The Linguistic Turn and Deliberative Development of Public Administration

Sharon Mendoza-Dreisbach[1]; Jeconiah Dreisbach[2*]

[1]School of Business, Skyline University College, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates
[2]The Global Center for Advanced Studies, Dublin, Ireland

INFO ARTICLE

* Corresponding author;
jecon@gcas.ie

ABSTRACT

This article examines the paradigmatic shift known as the linguistic turn within the field of public administration, exploring its profound implications for both theory and practice. Originating from philosophical discourse, the linguistic turn challenges traditional positivist approaches by foregrounding language and discourse as central to understanding administrative processes and outcomes. Through a comprehensive review of literature, this paper elucidates how this theoretical shift has reshaped the landscape of public administration. The study investigates the history and impact of linguistic theories on administrative practices, highlighting the emergence of discursive strategies in policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation. It critically analyzes how language constructs realities, shapes bureaucratic interactions, and influences policy effectiveness. Moreover, the deliberative development reveals how policy issues are framed through narratives and metaphors, influencing policy outcomes, highlights the importance of inclusive and rational deliberation in democratic legitimacy, advocating for participatory decision-making processes, and addresses the practical challenges of implementing inclusive deliberation in diverse societies, emphasizing accessibility and respectful dialogue. By integrating insights from linguistics, philosophy, and public administration, it argues for a more nuanced approach that acknowledges the linguistic dimensions of governance, promoting participatory, transparent, and equitable policy-making. The article suggests avenues for future research and practical implications for enhancing administrative effectiveness in diverse socio-political contexts.

INTRODUCTION

The linguistic turn represents a significant paradigm shift within the social sciences, challenging traditional positivist approaches by placing language and discourse at the forefront of inquiry (Surkis, 2012). Originating from philosophical critiques of foundationalism and the limitations of empirical observation, the linguistic turn gained prominence in the mid-20th century as scholars sought to understand how language constructs reality, shapes social interactions, and influences human cognition (Rorty, 1967; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 2017).

Central to the linguistic turn is the recognition that language is not merely a transparent medium for expressing pre-existing ideas, but rather, it actively structures and mediates our understanding of the world (Foucault, 1972). This insight has profound implications across disciplines, prompting scholars to investigate how discourse shapes power dynamics, identities, and social norms. Philosophers such as Ludwig Wittgenstein (1953) and Michel Foucault (1972) laid foundational groundwork by exploring the complexities of language games and discursive formations, respectively.

In the realm of public administration, the linguistic turn has revolutionized how scholars perceive bureaucratic processes, policy-making, and governance (Paile, 2018). Traditionally, public administration had been viewed through a lens of hierarchical structures, rational decision-making, and bureaucratic efficiency. However, scholars (Simon, 1990; Fiori, 2011) challenged this perspective by emphasizing the bounded rationality of decision-makers and the role of language in shaping administrative behavior.

Waldo (2007) further extended these insights by examining the rhetorical strategies used by public administrators to justify policies and legitimize their authority. Scholars (Roberts, 2020; Stillman, 2020) demonstrated that administrative actions are not only influenced by objective criteria but are also constructed and justified through linguistic means. This realization opened up new avenues for understanding how language influences policy outcomes, public perceptions, and institutional practices within government organizations.

The application of linguistic analysis in public administration has since diversified, encompassing discourse analysis, narrative construction, and the study of bureaucratic rhetoric (Fairclough, 1992). Fairclough (1992), for instance, introduced critical discourse analysis as a methodological approach to uncover power relations embedded within administrative discourse. This approach emphasizes the role of language in reproducing and challenging social inequalities, thereby enriching our understanding of governance processes.

This article aims to explore the evolution and implications of the linguistic turn within public administration as an academic discipline. By tracing its theoretical foundations, examining key proponents, discussing methodological approaches, and analyzing practical applications, this study seeks to illuminate how linguistic insights have transformed our understanding of administrative practices and governance dynamics. Ultimately, the linguistic turn invites us to reconsider traditional conceptualizations of public administration by foregrounding the significance of language in shaping policy-making processes and institutional behaviors.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE LINGUISTIC TURN IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

The linguistic turn marks a profound shift in the social sciences, particularly in philosophy and subsequently in other disciplines, including anthropology, sociology, and public administration. At its core, the linguistic turn challenges the traditional positivist and empiricist views that objective reality can be observed and described independently of language. Instead, it posits that language is not merely a neutral tool for conveying pre-existing ideas but is intricately involved in constructing and shaping our understanding of reality (Fisch, 2008).

