acted as brokers for interest groups and presented arguments around specific issues (Cross and Young 2002, 862). The partisan ideological element in Canadian politics has increased since the early 1990s (Cross and Young 2002, 862), however, and that shift is reflected in our findings. Given the increasing ideological divergence in Canada, and the availability of a topic such as HFI that is framed through the metaphor of the hungry child, and others, as the exemplar of government's abrogation of responsibilities to its citizenry, what is surprising is the agreement across parties that the core problem to overcome is inadequate household income and that the problem is solvable through economic means (McIntyre, Patterson, et al. 2016). Despite that basic agreement, the Hansard records show that legislators were unable to arrive at substantial policy action (McIntyre, Lukic, et al. 2016). With HFI, the framing dynamics we documented in the Canadian federal and British Columbia, Nova Scotia and Ontario legislatures resulted in an interactive co-construction of policy intractability, where the policy actors focused on the foundational dispute around moral authority at the expense of policy development or implementation.

In a recent essay, van Hulst and Yanow (2014, 3) draw attention to the question Gregory Bateson posed in an early work on meta-communication: when you see a confrontation, is it playing or is it fighting? During majority governments in Canada, opposition parties are both unable to push agendas or to stop bills from passing, and

consequently the discussions of HFI in the debates and Question Period sessions captured in the Hansard extracts are largely symbolic. In a sense they are analogous to 'play' in that they are noisy, but not really serious about setting policy in an instrumental sense. Wagenaar and Altink point out that, 'in moral policy the symbolic dimension of the policy is at least as, if not more, important than its instrumental aspect' (Wagenaar and Altink 2012, 284) and our framing analysis reveals that such rhetorical 'play fighting' has consequences for interactions around policy topics and choices for subsequent policy development. In the rhetoric surrounding HFI, there was sufficient shrillness when the image of the hungry child was invoked to suggest that this image alone could account for the co-construction of intractability on the issue related to income-based solutions to the issue. During the period we studied, legislators in the four jurisdictions only took action on partnerships with school-based meal programs and food banks because no one was willing to contradict assumptions that charitable organizations need and are deserving of recognition and support for their efforts. In this case, the emotionally charged images, particularly that of the 'hungry child', led to moral agreement and albeit paltry action to provide occasional food assistance and much symbolic support to food bank volunteers. That these powerful images created intractability of solutions that addressed inadequate incomes, but had the opposite effect on food charity partnerships, is testimony to the importance of empirical analysis of frames and framing in policy formation.

The extended time frame captured in our Hansard extract database permitted us to show that HFI seems to be characterized by the features of an intractable policy problem. HFI is a substantive, persistent, policy-sensitive problem that is also imbued with meaning, and has become metaphorical code for government failure. Struggles over conceptual boundaries are frequently part of morality politics. Wagenaar and Altink (2012) and Majic (2015) studied prostitution-related morality policies in Europe and the United States, respectively, and noted that in both settings imagery around coercion and human trafficking had become conflated with the issue in the course of moral framing. The topic of HFI is less obviously related to issues of 'morality' than prostitution is, yet we would argue that the rhetoric around the topic has generated a moralizing quagmire with scant policy solutions. Such framing dynamics result in conflation of the outcomes and causes of HFI and a deep disconnect that has proved un-malleable when it comes to resolving the solvable problem of inadequate income for food, despite evidence of its sensitivity to specific social policy instruments. Without reframing, regardless of who governs and who opposes, advancing income-based options for HFI is likely to remain elusive.

Conclusion and implications

Majic (2015, 280) notes the need for more research on how policies that are loaded with moral rhetoric are formed and implemented. In our analysis we revealed that in Canada, HFI's political rhetoric based on moral claims has virtually halted development of policy to address HFI. As legislators have used a framing process that is inherently emotional and judgmental, there has been a co-construction of intractability on the core issue: the abrogation of moral authority by governments who permit children to go hungry. Those framing dynamics make it more difficult to take a topic like HFI beyond

moral debate and policies limited to areas of paltry consensus regarding the role of helping hand organizations.

