

Article

Global IWRM Ideas and Local Context: Studying Narratives in Rural Cambodia

Ching Leong¹, and Farhad Mukhtarov²

¹ Co-Director, Institute of Water Policy, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore. spplcc@nus.edu.sg. 469A Bukit Timah Road, Tower Block, Level 2, #02-03A, Singapore 259770. 65-92719693. Corresponding author.

² Assistant Professor, International Institute of Social Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands, mukhtarov@iss.nl; Adjunct Senior Research Fellow at Institute of Water Policy, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore, sppfarh@nus.edu.sg.

Abstract: This article investigates how the “constructivist turn” in public policy and international political economy informs the interaction of global ideas and local practice in water governance. We use the implementation of ideas associated with Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) in the Lower Mekong river basin. This article provides some explanation of the attitudes in the villages in Cambodia due to the Sesan 2 Dam, which would see the relocation of thousands of people, damage fisheries, and inflict high coping costs on villagers. Based on 24 in-depth interviews with villagers, commune heads and local community leaders, we find diverse narratives which transcend the “pro or anti” dam narrative. We find four narrative types - myths, stories, noise and informed opinion, which relate to each other in degrees of social meaning and ideational force. Of these, the first two are more likely to be useful in terms of mobilization and policy-making. This typology provides a framework for analysis of social change in the studied villages and other context of policy translation. We should state that these four types are not separate from each other but are linked along two axis which together conscribe the four types of narratives outlined.

Keywords: dam, local communities, lived experiences, environmental narratives, Cambodia

1. Introduction

A prominent paradox in global water resources governance is the dichotomy between two concepts of “integrated water resources management” (IWRM). This dichotomy is especially pronounced in the Mekong River Basin, where on one hand, large dams are proposed and being built, often in the name of integrated management of water, land and energy. This results in people being evicted from their ancestral land and resettled within a developmental discourse; on the other, the Mekong River Commission as well as individual member-states have worked to emphasize the need for water and food security, which are threatened by the dams, and to promote IWRM in the region [1,2].

Many riparian countries have drawn up IWRM plans, with commitments to the protection of the environment [3]. At the same time, they continue to regard economic development and the prosperity of their peoples as being vital. There is a need therefore to understand how these two discourses, and the practices they sanction, co-exist in the Mekong region at the national and local levels. We do so in the case of a dam site in rural Cambodia where the global discourses of development and environmental preservation meet the local realities.

Theoretically, we build on the idea of “contact zones” as used in post-colonial studies [4,5]. Pratt [4] defines “contact zones” as “social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths...”. According to her, the “asymmetries of power” and crude force do not explain fully

the variegated experiences of the interaction between various ways of knowing and being, and are not determinant of the ensuing social order.

For us, various sites where international discourses, ideas, and capital come in contact with national and local discourses, values, and ways of being to constitute the “contact zones” and the body of literature in policy studies which studies policy mobility and translations can be of use in making sense of these “contact zones” and the nature of interaction in certain sites [6-8]. What is special in such a relationship is the “interactive, improvisational character of colonial encounters so easily ignored or suppressed by diffusionist accounts of conquest and domination” [4] (p. 4). The contingent, often unexpected and variegated ways in which the global meets the local in the context of IWRM is what interests us in this article.

As Benson and Jordan [9] mentioned, such emergent and fluid view of “policy in the making” is at odds with more conventional and formulaic approaches of policy design, policy implementation or theories of policy diffusion, policy transfer and learning [9-11]. Instead, “policy mobility and translation” as an approach in policy studies, looks at policy movement in a manner that resists attempts to theorize it through various macro-level structures and explanations, and views the ensuing policy process as a micro-political process which is context specific, interactive, improvisational and contingent [8,12,13]. The ideas of policy translation and “contact zones” provide us with the conceptual tools to make sense of how the global and the local interact, and to argue that narratives may be a well-suited tool to understand such interactions.

We draw from a constructivist view of international political economy (IPE), especially in the form offered by Abdelal, Blyth and Parsons [14]. As they contend, “(t)he central insight of constructivism is that collectively held ideas shape the social, economic, and political world in which we live” [14]. In charting their notion of a constructivist IPE, the authors propose four paths to consider. These are a) the path of meaning; b) the path of cognition; c) the path of subjectivity; and d) the path of uncertainty. We build on these four categories of a constructivist IPE in order to offer an account of how international policy discourses and material interests manifest themselves on the ground and make impact in the Mekong region. More specifically, we bring in a case study of the Sesun 2 Dam in Cambodia in order to illustrate our key points and offer a view on how IPE may relate to public policy in the case of the environment.

Our paper is organized as follows, Section 2 presents our treatment of approaches to study how the global and the local intersect, and introduces a discussion of policy translation, “contact zones” and a significant modification of the four paths of a constructivist IPE advanced by Abdelal et al. [14] – from four distinct types into a two-by-two matrix, which sees each type in relation to the others, as well as a continuum of pairs. Here we present our framework for studying the “contact zones”, and a discussion of our methodological choices of ethnographically informed “lived experiences”. In Section 3 we introduce our case study in rural Cambodia where the Sesun 2 Dam has been proposed. Section 4 presents our analysis and discussion of data from interviews with the villagers on the way they experience the global ideas on the ground. Finally, Section 5 summarizes and concludes the paper.

