

Authority Contests, Power and Policy Paradigm Change:  
 Explaining Developments in Grain Marketing Policy in Prairie Canada

Online Appendices

Appendix A: Codes and Analytical Constructs

Our analytical constructs sum the frequencies of supporting rationales that draw on four competing conceptions of policymaking authority and legitimacy, based upon the position taken on policy change or the status quo as appropriate for government or opposition status. Codes to capture the range of supporting rationales encountered in the debates were developed based on a preliminary review of the debates studied as well as broader set of debates on Canadian Wheat Board policy from 1994-. The following summary table outlines the composition of each construct in terms of each coded variable; the content of each code is described in general terms below the table.

<b>Constructs</b>	<b>Variables</b>
Representational Authority	FarmersAsEntrepreneurs, FarmersInJail, FarmersInRiding, PersonalIDWithFarmers, YoungFarmers, RegionalElectoralMandate, RuralVsUrban
Value-Driven Change/Status-Quo	PolicyPlatformCommitment, LegalityAndFairness, Ideology, Freedom, ValueOfMonopoly, HistoryorOutdated
Popular Authority	TimeForDebate, ParliamentaryProcedure, FarmerPlebesciteOnCWB, Democracy

Expert Authority	CertaintyStability, Corporations, EconomicOpportunity, FoodSovereignty, InternationalTrade, Jobs, FarmerCostsAndBenefits
------------------	--

1) *Representational Authority*

Representational authority captures two dimensions of regional representation that emerged from an initial review of the data: one, references to a regional electoral mandate (i.e. when a party holds the majority of the seats in the affected region) or lack thereof; and two, a non-electoral understanding of regional representation based upon sharing characteristics or having close personal contact with voters in the region. ‘FarmersInRiding,’ ‘PersonalIDWithFarmers,’ and ‘RuralVsUrban,’ measure the use of such rationales. ‘FarmersAsEntrepreneurs,’ ‘FarmersInJail,’ and ‘YoungFarmers’ capture arguments used to evoke emotional responses tied to direct or personal regional representation claims. For example, Conservative Government members emphasized connections to farmers who had been convicted of contravening the Canadian Wheat Board monopoly and who were subsequently jailed during the Chrétien era, in order to challenge the legitimacy of Liberals to speak on behalf of the region. Example: ‘The other thing I will point out is that it is interesting to note that there are 57 MPs who represent grain farmers in western Canada affected by the Canadian Wheat Board. Of those 57 MPs, 52 are Conservative and 5 are opposition. That is very telling. We just had a federal election in May. The member is asking if we represent Canadian wheat farmers. We absolutely do, 52 seats out of 57.’ (Pierre Lemieux, October 24, 2011. House of Commons Hansard #35 of the 41st Parliament, 1st Session.)

## 2) *Value-Driven Change/Status Quo*

Our measure of value-driven/status quo paradigm development includes direct references to policy platform commitments to change or to the status quo; to 'ideology' as a motivating factor; to specific values; and to the Wheat Board being out of step with the times or representing a rich and valuable tradition ('HistoryOrOutdated'). For example, the Conservative and Reform Party MPs most frequently stress 'Freedom' and 'LegalityAndFairness,' as incongruent with the existing policy paradigm while the Liberals and NDP members emphasize the continuing relevance of existing marketing policies ('ValueOfMonopoly').

Example: 'Mr. Speaker, what we do respect is the right of western Canadian farmers to have the same options as their cousins and colleagues in Ontario. What we are moving for is called fairness, the right to handle one's own product in a way, time, price and place of one's choosing.' (Gerry Ritz, October 25, 2011. House of Commons Hansard #36 of the 41st Parliament, 1st Session.)

## 3) *Popular Authority*

Our popular authority construct aggregates rationales that utilize the rhetoric of democratic values ('Democracy') or which cite farmer plebiscites held under each government on the future of the Canadian Wheat Board ('FarmerPlebesciteOnCWB'). We also incorporate two variables ('TimeForDebate,' 'Parliamentary Procedure') that capture arguments about the legitimate exercise of responsible government.