One of the pivotal figures in the philosophical foundations of the linguistic turn is Ludwig Wittgenstein. In his seminal work Philosophical Investigations (1953), Wittgenstein critiques the idea of a single, fixed meaning for words and concepts. He introduces the notion of language games, where language is seen as a system of rule-governed activities embedded within specific social practices. This perspective highlights that the meaning of words and concepts is context-dependent and emerges from their use in everyday language practices rather than from adherence to strict definitions.

Michel Foucault further developed the linguistic turn through his analysis of discursive formations and power relations. In The Archaeology of Knowledge (1972), Foucault explores how knowledge is produced and

circulated through discourse, which he defines as a system of statements that establish what can be known and said about a particular topic at a given historical moment. Foucault's approach underscores that language not only describes but also constitutes social reality by shaping how individuals perceive and interact within their environments.

Richard Rorty's work also significantly contributes to the theoretical foundations of the linguistic turn. In The Linguistic Turn: Essays in Philosophical Method (1967), Rorty argues against the idea of a mind-independent reality accessible through language. He advocates for a pragmatist approach where language is viewed as a tool for social negotiation and problem-solving rather than as a mirror of reality. Rorty's critique challenges the notion of language as a passive medium and emphasizes its active role in constructing and transforming social practices and institutions.

In the context of public administration, the theoretical insights of the linguistic turn have been applied to understand bureaucratic processes, policy-making, and governance. Herbert A. Simon, a key figure in administrative theory, integrated insights from cognitive psychology and linguistic philosophy in his study Administrative Behavior (2007). Simon (2007) introduced the concept of bounded rationality, which acknowledges that decision-makers operate within cognitive limits and rely on heuristics and language-based representations to navigate complex environments.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) further extends the theoretical foundations of the linguistic turn in public administration. Fairclough argues that administrative discourse not only reflects but also constructs social reality and power relations. In Discourse and Social Change (Fairclough, 1992), he developed a methodological framework to analyze how language is used to legitimate policies, maintain organizational hierarchies, and negotiate authority within bureaucratic settings.

Overall, the theoretical foundations of the linguistic turn underscore the dynamic and constructive role of language in shaping human understanding, social interactions, and institutional practices. By emphasizing the discursive nature of reality, these perspectives challenge traditional assumptions and open up new avenues for investigating the complexities of public administration and governance.

DELIBERATIVE DEVELOPMENT IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Frank Fischer's policy discourse analysis, John Dryzek's discursive democracy, and Nicole Curato's deliberative democracy offer profound insights into how language and communication shape public administration and policy-making. These frameworks underscore the central role of discourse and deliberation in democratic governance, providing tools to understand and improve the practice of public administration.

Policy discourse analysis (PDA) is a methodological approach that emphasizes the role of language in constructing policy issues and shaping public policy. PDA involves analyzing the narratives, metaphors, and arguments used in policy debates to uncover the underlying assumptions and power dynamics. Fischer (2003) argues that policy issues are not merely technical problems to be solved but are fundamentally about competing interpretations and meanings.

In public administration, PDA allows administrators and policymakers to critically examine how policy problems are framed and how these frames influence policy outcomes. For instance, Fischer's analysis of environmental policy highlights how the framing of environmental issues—whether as economic opportunities or ecological crises—affects the policy solutions proposed and implemented. By deconstructing these discourses, public administrators can become more aware of the ideological underpinnings of policy debates and work towards more inclusive and reflective policy-making processes (Fischer & Forester, 1993).

Meanwhile, the concept of discursive democracy builds on the idea that democratic legitimacy arises from the quality of public discourse rather than merely the aggregation of individual preferences through voting. Dryzek (2000) emphasizes the importance of inclusive and rational deliberation in which diverse voices and perspectives are heard and considered. This approach advocates for a deliberative process where participants engage in reasoned argumentation, reflecting on and potentially revising their preferences based on the strength of the arguments presented.