2. The March of Constructivism in Politics

In this section we discuss how constructivist ideas have shaped both public policy studies and IPE in the recent decades. Our goal is to provide some similarities in the way one may approach these two disciplines which are usually discussed separately and have conventionally been homes to communities which rarely intersect. We first discuss interpretive policy analysis and especially the role of narrative analysis in it, and then move on to discuss the constructivist notions of IPE.

2.1 Interpretive Policy Studies and Narratives

The interaction between constructivism and policy studies have been growing over the past decade [15-19]. In empirical investigations, these have ranged from regulation [20], to poverty [21], the role of science in public policy [22] and water management [23-27]. Since the early 2000s, there are also a number of key volumes which define and clearly distinguish interpretive policy analysis from other forms of policy analysis, such as Deborah Stone's "Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision-Making" [28], Frank Fischer's "Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices" [29], and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea and Dvora Yanow's "Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes" [30].

Arguments for constructivism within policy studies can be examined in two broad strands. First, the epistemological critique which takes issue with the fact that the only legitimate units of analyses in the production of knowledge are limited to observable behavior [31-34]. For these scholars, the positivist, empirical-scientific conception of the policy sciences fails to give a good account of what goes on in government and public policy more broadly [35]. For example, Dryzek observes that "generalization in social science is a chimera, as all situations are different" [35] (p. 310). He and other advocates of interpretive policy analysis suggest that we should look instead to interpretation and perceptions of a constructed reality in the process of policy making [30]. The "interpretive turn" in social sciences in the late 1970s and 1980s [36] was soon joined by others who argue for a hermeneutic approach to social sciences [37].

This approach prioritizes attention that an analyst gives to a policy narrative. Proponents of the narrative approach recognize that information is transformed both in its production and its use, that is to say, how people construct and communicate reality [37-39]. A field of narrative policy analysis has indeed been in formation since the publication of Roe's book [40] on the subject. Furthermore, Feldman et al. [15] speak about how narrative analysis benefits the study of public administration by allowing researchers to examine the "unstated, implicit understandings that underlie the stories people tell" (p. 147).

From the lens of these scholars of narratives, reality is a composite of empirical facts, values and other factors such as history, emotions and social context; all coalescing into a policy story. From this, we infer that a change in narrative would be a push towards policy change, or at least accompanies such a change.

The second strand of scholarly attention concerns itself with the notion of objectivity in constructivism. Ricouer [41] says that a narrative has an objective meaning that can be "constructed in various ways." He notes that, in a public discourse, the problems of right understanding can no longer be solved by a simple return to the alleged intention of the author [41] but must be construed by a process. "A text has to be construed because it is not a mere sequence of sentences, all on an equal footing, and separately understandable. A text is a whole, a totality" [41] (p. 158).

For Fisher, a collection of such understandings qualifies as "knowledge" which he thinks ought to be expanded "beyond the narrow confines of observational statements and logical proof to include an understanding of the ways people are embedded in the wider social contexts of situation and society" [42] (p. 179). Understanding policy change therefore requires us to take a thick description approach to depicting reality [43]. Fisher [42] (p. 108) furthermore writes: "(t)he key to explaining how change comes about has to be grounded in a detailed contextual examination of the circumstances at play in specific cases. For this purpose, quantitative methods have to take a back seat to qualitative research." This follows the broad field of "interpretive policy analysis" advocated by such thinkers as Yanow [19] and Schwartz-Shea and Yanow [30].

Further to this epistemological thread, Lejano & Ingram [44] argued that narratives form new knowledge, which is different from the objective, value-neutral paradigm of scientific knowledge, but not divorced from it. Such "narrative knowledge" [44] (p. 62) is produced whenever we translate

complex, technical or scientific knowledge into everyday ways of knowing – integrated with our beliefs, emotions, history and identities into a coherent and meaningful whole [45,46].

2.2. Interpretive turn and International Political Economy

The interpretive turn has also reached IPE which concerns itself with global issues. The constructivist notion of IPE has been developed to oppose material interests and political power as the major, non-exclusive, explanatory frameworks for international politics and global world order. Among many proponents of taking ideas, norms and discourses seriously in IPE, Barnett and Finnemore [47-49], and more recently Blyth [50] and Abdelal et al. [14] have argued for change in theoretical approaches.

Abdelal et al. [14] outlined four paths that such scholars may follow – the path of meaning, cognition, subjectivity and uncertainty. First, the path of meaning which calls attention to the politics of knowledge, and how policy actors construct meaning in the process of appropriating international discourses within a particular geographic or political locale. Notably, the view of international norms have emerged as key to this approach to political economy as “international norms define the boundaries of choice and thereby affect how societies, policymakers, and market participants discern the meaning of various policy stances” [14] (p. 9).

This type of research looks into how international organizations set norms to member-states and by this means define the boundaries of what is legitimate [47]. It also looks at how international organizations become “norms entrepreneurs” by pushing particular meanings on states and non-state actors, most notably, Transparency International and Freedom House rankings in pressuring states to fight corruption and institute “good governance” [51]. Framing the politics of norms and discursive contestations around the notion of legitimacy are all parts of this type of analysis [14] (p. 16).

The second is path of cognition which calls attention to the taken-for-granted assumptions in policy design and implementation, but also challenges the dominant role of rational choice and technocratic measures in decision-making [52]. Here, scholars are interested in extra-cognitive influences on the way humans construct their worlds, assign meanings to social processes and make policies as a result. This literature looks at the role of emotions, values, affect, and performativity [53,54], and is a growing strand in interpretive policy analysis, which may also be applied to IPE in this regard.

