

Book of Panel Abstracts

IPA 2017

Contents Page

Note	Page 4
Panel 1 - Rethinking Future innovative forms of democratic policymaking and political engagement: High-Impact Methods In teaching and learning in the E-Classroom	Page 5
Panel 2 - Left, right or in the middle? At the margins or at the core? Questioning the categorisation of popu-lism	Page 6
Panel 3 - Interpreting institutional change	Page 7
Panel 4 - Transnational Politics of Space: the contribution of critical policy studies	Page 8
Panel 5 - Democracy under stress? Interpreting empirical and conceptual challenges in argumentative policy analysis	Page 9
Panel 6 - Interpreting 'Food Democracy'	Page 10
Panel 7 - Interpreting Modern Slavery	Page 11
Panel 8 - Rethinking 'Researcher' and 'Policymaker' Interactions	Page 12
Panel 9 - Populist activism, welfare state reform and solidarity	Page 13
Panel 10 - Reflecting on technoscience in the age of post-democracy: What are the stakes?	Page 14
Panel 11 - Emergent publics in public policy: seeking opportunities for innovation and decision-making	Page 15
Panel 12 - The Spectre of Populism in Europe: Comparing Populist Currents in European Countries	Page 16
Panel 13 - Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse Theory and Hegemony	Page 17
Panel 14 - The pragmatic approach to the policy process	Page 18
Panel 15 - Populism, agency and the dynamics of collective action in times of crisis	Page 19
Panel 16 - Trusted expert(ise) in populist times	Page 20
Panel 17 - Contested Extractive Frontiers	Page 21
Panel 18 - The instabilities of expertise: power and knowledge in populist times	Page 22
Panel 19 - Reinterpreting activism	Page 23
Panel 20 - Public Policies in Latin America and the Cognitive Approach: Paradigms, Actors and Coalitions	Page 24
Panel 21 - Boundary work in systemic governance transformations to sustainability	Page 25
Panel 22 - "Rethinking Cultural Policy: Power, Politics and Public Contestation"	Page 26
Panel 23 - Innovations in Spatial Planning. Towards the Emergence and Mobility of Novel Approaches in Urban and Regional Planning	Page 27
Panel 24 - Hegemony, Governmentality, and the Trajectory of Democracy Project	Page 28
Panel 25 - Worlds between words. The politics of intra-European movement discourses	Page 29
Panel 26 - Narrativizing institutional crises	Page 30
Panel 27 - Critical Discourse Analysis and Policy	Page 31

Panel 28 - 'Framing the future. Policy change and controversies in uncertain democracies'	Page 32
Panel 29 - Creative City Strategies and Mutations in 'non-Western' contexts – Exploring Policy Trajectories	Page 33
Panel 30 - Intersectionality in Public Policy Making and Analysis	Page 34
Panel 31 - Building issues and mobilising concepts in conflicting policy processes	Page 35
Panel 32 - "Interpretive Teaching and Bringing Critical Participatory Processes into the Classroom"	Page 36
Panel 33 - Activism in liminal spaces: the rise of the 'boundary spanner' in Gypsy/Traveller protest, policy, research and practice.	Page 37
Panel 34 - Transforming the 'local': critical approaches to the study of local government	Page 38
Panel 35 - Achieving integrated food policy: slim pickings or feast of possibilities?	Page 39

Note

Call for Papers – Deadline 17th February 2017

Email: IPAconference2017@dmu.ac.uk

Activism, Populism, and the Future of the Democratic State

There is little doubt that the contemporary condition is marked by a major challenge to accepted values, institutions, styles of policymaking, forms of governance and modes of political engagement. The rise of new political forces and movements has undermined apparently fixed political arrangements (such as the European Union or mainstream political parties), as well as sedimented ideologies and mentalities, such as liberal democracy, globalization or neoliberalism. The global problems of climate change, immigration, wars and uneven economic development have provoked radical movements and activism from the Left and the Right of the spectrum across the globe. They have also bequeathed a series of wicked policy problems of great complexity.