In public administration, discursive democracy has practical implications for fostering more participatory and transparent decision-making processes. By incorporating mechanisms for public deliberation, such as citizen assemblies, public consultations, and participatory budgeting, public administrators can ensure that policy decisions are informed by a broad range of perspectives and that the voices of marginalized and underrepresented groups are included. This not only enhances the democratic legitimacy of policy decisions but also leads to more robust and sustainable outcomes (Dryzek, 2010).

Furthermore, deliberative democracy further develops the principles of deliberation and inclusivity in democratic governance. Curato focuses on the practical challenges and opportunities of implementing deliberative processes in diverse and unequal societies. She highlights the importance of creating conditions that enable meaningful participation, such as ensuring accessibility, fostering respectful dialogue, and addressing power imbalances that can hinder genuine deliberation (Curato, 2019).

In the context of public administration, Curato's deliberative democracy encourages administrators to design and facilitate deliberative forums that are accessible to all citizens, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds. This involves not only logistical considerations, such as providing translation services and accessible venues, but also creating a deliberative culture that values empathy, respect, and active listening. By doing so, public administrators can create spaces where citizens can engage in thoughtful and constructive dialogue, leading to more informed and equitable policy decisions (Curato et al., 2017).

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES ON THE LINGUISTIC TURN IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The linguistic turn in public administration has led to the development of various methodological approaches that emphasize the analysis of language, discourse, and communication within bureaucratic contexts. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a prominent methodological approach used to examine how language constructs and reflects power relations, ideologies, and social inequalities within administrative practices (Fairclough, 1992). CDA involves analyzing texts and discourse to uncover underlying discursive structures, rhetorical strategies, and linguistic features that shape administrative decision-making and policy formulation (Wallmeier, Helmig, & Feeney, 2018; Trochmann et al., 2021).

Narrative analysis is another methodological approach that focuses on studying the stories, narratives, and symbolic representations used by public administrators to convey meanings, justify actions, and establish organizational identity (Boje, 2001). This approach highlights the importance of narratives in shaping administrative practices, fostering organizational culture, and influencing stakeholder perceptions (Maiello, 2014; Ospina & Dodge, 2005; Dodge et al., 2005; Dodge, 2017). Rhetorical analysis examines the persuasive strategies and rhetorical devices employed in administrative discourse to influence public opinion, legitimize policies, and manage crises (Denters & Klok, 200). By analyzing speeches, policy documents, and public statements, rhetorical analysis reveals how language is strategically used to achieve administrative goals and maintain organizational authority (Gong, 2003; Vickers, 2012; Winton, 2013). These methodological approaches contribute to a deeper understanding of how language operates as a tool of governance, shaping administrative behaviors, decision-making processes, and policy outcomes. By employing these analytical frameworks, researchers can uncover the discursive mechanisms through which power is negotiated, authority is established, and policy agendas are framed within public administration.

INTEGRATING LINGUISTIC INSIGHTS INTO PRACTICE

The integration of linguistic insights into practice within public administration involves applying theoretical frameworks and methodological approaches to improve administrative processes, decision-making, and policy outcomes. For strategic communication, public administrators can leverage linguistic analysis to enhance strategic communication efforts. By understanding how language constructs meanings and shapes perceptions, administrators can craft messages that resonate with diverse stakeholders, clarify policy objectives, and mitigate misunderstandings (Raphael & Nesbary, 2005).

Moreover, linguistic analysis provides a nuanced understanding of policy texts and discourse, facilitating critical policy analysis and evaluation. Researchers can examine the underlying assumptions, ideological biases, and discursive strategies embedded within policy documents to assess their implications for governance and societal outcomes (Fischer & Gottweis, 2012).

Language plays a crucial role in shaping organizational culture and identity within government agencies. By analyzing bureaucratic rhetoric and communication practices, administrators can foster a cohesive organizational identity, promote shared values, and enhance employee morale and engagement (Rice, 2004; Jung et al., 2009; Molina, 2009). Integrating linguistic insights into training programs can enhance the capabilities of public administrators. By teaching discourse analysis skills and emphasizing effective communication strategies, training initiatives can improve decision-making processes, crisis management, and public engagement efforts (Bovens et al., 2001). Applying linguistic analysis ethically requires sensitivity to power dynamics, inclusivity, and the potential impact of language on marginalized communities (Plant, 2018). Administrators must ensure that linguistic practices uphold principles of transparency, fairness, and accountability in governance processes (Schön & Rein, 1994; Menzel, 2015).