The third is the path of subjectivity, which stresses the importance of the structures and forms that allow for pluralism and multiple ways of knowing in discussing what counts for “reality” and “truth”. Here, the major attention is drawn to how international discourses are created to constitute actors and define what is “thinkable” or not [14] (p.14). A good example is Epstein’s [55] analysis of the anti-whaling regime, which managed to persist in the presence of scientific data that whales are not endangered and could be safely hunted. Thus, there is a dialectic relationship between agency and structure in this type of work, agents work on defining norms and discourses, which once they become dominant, constitute agents and their preferences, which in turn “reproduce or incrementally shift structures” [14] (p.14).

Finally, the fourth is the path of uncertainty and unpredictability of policy, and the basic dilemma it poses – how can institutional design happen in the face of inherent unpredictability and contextual sensitivity of social practices? In this strand, the very notion of social reality is cast as emergent and contingent. In economic research, Keynes [56] was among the first to argue that the world is too complex for economic models to have the predictive power, and in IPE such scholars as Blyth [57,58] have taken these ideas further. As we will see in the next subsection, this is one of the key tenets of the “policy mobility and translation” school of public policy.

Drawing on these four paths, researchers of constructivist IPE reconceive how international developments take place [14,30]. Here, neither structure nor agency are privileged, but the dialectical relationship between the two illuminates the on-going process of contestation and fixings of ontologies (or reality). The result of our theoretical expositions is a typological modification of Abdelal et al. [14] in relation to the “contact zones” to fit it to our field explorations.

2.3 Analytical Matrix for Exploring the Global and the Local

In this, we conceive of the four paths of constructivism as two pairs along two continuums rather than four isolated types. First, within our narrative framework, one pair of contrast is between meaning and subjectivity. Meaning, we conceive of as essentially social, where the meaning is established by its relationship to others. This idea takes bearing from Saussure [59] where language is the result of a link between a signifier (words or images) with a signified (i.e., the concept). There is no “value” or specific meaning resulting from the mere linking of signifier and signified; instead meaning only emerges in relationships with other signs in the language-system. Hence, narratives are said to be meaningful in relationship to other narratives held by people in the community [44]. This stands in contrast to a subjective, a solipsistic conception of what the person feels without reference to social conditions, or others in the community.

Statements in the latter tend to be self-referential. The other pair of paths is an uncertainty and cognition continuum – high cognition means informative statements that weave different empirical facts together in a coherent whole and display high understanding of state of affairs. Uncertainty is the opposite – characterized by many doubts, gaps in knowledge, fears, or emotional reactions that may not be warranted by the objective state of affairs.

With this, we construct a simple matrix – on the horizontal axis, an ideational force with which the “reality” is constructed through the prominent discourses, and where narratives have either strong or weak power of persuasion. On the vertical axis, the degree of social meanings, of how subjects make sense of the changing role of water, hydropower and the impact of dams. Here “meaning” captures the collective nature of social meanings or ways of knowing, and “subjectivity” captures the phenomenological aspect of our interest – the lived experience of farmers and local communities.

In attempting to understand how various agents construct the narratives around the dam, we will tease out the differences along those two axes. In the next section, we discuss the case study site in rural Cambodia, the policy proposal to build a dam on the tributary to the Mekong river, and our methodological choices in this study. The conceptual framework we have suggested above would come together with the empirical data outlined in section 3 and inform our major discussion below in Section 4.

3. Case Study and Methodological Choices: Sesun 2 Dam in Cambodia

Cambodia’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita has tripled between 1999 and 2013. Along with this growth, comes rising demand for electricity – at the rate of 17.9% annually from 2012 to 2020. Cambodia is projected to grow to nearly 16 million within the next few years, with 80% of the population living in rural areas. The country’s capital Phnom Penh consumes 90% of its total electricity [60].

Currently, most of Cambodia’s electricity demand is met by imported electricity from Vietnam, Thailand and Laos, as well as locally-produced oil generators. High reliance on imported fossil fuels and electricity, lack of electricity in rural regions, and escalating energy demands are challenges being faced by the Cambodian government. Against such a backdrop, hydropower projects appear attractive as a means of producing clean energy while catering to the overall economic development of the region. About 80% of over 60 million people living along the Lower Mekong Basin rely on the

river for livelihood, food, socio-economic activities and other ecological services. The lower Mekong River includes Sesan and Srepok, two tributaries of the Mekong.

Our research site is along the Sesan River which flows through Central Vietnam and northeast Cambodia, in the province of Stung Treng. In November 2012, a 400-megawatt dam, the Lower Sesan 2 (LS2) dam project, was started with an investment of US\$816 million. The company is formed with a majority stake from China's Hydrolancang International Energy and Cambodia's Royal Group. Most of the electricity will be sold to state energy provider Electricite Du Cambodge (EDC) or exported to Vietnam under a 40-year contract [61].

A 2012 study [62] by US and Cambodian researchers estimated that the dam, once constructed, will deplete fish biomass (due to fish migration blockage) in both Sesan and Sreypok, by more than 9%. Experts have also warned that the LS2 dam might significantly change the hydrology of Mekong River and Cambodia's Tonle Sap Lake, while diminishing sediment flows to the Mekong Delta.

The Rivers Coalition in Cambodia, a group of NGOs, have reported the dam reservoir is set to flood more than 30,000 hectares, most of which is forest area including some 1,200 hectares of community farmland and housings. As a result, illegal logging in the affected forests has significantly gone up. A few active NGOs in Cambodia have challenged the government's evaluations of the complications arising from the LS2. They have argued for more open discussions between the government and civil society groups, including non-government organizations and civic leaders [60].