‘Activism’ and ‘populism’, ‘the activist’ and ‘the people’, campaigning and protest, often stand in opposition to the ethos, practices and processes of policy-making and governance. Technocratic appeals to expertise, the hierarchical design of participatory forums, and the coercive dynamics of collaborative spaces have all encouraged the drawing of sharp boundaries between policy, the state and activism. For many observers, these boundaries appear to have hardened, leading to new forms of campaigning and popular protest. Yet, at the same time, the ‘accepted realities’ of activism are also called into question. Different types of activism are increasingly recognised within the state apparatus, which are driven in part by individuals working at the borders of the state and civil society. Equally, innovative forms of co-production are arguably forging new alliances between state institutions and lay experts as shifting coalitions come together to address societal challenges such as climate change, mobility or social cohesion. Indeed, such reflections are challenging traditional models of the academic, calling for new ways of engaging with communities under the banner of the academic-activist.

With these debates in mind, IPA 2017 aims to trigger a dialogue to critically evaluate existing conceptions of activism and populism within the policy process. It seeks to question what we mean by ‘activism’ and ‘activists’, ‘populism’ and ‘the people’, and their impact on governance, policymaking and capitalist democracies in different contexts. It also aims to grapple with the array of public controversies that have recently surfaced in contemporary politics and society, while inquiring into the emergence of alternative visions, imaginaries and policy styles. Here the conference plans to assess the potentialities of innovative forms of democratic policymaking and political engagement in harnessing and channelling the new forces at play.

Call for Papers

The organisers of the 12th international conference on Interpretive Policy Analysis invite proposals for papers. Authors should submit the details of their papers, including an abstract of no more than 300 words, to the conference email at:

IPAconference2017@dmu.ac.uk

Papers should be submitted to one of the named panels (listed below) or to the open section. Panel convenors will review and select papers for their panel. Proposals should include: panel number; paper title; name, role, institutional affiliation and email address; abstract (no more than 300 words).

For general inquiries concerning the conference, please use the conference email: IPAconference2017@dmu.ac.uk.

IPA Conference 2017 organisers

Panel 1: Rethinking Future innovative forms of democratic policymaking and political engagement: High-Impact Methods In teaching and learning in the E-Classroom

Panel Convenor:

Anita Chadha, University of Houston, Downtown, chadhaa@uhd.edu

Panel Proposal:

In line with the focus of the 2017 Interpretive policy conference panel proposals about “innovative forms of democratic policy making and political engagement in harnessing and finding new means of engagement,” this panel proposal is about various means to engage and harness political engagement in the classroom using innovative technological aids. In raising the question whether an interpretive perspective lends itself to - or even demands - a particular style of teaching, I hope to engage three specific questions:

- How does or could thinking interpretively manifest itself in teaching?
- How do or can we try to open critical participatory processes in the classroom?
- How can we teach in ways that recognize the practical and theoretical aspects of the subject taught?

Increasing research is emerging about the use of technological aids to further class goals as educators evaluate how to effectively use these various techno-aids in an ever-changing e-classroom. The goal of the panel is to consider various means of technology in an e-classroom and discuss the use of varied forms of technology that would provide support of differing learning techniques. Based on the 2017 Conference theme embracing research that channels new forms of ‘political’ engagement with the emergence of alternative visions in assessing the potentialities of innovative forms of that engagement, virtual classrooms are a means for that engagement.

Virtual discussions in e-classrooms can challenge traditional models of the academic, and in engaging with communities under the banner of the academic-activist, this panel extends the discussion of innovative and alternative visions involving both academics and students under the banner of academic activist.

This area of teaching and learning is growing globally across the social sciences and can be applied to a vast range of policy topics. The panel would be grounded in promoting greater understanding of high-impact practices and innovative methodologies for any kind of classroom domestically and internationally. Contributions addressing one or more of these questions should be grounded in classroom experiences and/or connect interpretive thinking (in one of its multiple versions) to teaching practices. The panel provides a forum for scholars to participate in the scholarship of teaching and learning, share pedagogical techniques, and discuss trends in long-distance education. I would welcome proposals from educators at all levels who teach and present at the Interpretive conference including university faculty and administrators, high school teachers, graduate students, research scholars, those designing IT sites and others. The aim is to facilitate lively presentations and discussions that not only benefit presenters but involve the audience as well.

Panel 2: Left, right or in the middle? At the margins or at the core? Questioning the categorisation of populism

Panel Convenors:

Dr. Marlon Barbehön (marlon.barbehoen@ipw.uni-heidelberg.de), Institute of Political Science, Heidelberg University

Marilena Geugjes (marilena.geugjes@ipw.uni-heidelberg.de), Institute of Political Science, Heidelberg University

Mark van Ostaïjen (vanostaijen@fsw.eur.nl), Department of Public Administration and Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam

Panel Proposal:

Across the globe, we witness an alleged rise of ‘populist’ movements and a polarisation of political controversies and conflict. To make sense of these developments, observers from politics, media and academia typically localise these within the societal space and the political spectrum: is it the ‘middle of society’ which is increasingly infected by populism or is this phenomenon confined to the ‘periphery’? Are we in danger of losing the ‘middle ground’ of politics due to the rise of populist attitudes? And what are the implications for policy-making and the democratic state when the ‘centre’ loses ground to the ‘extremes’?