As for deliberative development, for example, in urban planning, these approaches can be used to facilitate inclusive and participatory processes where community members collaboratively shape the development of their neighborhoods. In health policy, deliberative forums can bring together patients, healthcare providers, and policymakers to discuss and design healthcare reforms that reflect the needs and experiences of all stakeholders. Embracing these frameworks, public administrators can move beyond top-down, technocratic approaches to policy-making and foster a more democratic and participatory governance system. This not only enhances the legitimacy and effectiveness of public policies but also empowers citizens to play an active role in shaping the decisions that affect their lives. By integrating linguistic insights into administrative practice, public administrators can foster more effective communication, informed decision-making, and responsive governance that addresses the diverse linguistic and cultural contexts of contemporary societies.

CONCLUSION

The linguistic turn has profoundly reshaped the field of public administration by illuminating the central role of language in shaping administrative practices, policy formulation, and governance dynamics. This paradigmatic shift, rooted in philosophical inquiries into language and meaning, has enriched our understanding of how bureaucratic processes are not merely functional but deeply influenced by discursive practices and communicative strategies. Key proponents such as Herbert A. Simon and Dwight Waldo have pioneered the integration of linguistic insights into administrative theory. Simon's concept of bounded rationality underscores how decision-making within bureaucracies is shaped by cognitive limitations and the interpretative frameworks conveyed through language (Simon, 1947). Waldo's analysis of bureaucratic rhetoric highlights how administrators use language to assert authority, justify policies, and shape public perceptions, thereby influencing governance practices (Waldo, 2007).

Methodologically, critical discourse analysis (CDA) and rhetorical analysis have provided valuable tools for examining how language constructs and reflects power relations within administrative settings. By analyzing administrative discourse, researchers can uncover underlying ideologies, rhetorical strategies, and narrative constructions that shape policy outcomes and institutional behaviors. Applications of linguistic analysis in governance and policy have demonstrated its practical relevance in enhancing strategic communication, fostering public engagement, and promoting transparency in decision-making processes. By understanding how language frames issues, communicates policies, and constructs administrative legitimacy, practitioners can better navigate complex governance challenges in diverse socio-political contexts.

Looking ahead, further exploration of linguistic insights promises to continue advancing our understanding of public administration as a dynamic socio-linguistic phenomenon. By integrating linguistic perspectives with other disciplinary approaches, scholars and practitioners can continue to enhance administrative practices, promote democratic accountability, and address emerging governance challenges in an increasingly

interconnected global landscape. As such, the linguistic turn offers a robust theoretical framework and methodological toolkit for unraveling the intricate ways in which language shapes and defines the contours of public administration and governance.

REFERENCES

Boje, D. M. (2001). Narrative methods for organizational and communication research. Sage Publications.

Bovens, M., Goodin, R. E., & Schillemans, T. (Eds.). (2001). The Oxford handbook of public accountability. Oxford University Press.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (2017). Interactional Linguistics: Studying Language in Social Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curato, N. (2019). Democracy in a Time of Misery: From Spectacular Tragedies to Deliberative Action. Oxford University Press.

Curato, N., Dryzek, J. S., Ercan, S. A., Hendriks, C. M., & Niemeyer, S. (2017). Twelve Key Findings in Deliberative Democracy Research. Daedalus, 146(3), 28-38. https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_00444

Denters, B., & Klok, P. J. (Eds.). (2001). Rhetorical democracy: Discursive practices of civic engagement. Rowman & Littlefield.

Dodge, J. (2017). The importance of narrative for public administration. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 27(1), 210–213. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muw053

Dodge, J., Ospina, S. M., & Foldy, E. G. (2005). Integrating Rigor and Relevance in Public Administration Scholarship: The Contribution of Narrative Inquiry. Public Administration Review, 65(3), 286–300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00454.x

Dryzek, J. S. (2000). Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations. Oxford University Press.

Dryzek, J. S. (2010). Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative Governance. Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and social change. Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.

Fiori, S. (2011). Forms of Bounded Rationality: The Reception and Redefinition of Herbert A. Simon's Perspective. Review of Political Economy, 23(4), 587-612. https://doi.org/10.1080/09538259.2011.611624

Fisch, M. (2008). Taking the Linguistic Turn Seriously. The European Legacy, 13(5), 605-622. https://doi.org/10.1080/10848770802268790

Fischer, F. (2003). Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices. Oxford University Press.