The 2009 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) shows that the dam project will displace nearly 5000 villagers in about 1100 households from seven villages in four communes. However, the 2009 report points out that the impacts might be much worse than predicted in the EIA. Villagers who live along the Sesan and Srepok Rivers upstream of the LS2 as well as 87 villages of the tributaries of the two rivers, will lose access to migratory fish. The same research also found that over 22,000 villagers living downstream from LS2 would be negatively impacted as a result of changes in river hydrology and water quality [61]. The 24 villagers interviewed come from three affected villages (Sreh Kor 2, Plork, and Kbal Romeas, where Sreh Kor 2 upstream and Kbal Rormeas being downstream). The interviews were conducted over three days, from August 11 to 13, 2015. The three villages shared the following characteristics – there were many medium income households (except for Sreh Kor village where households appear to be more well off than the rest of the villages). All the villagers were highly dependent on river water for both drinking and daily usage. The villagers typically worked as rice farmers, non-rice farmers, and fishermen. Importantly for our study of constructivism and narratives, the households are situated near to one another so that the flow of information is good and community meetings are frequent. We have not pursued a comparison across villages and did not therefore code utterances by interviewees in accordance with the village they come from. While the names of the interviewees are known to authors, because of requested anonymity we do not provide any references to the authors of quotes. Instead, we categorise these quotes in the four categories we have devised and count these in order to understand the comparative spread of these types in our sample.

The lived experience method was operationalized with interview guide along three themes, namely (1) Everyday Use of Mekong River, (2) Hydropower Dam and (3) Perceived Participation. The breakdown of interviews in Sreh Kor 2 (August 11, 2015), Plork (August 12, 2015), and Kbal Ror Meas (August 13, 2015) is as in Table 1.

Table 1. The Matrix of Social Construction of IPE. Based on Abdelal et al. [14]

<p>I feel afraid, that life will be more difficult. When they construct the dam, they will close the big river and they will create the new small one. I forgot how I got this information</p> <p>Q1 (Myths)</p>	<p>I worry a lot. I am afraid that when we go to new land, it won't be as good as the old place. Second, I am afraid that the land cannot be farmed. I do not know that kind of land. We grow rice, we harvest rice. We plant fruits, we collect fruits. We worry. New land is not the same as old land</p> <p>Q2 (Stories)</p>	<p>Meaning</p>	<p>Degrees of Social Meaning</p>
<p>The river gives us fish and water. As water is unclear, we have to adapt to that.</p> <p>Q3 (Noise)</p>	<p>Yes, there are benefits. I think we cannot win (to stop the dam). They (NGOs) can just explain things to us. We understand but we cannot do anything. We protested several times, but they do not care about us. They do not "take their ear" to listen and they walk away.</p> <p>Q4 (Informed Opinions)</p>		
<p>Uncertainty</p>	<p>Cognition</p>		
<p>Ideational Force</p>			

We base our research on the method of "lived experiences", which has its roots in ethnographic methodology and phenomenology [63]. We are interested in the storylines that local residents have with regard to resettlement (e.g. Rousseau [64]) Here we are not interested in gaining information from our research subjects based on the concepts or codes which we have designed a priori, but allow for those ideas to emerge from the fieldwork, in terms and meanings experienced and formed by the researched themselves [44]. This is closely related to ethnography as a research methodology [65]. Ethnography can be defined as "a family of methods involving direct and sustained social contact with agents, and of richly writing up the encounter, respecting, recording, and representing at least partly in its own terms, the irreducibility of human experience" [66] (p.5). Narrative is a unit of analysis in this research as it allows to understand the reasoning of people which may otherwise appear senseless or difficult to explain [67].

The contemporary forms of ethnography have been called "ethnography-lite" as the world is increasingly inter-related and on the move [7,68] Kubik [69] speaks of "ethnographic sensitivities" where ethnography is global and multi-sited. We follow in the steps of these scholars, but limit ourselves to the "lived experiences" at the local level for this study. As our major point with this article is to discuss how IPE and public policy inform each other through the use of narratives and "contact zones", our case has an illustrative power.

With regard to how we operationalised this method, we do not claim that each statement constitutes a "narrative" but rather how such a statement, together with other similar, stands for a certain narrative type. Of course, individuals can hold beliefs across different narrative types, and such beliefs can change over time; and indeed, the momentum and pervasiveness of such beliefs have great impact on how local narratives regarding development and dams are constructed.

A more detailed multi-sited ethnography and policy interviews with other actors involved in the construction of Sesun 2 Dam as well as the stakeholders at the national and transnational levels would be useful for an extensive “political ethnography” of this project. This, unfortunately, is beyond the scope of this article.

4. Discussion: Narrative Types

As a result of coding the interview transcripts, we identified four categories present in the field: “myths”, “stories”, “informed opinions”, and “noise”. Each category has attributes which vary across two scales: the extent to which a narrative is shared among community members, and an extent to which it is consistent and coherent as well as powerful in making a point. We discuss each of these categories below with quotes from the transcripts.