Rein and Schön (1996, 100) suggest that policy analysts need to develop the capacity to retain distance from emotionally charged controversies and maintain a high level of self-reflection. Similarly, Wagenaar and Altink (2012, 290) point out that recognizing when a policy topic is in the center of ideological and moral debates is important for taking steps toward resolution. By recognizing the multi-layered nature of intractable topics and maintaining self-reflection policy analysts can help practitioners recognize how their own actions contribute to the deadlocked disputes they find themselves in (Rein and Schön 1996, 102). They also bring attention to the assumptions analysts have about whether policy participants are to be viewed as fellow inquirers who are 'members of a cooperative social system … [and] face a common problematic situation that they have a shared interest in reframing and resolving', or are best viewed as interested parties who 'use inquiry to serve their interests' and for whom the situation represents, 'a struggle that necessarily takes the form of a win-lose game' (Rein and Schön 1991, 282).

Our research using the Canadian Hansard records suggests that for a topic like HFI, legislators must be viewed primarily as interested parties who give priority to the strategic utility of new information. In that context, the function of researchers, advocates, and others who exchange and present such information in encouraging political actors to reflect on frames is to mediate around the issue or to, 'transform the dispute so as to make it more susceptible to satisfactory settlement' (Rein and Schön 1991, 282). Is it possible that evidence of interaction framing actually supports the earlier advice to policy analysts to retain distance? We have not yet found a way forward on the HFI issue but nongovernmental policy advocates might reconsider their approaches and work toward presenting the problem in a more pragmatic way that in fact distances them from the issue (Schön and Rein 1994). Topics such as HFI need to be made less available as emotionally charged political rhetoric; could this distancing be accomplished through a simple shared objective related to addressing the depth of poverty that generates HFI, that is, a concrete poverty reduction objective rather than a goal of poverty eradication?

Another approach would see HFI reframed as a metric generated by governments to measure a depth of poverty that affects food access. Redressing income insufficiency for those affected is required, and there are many options to do so. Using this approach, HFI could be reframed as an indicator of a depth of material deprivation that has become too frequently counted in Canadian surveys. Income supports through a variety of policy initiatives can reduce and possibly eliminate this unnecessary hardship for households. With this frame shift, the logic of managing endemic poverty by government partnerships with food charities will lose its potency. We would suggest, as van Hulst and Yanow have pointed out, that a subtle change in the framing processes might shift, 'a model *of* the world – reflecting prior sense-making – and a model *for* subsequent action in the world' (2014, 7).

Notes

1. Within stories policy actors manipulate symbolic devices to highlight some aspects of events, and downplay others, while maintaining the appearance of stating simple 'facts' (Stone 1989,

282). As such, metaphors and symbolic devices are elements that policy actors draw on while framing meanings around a policy topic.

2. While the political affiliation of the legislator is not essential to this paper's argumentation, as an aid to readers, we delineate legislators' political orientation by party membership as well as the jurisdiction and governing status of the member's party. The federal and provincial branches of the New Democratic Party (NDP) are viewed as leftist. The federal, Nova Scotia and Ontario Liberal Parties (LIB) are viewed as centrist. British Columbia is virtually a two-party province (NDP and BC/LIB), and the BC Liberal Party is treated as positioned on the right. Following a federal right-wing schism in the late 1980s, a federal Reform Party and later, Canadian Alliance party emerged; a right-wing merger in 2003 with the Progressive Conservative (PC) party yielded today's federal Conservative Party of Canada (CPC). The Reform Party (REF), Canadian Alliance, Conservative Party of Canada, and federal and provincial Progressive Conservative parties are all treated as rightist. The Bloc Quebecois (BQ) is a leftist sovereigntist party at the Federal level seeking independence for the province of Quebec.
3. In Canada, the term food bank is used to mean a place where recipients obtain donated food items directly from a charitable organization for preparation and consumption elsewhere.

Acknowledgments

An early version of this paper, under the title 'Framing analysis of household food insecurity uncovers power sensitivity within the Canadian political arena', was presented on 8 July 2015, at the 10th Annual Interpretive Policy Analysis Conference in Lille, France. We would like to thank the session organizers and participants for their comments on the earlier version.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This study was funded by a Programmatic Grant in Health and Health Equity from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) [Grant Number FRN115208].

Notes on contributors

Lynn McIntyre is Professor Emerita of Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine, the University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada. She has a long-standing program of research related to policy drivers of household food insecurity.

Patrick B. Patterson is a research associate in the Department of Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine, the University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada. His research focuses on interpretive policy analysis particularly as it relates to precarity.