Example: 'Madam Speaker, time allocation and closure are legitimate tools of a democracy. They are within the bounds of what we are allowed to do in this place. In the case of this bill, it is

a matter of timing.’ (Gerry Ritz, October 20, 2011. House of Commons Hansard #33 of the 41st Parliament, 1st Session.)

#### 4) *Expert Authority*

Our measure of expert authority amalgamates a variety of arguments surrounding the economic costs and benefits of policy change (‘CertaintyStability,’ ‘Corporations,’ ‘EconomicOpportunity,’ ‘FoodSovereignty,’ ‘InternationalTrade,’ ‘Jobs,’ ‘FarmerCostsAndBenefits’). We did not rely on a direct coding of references to expert opinion because fundamental differences in the style of expert consultation under Liberal and Conservative governments made this measure unreliable. Economic costs and benefits arguments as a baseline were a stable available measure of expert authority between the two comparative cases.

Example: ‘We need to look at the cost factor of this massive, tragic transformation. Most analysts predict that grain prices will fall after the elimination of the single desk. Another likely outcome is industry consolidation as large producers squeeze out smaller producers.’ Alex Atamanenko, November 28, 2011. House of Commons Hansard #55 of the 41st Parliament, 1st Session.

The full text of the debates studied was independently coded by two undergraduate research assistants using QSR International’s NVivo qualitative analysis software. Each coder was trained by one of the researchers using a codebook containing detailed descriptions of each code and illustrative examples drawn from the debate text. Coders were instructed to refrain

from any discussion of the coding process and worked in separate environments. Calculated intercoder reliability values (see Appendix B) for this analysis in the acceptable to high range.

## Appendix B: Intercoder Reliability

Codes	Source Text	Source Text Length	Kappa Coefficient*	Percent Agreement
FarmersRepresentation	2011_41stParliament	413 pages (1299206 chars)	0.7412	87
FarmersRepresentation	Bill_C4_Debates	460 pages (1269552 chars)	0.881	94.05
FarmersRepresentation	Bill_C72_Debates	50 pages (176905 chars)	0.967	98.53
GovernmentMP	2011_41stParliament	413 pages (1299206 chars)	0.9629	98.17
GovernmentMP	Bill_C4_Debates	460 pages (1269552 chars)	0.9635	98.76
GovernmentMP	Bill_C72_Debates	50 pages (176905 chars)	0.9789	99.16
OppositionMP	2011_41stParliament	413 pages (1299206 chars)	0.9434	97.17
OppositionMP	Bill_C4_Debates	460 pages (1269552 chars)	0.9006	95.77
OppositionMP	Bill_C72_Debates	50 pages (176905 chars)	0.9592	98.26
RationaleForChange	2011_41stParliament	413 pages (1299206 chars)	0.8912	94.67
RationaleForChange	Bill_C4_Debates	460 pages (1269552 chars)	0.7792	95.19
RationaleForChange	Bill_C72_Debates	50 pages (176905 chars)	0.9115	99.45
RationaleForStatusQuo	2011_41stParliament	413 pages (1299206 chars)	0.8573	92.93
RationaleForStatusQuo	Bill_C4_Debates	460 pages (1269552 chars)	0.5963	98.23
RationaleForStatusQuo	Bill_C72_Debates	50 pages (176905 chars)	1	100
RegionalRepresentation	2011_41stParliament	413 pages (1299206 chars)	0.7599	90.83
RegionalRepresentation	Bill_C4_Debates	460 pages (1269552 chars)	0.8102	92.01
RegionalRepresentation	Bill_C72_Debates	50 pages (176905 chars)	0.8993	95.15

\* The kappa coefficient compares agreement between separate coders more reliably than percent agreement by adjusting for the possibility of agreement by chance alone; the minimum cutoff of accepted ranges is from 0.4 to 0.67 in the literature (Krippendorf 1980, QSR International 2012)