From an interpretive perspective, these attempts to make sense of conflict and contestation by means of ‘the middle’ and ‘populism’ are not to be seen as neutral observations of objectively given phenomena. Instead, they constitute performative socio-political practices which are informed by a variety of (implicit) assumptions about how modern societies and democratic states are composed. In order to investigate what these interpretations and categorisations ‘do’, we need to understand the functions of references to ‘populism’, how its emergence is related to constructions of ‘the middle’ and how this relationship informs our understanding of conflict.

The aim of the proposed panel is to gather papers which interpretively investigate, critically problematise or empirically substantiate a broader focus on populism. In the literature, there generally seems to be an implicit understanding of populism as an extreme and solely political phenomenon. However, its logics are not limited to the political realm and its extremism can easily be questioned. Therefore, in this panel the practices of categorising populist phenomena will not be taken for granted but analysed in terms of underlying normative assumptions, argumentative strategies and/or political implications. With these perspectives, we may gain a better understanding of how the challenge of ‘populism’ is contingent upon how we collectively make sense of this phenomenon by positioning it in relation to its constitutive others.

Panel 3: Interpreting institutional change

Panel Convenors:

Imrat Verhoeven & John Grin,

Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research, University of Amsterdam

i.verhoeven@uva.nl & j.grin@uva.nl

Panel Proposal:

Issues like migration, climate change, and the transformation of welfare states challenge incumbent institutional arrangements by calling for changes of (in)formal rules, policies and governing practices. Movements of undocumented migrants demand new rules and policies on citizenship; NGOs push for tighter climate regulations and sustainable industries; social entrepreneurs seek more room to take over welfare tasks. These are but a few examples of many that can be found in an abundance of policy domains.

To truly understand such processes of institutional change we can draw on so called 'third phase institutionalism' which recognizes that institutional context, comprising a range of formal and informal institutions, constrains and enables players, but essentially through agency. Drawing on Giddens, institutions are seen to have effects by being instantiated in the action of individuals (Lowndes & Roberts 2013). This perspective opens up neo-institutionalist approaches to change beyond elitist policy entrepreneurs by also including social movements, citizens' initiatives, and NGOs. Moreover, it invites interpretive scholars to analyze the stories, frames or discourses of change in a context-sensitive approach.

This panel seeks to explore the interactions between elite and non-elite actors involved in institutional change and aims to develop interpretive understandings of how these processes operate through agency. We invite interpretive papers that present empirical findings on single cases, comparative case studies, ethnographic observations or other qualitative material on the transformative practices related to issues that require institutional change. We also invite papers that theoretically develop interpretive perspectives on institutional change. Articulation of analytical frameworks and useful concepts is encouraged.

Literature

Lowndes, V. & M. Roberts (2013) *Why Institutions matter. The new institutionalism in political science*, Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Panel 4: Transnational Politics of Space: the contribution of critical policy studies

Panel Convenors:

Dr. Andreas Öjehag Pettersson, Karlstad University (Sweden), andreas.ojehag@kau.se

Dr. Natalie Papanastasiou, University of Amsterdam (The Netherlands), N.Papanastasiou@uva.nl

Panel Proposal:

Studying policy interpretively in contexts of transnational political space poses a number of conceptual and methodological challenges. Developing an intimate understanding of the situated contexts of policy and everyday policy practices of actors are key foci of interpretive inquiry, and yet, interpretively studying the expansive, slippery spaces of the 'transnational' can be a particularly daunting task. This panel seeks to bring together researchers studying policy in transnational spaces to share how they critically engage with the elusive nature of spaces such as the international, global, and European.

This panel calls for papers engaging with the theme of transnational politics of space and in particular those exploring the role and function of expertise in such settings. We also welcome papers investigating the production of transnational spaces and their relationship to local policy practices.