Catherine L. Mah is assistant professor of health policy at Memorial University, and is appointed at the Dalla Lana School of Public Health at the University of Toronto and the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health. She leads a multidisciplinary program of research in the policy and practice of public health, with a focus on health-promoting innovations in the food system. Her work integrates population health intervention research, policy analysis, and policy action on environmental contexts for consumption.

References

Anderson, S. A. 1990. "Core Indicators of Nutritional State for Difficult-To-Sample Populations." *Journal of Nutrition* 120: 1559–1600.

Bhattacharya, J., J. Currie, and S. Haider. 2004. "Poverty, Food Insecurity, and Nutritional Outcomes in Children and Adults." *Journal of Health Economics* 23 (4): 839–862. doi:10.1016/j.jhealeco.2003.12.008.

Carter, K. N., K. Kruse, T. Blakely, and S. Collings. 2011. "The Association of Food Security with Psychological Distress in New Zealand and Any Gender Differences." *Social Science & Medicine* 72 (9): 1463–1471. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.03.009.

Che, J., and J. Chen. 2001. "Food Insecurity in Canadian Households." *Health Reports* 12 (4): 11–22.

Cross, W., and L. Young. 2002. "Policy Attitudes of Party Members in Canada: Evidence of Ideological Politics." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 35 (4): 859–880. doi:10.1017/S0008423902778475.

deWulf, A., B. Gray, L. Putnam, R. Lewicki, N. Aarts, R. Bouwen, and C. Van Woerkum. 2009. "Disentangling Approaches to Framing in Conflict and Negotiation Research: Ameta-Paradigmatic Perspective." *Human Relations* 62 (2): 155–193. doi:10.1177/0018726708100356.

Emery, J. C., A. C. Herbert, J. M. Bartoo, S. I. Ana Ferrer, V. T. Kirkpatrick, and L. McIntyre. 2012. "Evidence of the Association between Household Food Insecurity and Heating Cost Inflation in Canada, 1998-2001." *Canadian Public Policy* 38 (2): 181–215. doi:10.3138/cpp.38.2.181.

Emery, J. C. H., V. C. Fleisch, and L. McIntyre. 2013. "Legislated Changes to Federal Pension Income in Canada Will Adversely Affect Low Income Seniors' Health." *Preventive Medicine* 57 (6): 963–966. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2013.09.004.

FAO. 1996. *Rome Declaration on World Food Security and World Food Summit Plan of Action*. [Online]. Rome: UN Declaration. http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/w3613e/w3613e00.htm

Fenton-Smith, B. 2008. "Discourse Structure and Political Performance in Adversarial Parliamentary Questioning." *Journal of Language and Politics* 7 (1): 97–118. doi:10.1075/jlp.

Fitzpatrick, T., L. C. Rosella, A. Calzavara, J. Petch, A. D. Pinto, H. Manson, V. Goel, and W. P. Wodchis. 2015. "Looking Beyond Income and Education Socioeconomic Status Gradients Among Future High-Cost Users of Health Care." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 49 (2): 161–171. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2015.02.018.

Food Secure Canada. 2015. Online. Accessed November 18 2015. http://foodsecurecanada.org/

Fuller-Thomson, E., and J. Nimigon. 2008. "Factors Associated with Depression among Individuals with Chronic Fatigue Syndrome: Findings from a Nationally Representative Survey." *Family Practice* 25 (6): 414–422. doi:10.1093/fampra/cmn064.

Galesloot, S., L. McIntyre, T. Fenton, and S. Tyminski. 2012. "Food Insecurity in Canadian Adults: Receiving Diabetes Care." *Canadian Journal of Dietetic Practice and Research* 73 (3): e261–e266. doi:10.3148/73.3.2012.e261.

Goodin, R. E., M. Rein, and M. Moran. 2006. "The Public and Its Policies." In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, edited by M. Moran, M. Rein, and R. E. Goodin, 3–35. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gray, B., R. Lewicki, and M. Elliott. 2003. *Making Sense of Intractable Environmental Conflict: Concepts and Cases*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Gucciardi, E., J. A. Vogt, M. DeMelo, and D. E. Stewart. 2009. "Exploration of the Relationship between Household Food Insecurity and Diabetes in Canada." *Diabetes Care* 32: 2218–2224. doi:10.2337/dc09-0823.

Hadley, C., and D. L. Crooks. 2012. "Coping and the Biosocial Consequences of Food Insecurity in the 21st Century." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 149 (S55): 72–94. doi:10.1002/ajpa.22161.