4.1 Noise

On the weaker end, noise is what we call fragmented narratives, uncertain in factual origin and not embedded in any social norm or view. They are often transient and uncertain in origin and emotional in content. Narratives here are often not fully formed. Here are a few examples of noise from our fieldwork site:

“This is because, I also don’t know, but I heard from others that it is because they construct a dam at the end of the river”

“I don’t know what to do next. I don’t really have experience what to do besides doing farming and raising fish”

“We have no fish anymore, so what should we do? That’s why we should raise the fish. I have no experience, but I have to learn. If everyone raises, I will follow them”

“So, we do not dare to say if their suggestion (proposing compensation) is cheap or expensive. We do not want to leave our home. Our house is not cheap to build. Who wants to leave? Even if you have a boat, do you think you can take me and my husband? No, you cannot take us. We cannot live on the river. Only Yuon (Vietnamese) build houseboats to live on water. We cannot. Khmer and minority do not build house on water (river, lake)”.

These quotations indicate much confusion and fragmentation in terms of bits and pieces of information, often invalidated, which are not yet well shaped into a narrative, of such a narrative is, these are fragmented and poorly articulated.

4.2 Myths

Myths are powerful, but they may lack full grounding in fact. They end to appear in situations when information is scarce, and no clear communication is provided. In our case, they occur in a number of areas, such as resettlement, water quality for drinking, fishing and the possibility of markets opening up in places with hitherto available water. Below are some quotes from our interviews which indicate that such myths lack clarity and are shared among multiple actors. Here it is important to note that we use the term “myth” in order to signify a story which does not rely on factual information but is told in a cohesive manner nevertheless. We realize that the study of myths in social sciences is rich in various approaches (e.g. de Guevara, [70]), and qualify our use of the term “myth” in that particular fashion.

“Water is public use since it is available all the time so there is no complaint about the shortage of water and we also do not have to buy it. But the quality of water from the river is not good because there is Yali dam construction in Vietnam. The quality of water has changed since 2001.

In the beginning, I didn't know the dam project but just noticed that during dry season water levels had suddenly dropped and boats disappeared. Before 1999, people could use water for direct drinking but now we have to boil it."

The passage above shows that the resident has made sense of the change and has a cause-effect model to link the dam with adverse effects on water quality and quantity. However, there is much uncertainty about the future and possible ways to deal with the situation.

Another example of a myth-like statement is this: "I am afraid that life will be more difficult. When they construct the dam, they will close the big river and they will create only the new small one. I forgot how I got this information".

This quotation from an interview with a farmer indicates that there is little clarity, and gaps in information in terms of the future plans of the government and possible impacts of these on the river. In such uncertainty, multiple narratives and myths appear.

The following two passages further illustrate little certainty about the future, and thus confusion among people who are not sure whom to believe or what to expect. Such uncertainty is unsettling and does not contribute to trust in government or between citizens.

"According to them (government officials), not much land will be flooded. But those who campaign against the dam says there will be a big flood. It is hard to decide. People say that the waters will reach a height of 5 meters. If so, it will flood the house. Others say water will not reach 5 meters."

"I don't know. I'm just worried that water will be contaminated and there will be lack of water. Now the dam is still opened, but if it is blocked, the tree branches or its roots will be rotten and drop to the river that will be hard to consume. That is the point."

4.3 *Informed Opinions*

Opinions have a stronger footing in fact. However, there is little sense of a shared understanding, or of looking at interests in a collective manner. Here are some examples of informed opinions of farmers and villagers. These are much better articulated than the myths or noise, but are not widely shared as stories are. They are pronounced from a singular perspective and have consistency and clarity to their narrative.

"I used to join the meeting twice with the dam representative. And I try to raise the issue, but the price is still kept the same as original. The chief of the village has also complained to the provincial department, but they still use the original plan."

"To my family, this Sur San River provides a lot of benefits to me. Along the river side, the vegetable is plentiful there. The fish is also available. The environment is clean as well. In contrast, it has been changing now."

"I did not get it. People who live at the down side there is no compensation. However, for those live at the upstream side they had. three persons from the upstream dam didn't get compensation yet. I also have land there, but it is far from dam."

"To me, people should negotiate through the local authority because they are more powerful and because they have meetings, public forum. When they say in this meeting, their suggestions will be recorded in the minutes of meeting. They, most of the time, complain the company through organizations. The company makes excuse that people are against the development project. The company is careless with the people. Right?"

4.4 Stories

Unlike myths and noise, stories are high in cognition and social meaning, and have a strong outward-looking, other-regarding component, rooted as well in different empirical facts which are more established than the case with the myths. Below are a few examples of these.

“The government should bring the compensation book and consult with people (villagers). People should be involved in determining or setting the price of that compensation. This is done in order to know whether people agree or not first”.

“I worry a lot. I am afraid that when go to new land is not good as old place. Second, I am afraid that the land cannot be farmed. I do not know the kind of land. We grow rice, we get rice. We plant any fruits, and we get the results. We worry. New land may not be the same as old land”.

These quotations underpin uncertainty, but with a more articulated position from the respondent in terms of advocacy, what is right or wrong and how they could possibly act upon these. Stories are also riddled with emotions, values and morality claims, for example:

“Advantage is we can have electricity country wide, and even sell it to outside the country. However, we cannot conclude it until there will be result we can see.”

This suggests a lack of trust in government and in people reporting deviant behavior. At the same time, there is a stronger sense of social justice in the statement below:

“I think that river is a property for all, not for people, or government. It is a property for all. We have to help each other to protect the river, like protect not to have illegal fishing, take care of fish. We must cooperate to protect it.”