Fischer, F., & Forester, J. (1993). The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning. Duke University Press.

Fischer, F., & Gottweis, H. (Eds.). (2012). The argumentative turn revisited: Public policy as communicative practice. Duke University Press.

Forester, J. (1999). The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes. MIT Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge. Pantheon Books.

Gong, T. (2003). More than Mere Words, Less than Hard Law: A Rhetorical Analysis of China'S Anti-Corruption Policy. Public Administration Quarterly, 27(2), 159–187. https://doi.org/10.1177/073491490302700204

Hood, C. (1998). The art of the state: Culture, rhetoric, and public management. Clarendon Press.

Jung, T., Scott, T., Davies, H. T. O., Bower, P., Whalley, D., McNally, R., & Mannion, R. (2009). Instruments for Exploring Organizational Culture: A Review of the literature. Public Administration Review, 69(6), 1087–1096. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2009.02066.x

Maiello, A. (2014). The Organizational View of Public Participation: A Narrative Analysis. Syst Pract Action Res, 27, 499–522. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11213-013-9292-x

Menzel, D. C. (2015). Research on Ethics and Integrity in Public Administration: Moving forward, looking back.

Public Integrity, 17(4), 343–370. https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2015.1060824

Molina, A. D. (2009). Values in public administration: the role of organizational culture. International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior, 12(2), 266–279. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijotb-12-02-2009-b007

Ospina, S. M., & Dodge, J. (2005). It's about time: Catching Method Up to Meaning-The Usefulness of Narrative Inquiry in Public Administration Research. Public Administration Review, 65(2), 143–157. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00440.x

Paile, M. (2018). Linguistic Turns in Public Administration: Knowledge and Social Practices. Journal of Public Administration, 53(1), 5-23. https://doi.org/10.10520/EJC-114f7f2573

Plant, J. F. (2018). Responsibility in public administration ethics. Public Integrity, 20(sup1), S33–S45. https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2017.1413927

Raphael, D. M., & Nesbary, D. (2005). Getting the message across: Rationale for a Strategic Communications course in the Public Administration curriculum. Journal of Public Affairs Education, 11(2), 133–146. https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2005.12001386

Rice, M. F. (2004). Organizational Culture, Social Equity, and Diversity: Teaching Public Administration Education in the Postmodern era. Journal of Public Affairs Education, 10(2), 143–154. https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2004.12001354

Roberts, A. (2020). Should we defend the administrative state? Public Administration Review, 80(3), 391–401. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13185

Rorty, R. (1967). The linguistic turn: Essays in philosophical method. University of Chicago Press.

Schön, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.

Schön, D. A., & Rein, M. (1994). Frame reflection: Toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies. Basic Books.

Simon, H. A. (1947). Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organization. Free Press.

Simon, H.A. (1990). Bounded Rationality. In: Eatwell, J., Milgate, M., Newman, P. (eds) Utility and Probability (pp 15-18). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-20568-4_5

Stillman, R. (2020). Dwight Waldo: Administrative Theorist for our Times. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429423154

Surkis, J. (2012). When was the linguistic turn? A genealogy. The American Historical Review, 117(3), 700–722. https://doi.org/10.1086/ahr.117.3.700

Trochmann, M. B., Viswanath, S., Puello, S., & Larson, S. J. (2021). Resistance or reinforcement? A critical discourse analysis of racism and anti-Blackness in public administration scholarship. Administrative Theory & Praxis, 44(2), 158–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2021.1918990

Vickers, M. H. (2012). A rhetorical portrayal of the sham face of organizational support. Administrative Theory & Praxis, 34(4), 533–556. https://doi.org/10.2753/atp1084-1806340402

Waldo, D. (2007). The administrative state: A study of the political theory of American public administration. Routledge.

Wallmeier, F., Helmig, B., & Feeney, M. K. (2018). Knowledge Construction in Public Administration: A Discourse Analysis of Public Value. Public Administration Review, 79(4), 488–499. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13005

Winton, S. (2013). Rhetorical analysis in critical policy research. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26(2), 158–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2012.666288

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). Philosophical investigations. Basil Blackwell.