Themes might include (but are not limited to):

- Knowledge, politics and power of transnational space: how can we study the discursive production of the global, international, or European in relation to best practice, competitiveness, and universal knowledge? What does the study of universal best practices reveal about the relationship between knowledge, space, and power?
- Mobile expertocracies: what can we learn from mobile policy experts who move between different local, national, and international policymaking arenas? What are the different ways of studying these actors?
- Politics of scale in policymaking: how do we think critically about taken-for-granted scalar architectures of policymaking, such as 'multi-level governance'?
- Territory and transnational space: how can studies of policy deal with the tension between the materiality of territory and the relational, fluid nature of space?

We welcome papers discussing methodological and/or conceptual challenges of exploring transnational politics of space, and which draw on any range of approaches and disciplines associated with critical policy analysis.

Panel 5: Democracy under stress? Interpreting empirical and conceptual challenges in argumentative policy analysis

Panel Convenors:

Prof. Dr. Sybille Münch, Professor for Theory of Public Policy, Center for the Study of Democracy, Leuphana University of Lüneburg; sybille.muench@uni.leuphana.de

Prof. Dr. Thomas Saretzki, Professor for Political Theory and Public Policy, Center for the Study of Democracy, Leuphana University of Lüneburg; thomas.saretzki@uni.leuphana.de

Panel Proposal:

When in the early 1990s policy scholars proclaimed an “argumentative turn”, they called for nothing less than a rejuvenation of Lasswell’s “policy sciences of democracy”. More than 20 years later, diagnoses of democratic crisis abound: Debates on Post-Democracy, rising populism, anti-pluralism and what some call the advent of “post-truth politics” make some observers conjecture that democracy is under stress. In this panel, we aim to tackle this diagnosis from different angles: On the one hand, one could agree with this interpretation and ask how the different aspects of democratic stress translate into stress for critical policy analysis. What do the current trends mean for an approach that once set out to make the quality of argument the organizing principle of policy analysis? If interpretive policy analysis transformed “speaking truth to power” into a deliberative “making sense together”, how is this endangered by what some authors contend to be an increasing degree of “enclave deliberation” in “echo chambers”? Is the post-positivist critique of the “rationality project” still valid in the face of seemingly irrational policy and communication styles?

On the other hand, we invite theoretical and empirical papers on the diagnosis of democracy under stress itself. Have democracies really become more vulnerable and if so what are these stressors? How is the dominant assessment of stress and crisis framed and narrated? How are political, social, economic and ecological conditions interpreted as stressors of democracy and with what consequences for policy-making?

Panel 6: Interpreting 'Food Democracy'

Panel Convenors:

Basil Bornemann, University of Basel (basil.bornemann@unibas.ch)

Sabine Weiland, Lille Catholic University (sabine.weiland@univ-catholille.fr)

Panel Proposal:

Food constitutes a major policy issue, be it in relation to food production, consumption, trade, public health, environmental impacts, animal rights, and cultural identity. In the 21st century food system, power and control of food have become deeply concentrated and consolidated, at the costs of people's livelihoods, justice, and sustainability. Food is a commodity, and large profit-driven multinational corporations are making critical decisions on the ways food is produced, transported and marketed. More recently, however, the established food regime is being challenged by alternative visions, such as food democracy.

Food democracy is a multi-faceted political notion to counter the increasing corporate control and lack of consumer participation in the food system. It promotes interpretations of food as a locus of the democratic process: a reference point for the articulation of people's interests; a driving force for social movements to fight for access to affordable and healthy food; a reminder of the state's role to foster public goods and the public interest. The promise of food democracy goes beyond adequacy of food supply and stresses decency and social justice in order to make food systems more resilient and sustainable. In this vein, apart from democratising existing food systems, the concept also challenges and seeks to transform established understandings and practices of democratic governance as such.

The proposed panel aims to shed light on the relationship between food and democracy from an interpretive perspective. We invite both theoretical and empirical papers to explore, sharpen and challenge the notion of food democracy as a transformative moment of the prevailing agro-industrial food system. More specifically, the panel will deal with questions such as: How are food concerns being articulated, processed and regulated in modern democracies? How does food challenge and transform established understandings and practices of (non-)democracy? What are prospects and limitations of a democratisation of food systems?