Stories are the most articulated and widely shared form of narratives and have much in common with advocacy in a sense that they solidify the framing, actors and cause-effect relationships. By such explicit framing, these stories are most likely to gain support of other villagers and develop into a social movement with clear advocacy implications.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we looked at how local populations in three villages in rural Cambodia, namely Sreh, Plark, and Kbal Rormeas have experienced the proposal to build a large hydropower dam in the vicinity of their villages, which reflects the global trend of displacement and increased construction of dams in the South-East Asia often framed in the language of IWRM [71].

The environmental impact assessment showed a number of impacts on their livelihoods, such as the inundation of land, the impact on fisheries and the need for about 2000 people across a number of villages to leave their ancestral lands. With regard to this, we have concerned ourselves with the “lived experiences” of villagers in their everyday life and dependence on the Mekong River.

Theoretically, we have conceptualized these three villages as the sites of “contact zones” where the global push for development comes into contact with the local reality of everyday life and cultivation of rice, fisheries and other economic activities. We are interested in exploring the narratives advanced by our interviewees and making a distinction between strong and weak narratives on one continuum, and confusion and opinion on the other. To help make sense of the narratives from the field, we modified the typology of Abdelal et al. [14] and put forward a 2X2 matrix for classifying narratives.

The four types which we identified are: myths, stories, noise and informed opinion. Of these, the first two are more likely to be useful in terms of mobilization and policy-making, given that the latter then

to be more self-regarding. However, the four quadrants are linked, as narratives evolve from one form to another.

One contribution of our article is to argue that the “four paths: to social construction can be conceived of jointly as part of a simple matrix. We have also used an empirical test to show how narratives in a certain case can fall into each of these quadrants and how the narratives and discourses in each quadrant differ from one another.

We have argued that stories are strong narratives – coherent and with a strong causal progression, with delineated objects and subjects and causes. These also are socially shared and not individually perceived. Myths are moderately strong narratives, but with a less solid grounding in coherence with external, objective factors. Weak narratives are not socially shared and hence lack the strength of persuasion and richness which the strong narratives have. When a respondent has expressed confusion and uncertainty about the situation, often in terms of fear and lack of control, and when such sentiment has been stated for him or her individually, we have coded this as “noise” – a concern which however is not yet developed into a narrative.

When actors have stated their ideas in a more coherent fashion, presenting causal stories which however were not clearly shared among community members, we coded these as “informed opinion”. While the latter may be useful for individual action, the former are poor guides for collective action, for which only strong narratives are useful.

As a result of our study, we found that the anti-dam sentiment among the interviewed villagers is the strongest, and hence gives rise to strong narrative of resistance to the dam and preservation of their land and habitual lifestyles (88 references to this narrative). However, a narrative which we labeled “weak narrative” comes close in its support. It views the building of the dam as inevitable, and encourages villagers to organize in order to achieve a better compensation and future adaptation to changing life conditions. This narrative is common (52 references to it), but it lacks the same symbolic and mobilization power that the anti-dam narrative has, as there are no advocacy groups or NGOs which could strengthen the narrative on behalf of the villagers.

A number of villagers expressed high confusion and helplessness with regard to coming changes (62 references to it), and some others have been clear on how to change things towards better, but not certain if this is achievable (64 references to it). Overall, the two narratives can be discerned from the interviews – a strong “anti-dam” narrative and a weaker “adaptation and accommodation” narrative.

We believe that strong narratives are most visible in the field, but not necessarily the most legitimate, or most widely shared ones. We also believe that many ideas and opinions stated individually have the potential of developing into strong narratives. What we are not able to explain at this stage, however, is what makes this shift possible, from weak narratives to strong ones, and from confusion and opinion to weak and strong narratives. It seems to us that these are based on strong leadership, on the open forum for deliberation and discussion, social capital and trust in a community, and possibly the presence of skilled intermediaries, or translators/narrators, who could add symbolic and political power to narratives by making it richer and more authentic. These are propositions that future researchers could explore.

Acknowledgments: The writers acknowledge the research assistance of Mr Phaloeuk Kong and Ms Tan Ting Yu.

References

1. Dore, J.; Lebel, L.; Molle, F. A framework for analysing transboundary water governance complexes, illustrated in the Mekong Region. *Journal of Hydrology* **2012**, *446*, 23-36, DOI: 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.07.023.