Hajer, M., and D. Laws. 2006. "Ordering through Discourse." In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, edited by M. Moran, M. Rein, and R. E. Goodin, 249–266. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Health Canada. 2007. *Income-Related Household Food Insecurity in Canada, Canadian Community Health Survey, Cycle 2.2 Nutrition (2004)* (Cat. H164-42/2007E-PDF) Ottawa: Office of Nutrition Policy and Promotion, Health Products and Food Branch. ISBN 978-0-662-45455-7. HC Pub. No. 4696.

Hsieh, H.-F., and S. E. Shannon. 2005. "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis." *Qualitative Health Research* 15 (9): 1277–1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687.

Knill, C. 2013. "The Study of Morality Policy: Analytical Implications from a Public Policy Perspective." *Journal of European Public Policy* 20 (3): 309–317. doi:10.1080/13501763.2013.761494.

Ledrou, I., and J. Gervais. 2005. "Food Insecurity." *Health Reports* 16 (3): 47–50.

Loopstra, R., N. Dachner, and V. Tarasuk. 2015. "An Exploration of the Unprecedented Decline in the Prevalence of Household Food Insecurity in Newfoundland and Labrador, 2007–2012." *Canadian Public Policy* 41 (3): 191–206. doi:10.3138/cpp.2014-080.

Mah, C. L., C. Hamill, K. Rondeau, and L. McIntyre. 2014. "A Frame-Critical Policy Analysis of Canada's Response to the World Food Summit 1998-2008." *Archives of Public Health* 72 (1): 41. doi:10.1186/2049-3258-72-41.

Majic, S. 2015. "Implementing 'New' Norms? Examining 'John School' Policies in the United States." *Critical Policy Studies* 9 (3): 278–296. doi:10.1080/19460171.2015.1027717.

McIntyre, L., A. C. Bartoo, and J. H. Emery. 2014. "When Working is Not Enough: Food Insecurity in the Canadian Labour Force." *Public Health Nutrition* 17 (1): 49–57. doi:10.1017/S1368980012004053.

McIntyre, L., J. V. A. Williams, D. H. Lavorato, and S. Patten. 2013. "Depression and Suicide Ideation in Late Adolescence and Early Adulthood are an Outcome of Child Hunger." *Journal of Affective Disorders* 150 (1): 123–129. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2012.11.029.

McIntyre, L., P. B. Patterson, L. C. Anderson, and C. L. Mah. 2016. "Household Food Insecurity in Canada: Problem Definition and Potential Solutions in the Public Policy Domain." *Canadian Public Policy/Analyse de Politiques*. doi:10.3138/cpp.2015-066.

McIntyre, L., R. Lukic, P. B. Patterson, L. C. Anderson, and C. L. Mah. 2016. "Legislation Debated as Responses to Household Food Insecurity in Canada, 1995–2012." *Journal of Hunger and Environmental Nutrition*. doi:10.1080/19320248.2016.1157551.

Mooney, C. Z. 1999. "The Politics of Morality Policy: Symposium Editor's Introduction." *Policy Studies Journal* 27 (4): 675–680. doi:10.1111/psj.1999.27.issue-4.

Mooney, C. Z., and R. G. Schuldt. 2008. "Does Morality Policy Exist? Testing a Basic Assumption." *Policy Studies Journal* 36 (2): 199–218. doi:10.1111/j.1541-0072.2008.00262.x.

Mucciaroni, G. 2011. "Are Debates about "Morality Policy" Really about Morality? Framing Opposition to Gay and Lesbian Rights." *Policy Studies Journal* 39 (2): 187–216. doi:10.1111/psj.2011.39.issue-2.

Neff, C. 2012. "Australian Beach Safety and the Politics of Shark Attacks." *Coastal Management* 40 (1): 88–106. doi:10.1080/08920753.2011.639867.

Patterson, P. B., L. McIntyre, L. C. Anderson, and C. L. Mah. 2016. "Political Rhetoric from Canada can Inform Healthy Public Policy Argumentation." *Health Promotion International*. doi:10.1093/heapro/daw019.

Penner, E., K. Blidook, and S. Soroka. 2006. "Legislative Priorities and Public Opinion: Representation of Partisan Agendas in the Canadian House of Commons." *Journal of European Public Policy* 13 (7): 1006–1020. doi:10.1080/1350176060023979.