Panel 7: Interpreting Modern Slavery

Panel Convenor:

Alison Gardner, Research fellow: Rights and Justice, University of Nottingham. alison.gardner1@nottingham.ac.uk / alisongardner12@gmail.com

Panel Proposal:

There are estimated to be 46 million people enslaved around the world today[1], and the UN General Assembly has agreed to end slavery by 2030 through “immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking” (Sustainable Development Goal 8.7). Yet despite the growth of international and national legislation, public policy approaches to addressing modern slavery remain under-theorised and under-developed, with local initiative often resting with activists and NGOs rather than governments. This is perhaps related to the (often unacknowledged) fact that the politics of anti-slavery policy are complex and contested, connecting with wider debates surrounding gender, global economic structures, labour and migration. Anti-slavery policies also draw support from a diverse coalition of political interests, ranging in perspective from anti-immigration campaigners to those focusing on social justice and human rights, making the practical details of policy implementation fraught with controversy.

This panel will explore how an interpretive perspective can bring fresh insights to our understanding of modern slavery, and the design of public policy responses. We welcome proposals which broadly apply interpretive theories and analysis to this policy area, for example addressing questions including (but not limited to):

- What can an interpretive approach reveal about the way modern slavery is perceived and addressed by governments, policymakers and communities?;
- What could a focus on meaning and/or practices add to our understanding of the social and cultural drivers or inhibitors for modern slavery?
- What tensions and synergies exist in the role of academics as critics and as activists in this field?
- How might we de-centre policy-making, research and resources to develop effective responses?
- What theoretical concepts could assist us in designing and implementing those responses?

[1] Walk Free Foundation, “2016 Global Slavery Index”

Panel 8: Rethinking ‘Researcher’ and ‘Policymaker’ Interactions

Panel Convenors:

Imelda McDermott, Research Fellow, Health Policy, Politics & Organisation Group (HiPPO), University of Manchester, UK. Email: imelda.mcdermott@manchester.ac.uk

Sara Shaw, Senior Researcher, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK. Email: sara.shaw@phc.ox.ac.uk

Jay Shaw, Assistant Professor, Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Canada. Email: jay.shaw@wchospital.ca

Panel Proposal:

Recent trends have seen ‘researcher’ and ‘policymaker’ interactions evolving. On the one hand, new digital technologies have seen organisations and individual ‘researchers’ and ‘policymakers’ having a social media account, either as a representative of an organisation or an individual. The nature of academics’ writing practices is changing, with researchers now expected not only to publish journal articles but also to write blogs and tweet regularly (Tufting et al., in progress). There is also a sharp rise in the number of Members of Parliament using social media and it has been claimed that social media can enhance the transfer of ‘evidence’ from researchers to policymakers (Leavey, 2013).

On the other hand, there are attempts to shift the concepts of ‘knowledge transfer’ or ‘knowledge translation’ to ‘co-production’ (Jassanoff, 2013) which encourages ‘open’ and ‘innovative’ policy-making. This can be seen in the rise of initiatives such as ‘Policy Lab’ in the United Kingdom, ‘MindLab’ in Denmark, RVO X Lab in the Netherlands, ‘DesignGov’ in Australia, etc. The idea behind these was to create a ‘space’ for policymakers to engage not only with ‘experts’ but more widely with businesses and the ‘public’.

The rise in the use of social media and new initiatives challenge the existing model of ‘researcher’ and ‘policymaker’ interactions. Building off the success of last year’s session on this topic, we invite papers that use an interpretive approach to explore these new interactions between ‘researcher’ and ‘policymaker’ and/or how these new ways complement (or contradict) existing ones. Some relevant questions might include: To what extent does the use of social media and co-production change the way ‘researchers’ and ‘policymakers’ interact? What these new interactions might look like? What are the benefits, risks, and challenges associated with these new ways of interacting? How would these new interactions impact on existing ones?

Jassanoff, S. (2013) States of knowledge: The co-production of science and the social order. London: Routledge

Leavey, J. (2013) Social media and public policy: What is the evidence? <https://www.alliance4usefulevidence.org/assets/Social-Media-and-Public-Policy.pdf>

Tufting, K, Barton, D., Hamilton, M., McCulloch, S., Bhatt, I. (in progress). The dynamics of knowledge creation: Academics’ writing practices in the contemporary university place. <https://wp.lanacs.ac.uk/acadswriting/about/>

Panel 9: Populist activism, welfare state reform and solidarity

Panel Convenors:

Evelien Tonkens, professor, department of Citizenship, University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht, the Netherlands;
e.tonkens@uvh.nl

Jan Willem Duyvendak, professor, department of Sociology, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands;
w.g.j.duvendak@uva.nl