2. Gerlak, A.; Mukhtarov, F. Many Faces of Security: Discursive Framing in Cross-border Natural Resource Governance in the Mekong River Commission. *Globalizations* **2016**, *13*(6), 719-740.
3. Global Water Partnership Annual Report 2009. Available online: https://issuu.com/gwp-publ/docs/gwp_in_action_-_annual_report_2009 (accessed on 11 October 2018)
4. Pratt, M.L. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*; Taylor and Francis: Abingdon, UK, 1992
5. Pratt, M.L. Arts of the Contact Zone. *Profession* **1999**, *91*, 33-40.
6. Blaustein, J. *Speaking Truths to Power: Policy Ethnography and Police Reform in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, 1st ed.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2015.
7. Clarke, J.; Bainton, D.; Lendvai, N.; Stubbs, P. *Making Policy Move: Towards a Politics of Translation and Assemblage*; Policy Press: Cambridge, UK, 2015.
8. Mukhtarov, F. Rethinking the travel of ideas: policy translation in the water sector. *Policy & Politics* **2014**, *42*(1), 71-88.
9. Benson, D.; Jordan, A. Policy transfer research: still evolving, not yet through? *Political studies review* **2012**, *10*(3), 333-338, DOI: 10.1111/j.1478-9302.2012.00273.x.
10. Dolowitz, D. P.; Marsh, D. Learning from abroad: The role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making. *Governance* **2000**, *13*(1), 5-23, DOI: 10.1111/0952-1895.00121.
11. Doblin, F.; Simmons, B.; Garrett, G. The global diffusion of public policies: Social construction, coercion, competition, or learning? *Annual Review of Sociology* **2007**, *33*, 449-472.
12. Freeman, R. Reverb: policy making in wave form. *Environment and Planning A* **2012**, *44*(1), 13-20, DOI: 10.1068/a44177.
13. Mukhtarov, F.; Daniell, K. Diffusion, adaptation and translation of water policy models across countries. In *Oxford Handbook of Water Policy and Politics*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2016.
14. Abdelal, R.; Blyth, M.; Parsons, C. *Constructing the International Economy*; Cornell University Press: Ithaca, N.Y., USA, 2010.
15. Feldman, M. S.; Sköldbberg, K.; Brown, R. N.; Horner, D. Making sense of stories: A rhetorical approach to narrative analysis. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* **2004**, *14*(2), 147-170, DOI: 10.1093/jopart/muh010.
16. Hajer, M. Policy without polity? Policy analysis and the institutional void. *Policy sciences* **2003**, *36*(2), 175-195, DOI: 10.1023/A:1024834510939.
17. Hampton, G. Narrative policy analysis and the integration of public involvement in decision making. *Policy Sciences* **2009**, *42*(3), 227-242, DOI: 10.1007/s11077-009-9087-1.
18. Yanow, D. Silences in public policy discourse: organizational and policy myths. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* **1992**, *2*(4), 299-423.
19. Yanow, D. Interpretation in policy analysis: On methods and practice. *Critical policy analysis* **2007**, *1*(1), 110-122, DOI: 10.1080/19460171.2007.9518511.
20. Bridgman, T.; Barry, D. Regulation is evil: An application of narrative policy analysis to regulatory debate in New Zealand. *Policy Sciences* **2002**, *35*(2), 141-161, DOI: 10.1023/A:1016139804995.
21. Cassiman, S.A. Toward a more inclusive poverty knowledge: Traumatological contributions to the poverty discourse. *The Social Policy Journal* **2006**, *4*(3-4), 93-106, DOI: 10.1300/J185v04n03_06.
22. Garvin, T.; Eyles, J. The sun safety metanarrative: Translating science into public health discourse. *Policy Sciences* **1997**, *30*(2), 47-70, DOI: 10.1023/A: 1004256124700.
23. Jeffery, P.; Seaton, R.A.F. A Conceptual Model of 'Receptivity' Applied to the Design and Deployment of Water Policy Mechanisms. *Environmental Sciences* **2004**, *1*(3), 277-300, DOI: 10.1080/15693430412331291661.
24. Moss, T.; Newig, J. Multilevel water governance and problems of scale: Setting the stage for a broader debate. *Environmental Management* **2010**, *46*(1), 1-6, DOI: 10.1007/s00267-010-9531-1.
25. Mukhtarov, F.; Cherp, A. The hegemony of integrated water resources management as a global water discourse. In *River Basin Management in the Twenty-First Century*, Squires, V. R., Milner, H. M., Daniell, K. A., Eds; CRC Press: USA, 2014
26. Newig, J.; Pahl-Wostl, C.; Sigel, K. The role of public participation in managing uncertainty in the implementation of the Water Framework Directive. *European Environment* **2005**, *15*(6), 333-343, DOI: 10.1002/eet.398.
27. Trottier, J. Water crises: Political construction or physical reality? *Contemporary Politics* **2008**, *14*(2), 197-214, DOI: 10.1080/13569770802176929.