Perez-Escamilla, R., and R. Pinheiro de Toledo Vianna. 2012. "Food Insecurity and the Behavioral and Intellectual Development of Children: A Review of the Evidence." *Journal of Applied Research on Children* 3 (1): 1–16.

Pierce, J. J., S. Siddiki, M. D. Jones, K. Schumacher, A. Pattison, and H. Peterson. 2014. "Social Construction and Policy Design: A Review of Past Applications." *Policy Studies Journal* 42 (1): 1–29. doi:10.1111/psj.2014.42.issue-1.

Quinlan, M. 2012. "The 'Pre-Invention' of Precarious Employment: The Changing World of Work in Context." *The Economic and Labour Relations Review* 23 (4): 3–24. doi:10.1177/103530461202300402.

Rein, M. 1976. *Social Science and Public Policy*. New York: Penguin.

Rein, M. 2006. "Reframing Problematic Policies." In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, edited by M. Moran, M. Rein, and R. E. Goodin, 389–405. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rein, M., and D. A. Schön. 1991. "Frame-Reflective Policy Discourse." In *Social Sciences and Modern States: National Experiences and Theoretical Crossroads*, edited by P. Wagner, C. H. Weiss, B. Wittrock, and H. Wollmann, 262–289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rein, M., and D. A. Schön. 1996. "Frame-Critical Policy Analysis and Frame-Reflective Policy Practice." *Knowledge and Policy* 9 (1): 85–104. doi:10.1007/BF02832235.

Rock, M. J., L. McIntyre, S. A. Persaud, and K. L. Thomas. 2011. "A Media Advocacy Intervention Linking Health Disparities and Food Insecurity." *Health Education Research* 26 (6): 948–960. doi:10.1093/her/cyr043.

Rose, M., and F. R. Baumgartner. 2013. "Framing the Poor: Media Coverage and U.S. Poverty Policy, 1960–2008." *Policy Studies Journal* 41 (1): 22–53. doi:10.1111/psj.12001.

Schneider, A., and H. Ingram. 1990. "Behavioral Assumptions of Policy Tools." *The Journal of Politics* 52 (2): 510–529. doi:10.2307/2131904.

Schön, D. A., and M. Rein. 1994. *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies*. New York: Basic Books.

Seligman, H. K., B. A. Laraia, and M. B. Kushel. 2010. "Food Insecurity is Associated with Chronic Disease among Low-Income NHANES Participants." *Journal of Nutrition* 140 (2): 304–310. doi:10.3945/jn.109.112573.

Stone, D. A. 1989. "Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas." *Political Science Quarterly* 104 (2): 281–300. doi:10.2307/2151585.

Tarasuk, V., N. Dachner, and R. Loopstra. 2014. "Food Banks, Welfare and Food Insecurity in Canada." *British Food Journal* 116 (9): 1405–1417. doi:10.1108/BFJ-02-2014-0077.

Tarasuk, V., A. Mitchell, and N. Dachner. 2014. *Household Food Insecurity in Canada, 2012*. [Online]. Toronto: Research to Identify Policy Options to Reduce Food Insecurity (PROOF). http://nutritionalsciences.lamp.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Household_Food_Insecurity_in_Canada-2012_ENG.pdfTarasuk2015

Tarasuk, V., A. Mitchell, and N. Dachner. 2015. *Household Food Insecurity in Canada, 2013*. [Online]. Toronto: Research to Identify Policy Options to Reduce Food Insecurity (PROOF). http://proof.utoronto.ca/resources/proof-annual-reports/annual-report-2013

van Hulst, M., and D. Yanow. 2014. "From Policy "Frames" to "Framing": Theorizing a More Dynamic, Political Approach." *American Review of Public Administration*. doi:10.1177/0275074014533142:1-21.

Wagenaar, H. 2011. *Meaning in Action: Interpretation and Dialogue in Policy Analysis*. Armonk: M. E. Sharpe.

Wagenaar, H., and S. Altink. 2012. "Prostitution as Morality Politics or Why It Is Exceedingly Difficult to Design and Sustain Effective Prostitution Policy." *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 9 (3): 279–292. doi:10.1007/s13178-012-0095-0.

Ward, J. 1980. *The Hansard Chronicles: A Celebration of the First Hundred Years of Hansard in Canada's Parliament*. Toronto: Deneau and Greenberg.

Wildavsky, A. 1979. *Speaking Truth to Power*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.