28. Stone, D. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*, 3rd ed.; W. W. Norton & Company: New York, USA, 2001.
29. Fischer, F. *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2003.
30. Schwartz-Shea, P.; & Yanow, D. *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*; Routledge: London, UK, 2012.
31. Banfield, E. *The unheavenly city: The nature and future of our urban crisis*; Little Brown and Company: Boston, USA, 1970.
32. Fischer, F. *Politics, Values, and Public Policy: The Problem of Methodology*; Westview Press: Boulder, Colo, USA, 1980.
33. Moynihan, D. P. The professionalization of reform. *The Public Interest* **1965**, 6-16.
34. Schuman, D. *Policy Analysis, Education, and Everyday Life: An Empirical Reevaluation of Higher Education in America*; D. C. Heath: USA, 1982.
35. Dryzek, J. Policy analysis as a hermeneutic activity. *Policy Sciences* **1982**, *14*(4), 309-329, DOI: 10.1007/BF00137394.
36. Rabinow P.; Sullivan, W. M. *Interpretive Social Science*, 1st and 2nd eds.; University of California Press: California, USA, 1979, 1985.
37. Lejano, R. P.; Leong, C. A Hermeneutic Approach to Explaining and Understanding Public Controversies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* **2012**, *22*(4), 793-814, DOI: 10.1093/jopart/mus001.
38. Guba, E. G.; Lincoln, Y. S. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In *Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. Handbook of qualitative research*; SAGE Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 1994; 2(163-194), pp. 105-117.
39. Lin, D. An information-theoretic definition of similarity. *ICML* **1998**, *98*, 296-304.
40. Roe, E. *Narrative policy analysis: theory and practice*; Duke University Press: Durham, NC, USA, 1994.
41. Ricoeur, P. The model of the text: Meaningful action considered as a text. *New Literary History* **1973**, *5*(1), 91-117.
42. Fisher, R. J. Social desirability bias and the validity of indirect questioning. *Journal of consumer research* **1993**, *20*(2), 303-315, DOI: 10.1086/209351.
43. Geertz, C. *The Interpretation of Cultures*; Basic Books: New York, USA, 1973.
44. Lejano, R. P.; Ingram, H. Collaborative networks and new ways of knowing. *Environmental Science and Policy* **2009**, *12*(6), 654-662, DOI: 10.1016/j.envsci.2008.09.005.
45. Polkinghorne, D. *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*; State University of New York Press: Albany, USA. 1988.
46. Sandelowski, M. Telling stories: Narrative approaches in qualitative research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* **1991**, *23*(3), 161-166, DOI: 10.1111/j.1547-5069.1991.tb00662.x.
47. Barnett, M.; Finnemore, M. *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*; Cornell University Press: Ithaca, N.Y., USA, 2004.
48. Finnemore, M. *National Interests in International Society*; Cornell University Press: Ithaca, N.Y., USA, 1996.
49. Katzenstein, P. *The Culture of National Security*; Columbia University Press: New York, USA, 1996.
50. Blyth, M. Structures do not come with an Instruction Sheet: Interests, Ideas and Progress in Political Science. *Perspectives on Politics* **2003**, *1*(4), 695-703, DOI: 10.1017/S1537592703000471
51. Cox, R. *Ethics and Integrity in Public Administration: Concepts and Cases*; Routledge: London, UK, 2009.
52. Kahneman, D.; Slovic, P.; Tversky, A. *Judgement Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1982.
53. Mukhtarov, F.; Gerlak, A. K. Epistemic forms of integrated water resources management: towards knowledge versatility. *Policy Sciences* **2014**, *47*(2), 101-120, DOI: 10.1007/s11077-013-9193-y
54. Schneider, A.; Ingram, H. Ways of Knowing: Implications for Public Policy. Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, USA, 2007.
55. Epstein, C. Moby Dick or Moby Doll? Discourse, or How to Study the "Social Construction of" All the Way Down. In *Constructing the International Economy*; Abdelal, R., Blyth, M., Parsons, C., Eds; Cornell University Press: Ithaca, USA, 2010, pp. 175-194.
56. Keynes, J. M. The general theory of employment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **1937**, *51*(2), 209-223.
57. Blyth, M. Great Punctuations: Prediction, Randomness, and the Evolution of Comparative Political Science. *American Political Science Review* **2006**, *100*, 493-498, DOI: 10.1017/S0003055406137569.

58. Blyth, M. Powering, Puzzling, or Persuading? The Mechanisms of Building Institutional Orders. *International Studies Quarterly* **2007**, *51*(4), 761-777, DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2478.2007.00475.x.
59. Saussure, F. d. *Cours in General Linguistics*; Philosophical Library: New York, USA, 1959.
60. Rethinking Hydropower: Reflections on the Lower Sesan 2 Dam. The Greater Mekong Blog. Available online: <https://wle-mekong.cgiar.org/rethinking-hydropower-reflections-on-the-lower-sesan-2-dam/> (accessed on 11 October 2018)
61. Fact Sheet: Lower Sesan 2 Hydropower Project, Northeastern Cambodia. Available online: http://www.mekongwatch.org/PDF/LS2_FactSheet_ENG_20151110.pdf (accessed on 11 October 2018)
62. Ziv, G.; Baran, E.; Nam, S.; Rodríguez-Iturbe, I.; Levin, S. A. Trading-off fish biodiversity, food security, and hydropower in the Mekong River Basin, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2012, *109*(15), 5609-5614, DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1201423109
63. Morvant-Roux, S.; Guerin, I.; Roesch, M.; Moisseron, J.Y. Adding value to randomization with qualitative analysis: the case of microcredit in rural Morocco. *World Development* **2014**, *56*, 302-312, DOI: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.03.002
64. Rousseau, J.F.; Orange, D.; Habich-Sobiergala, S.; Van Thiet, N. Socialist hydropower governances compared: dams and resettlement as experienced by Dai and Thai societies from the Sino-Vietnamese borderlands. *Regional Environmental Change* **2017**, *17*(8), 2409-2419, DOI: 10.1007/s10113-017-1170-0.
65. Pachirat, T. The Political in Political Ethnography: Dispatches From the Kill Floor. In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*; Schatz, E., Ed.; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, USA, 2009, pp. 143-162.
66. Willis, P.; Trondman, M. Manifesto for Ethnography. *Ethnography* **2000**, *1*(1), 5-16, DOI: 10.1177/14661380022230679.
67. Levine, J.; Isaeva, A.; Eddy, I.; Foggin, M.; Gergel, S.; Hegerman, S.; Zeriffi, H. A cognitive approach to the post-Soviet Central Asian pasture puzzle: new data from Kyrgyzstan. *Regional Environmental Change* **2017**, *17*, 941-947.
68. Schatz, E. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*; Chicago University Press: Chicago, USA, 2009.
69. Kubik, J. Ethnography of politics: foundations, applications, prospects. In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*; Schatz, Ed; Chicago University Press: Chicago, USA, 2009
70. de Guavara, B. *Myth and Narrative in International Politics*; Palgrave MacMillan: London, 2016.
71. Conca, K. Governing water. *Contentious Transnational Politics and Global Institution Building*; Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Cambridge, London, 2006.