Thomas Kampen, assistant professor, department of Citizenship, University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht, the Netherlands; t.kampen@uvh.nl

Panel Proposal:

In many countries, welfare state reform has given rise to populist activism to protect and defend the welfare state as it (supposedly) was, for whom it (supposedly) was. Welfare state reform combines austerity policies with devolution of national policies to the local level. Austerity is defended as an inevitable response to rising demands and ageing populations. Devolution is presented as part of glocalisation: now that the national scale is partly giving way to the local and global scale, welfare states must follow by operating more locally. Populist activism protests these policy frames. Populist activists argue that the national welfare state should remain intact, but should be restricted to 'those who built it', thereby excluding various generations of migrants and refugees.

We do not want to join the chorus of welfare chauvinism- bashing. Instead, the aim of this panel is twofold: first, we aim to understand this populist activism, including its welfare chauvinism, preferably in a comparative perspective. Second, we want to address the issue that populist activism responds to, concerning solidarity in welfare states that are faced with rising demands and costs as well as with rising immigration.

We welcome papers that address the following questions. How is the relation framed between welfare state reform and populist activism for welfare state protection? (How) does the framing of welfare state reform contribute to polarization between (ethnic) groups? Are there also signs of de-polarizing policy and/or de-populist framing? What solidarity can we expect from those who frame each other as strangers? What could be the contours of and conditions for an inclusive welfare state that is compatible with a pluralist (multicultural) society?

Panel 10: Reflecting on technoscience in the age of post-democracy: What are the stakes?

Panel Conveners:

Kathrin Braun, kathrin.braun@univie.ac.at
Department of Political Science, University of Vienna,

Ingrid Metzler, ingrid.metzler@gmail.com
Department of Science and Technology Studies, University of Vienna

Anne Loeber, A.M.C.Loeber@uva.nl
Department of Political Science, University of Amsterdam

Sabine Könniger, koenninger@imew.de
Institute "Mensch, Ethik und Wissenschaft" (IMEW gGmbH), Berlin

Heidrun Åm, heidrun.aam@ntnu.no
Centre for Technology and Society, Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Panel Proposal:

The year 2016 has intensified the sense of a fundamental crisis in Western democracies. Institutions are challenged by low voter turnouts, the rise of post-truth politics, or the displacement of political decisions into opaque spheres. Simultaneously and somehow paradoxically, practices of participatory governance and deliberative policymaking proliferated in the last years. Technoscience and scientific governance are amongst the most prominent areas where deliberation efforts evolved. Countless formats, concepts, strategies and institutional innovations were designed for making governmental practices more accountable, responsible, or inclusive. They apparently however often fail to concretely impact political or industrial decision-making and fail to obliterate the perceived gap between governments and citizens. What alternative practices of reflecting technoscientific developments do we discern that can be (re-)appreciated in terms of political judgement? How are we to analyze, assess and enact these efforts against the background of post-truth post-democracy? Is there a need to rethink claims to democratize technoscientific governance or to rethink our conceptual, theoretical, methodological means of analysis and assessment, and if so, how?

We welcome papers that conceptualize and describe practices of technoscience and scientific governance under conditions of post-truth post-democracy. In particular, we invite papers that reflect on such practices from the perspective of activism. Would the current crisis warrant that scholars take on a role as academic-activists?

Within this frame, we particularly welcome empirical engagements and conceptual papers on

- practices in which the public implications of individual decisions are explicated in a way that challenges the 'self-evidence' of certain developments and the associated patterns of institutionalized accountability,
- practices that contribute to the creation of a 'shared' or 'public space' for reflection and possible intervention,
- the question which roles we should take up as analysts in this age of fact-resistant politics.

Panel 11: Emergent publics in public policy: seeking opportunities for innovation and decision-making

Panel Conveners:

Eefje Cuppen (Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management, Department of Multi Actor Systems); e.h.w.j.cuppen@tudelft.nl

Udo Pesch (Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management, Department of Values, Technology and Innovation); u.pesch@tudelft.nl

Nanke Verloo (University of Amsterdam, department of geography, planning and international development studies); n.verloo@uva.nl

Panel Proposal:

The call for panels for this conference raises attention to the “array of public controversies that have recently surfaced in contemporary politics and society”. Indeed, it seems that increasingly citizens organize collective action against decisions in diverse policy domains. For instance, in the energy field controversy has emerged regarding new ways to produce and transport energy sources, and in the field of public health we observe controversies about a range of vaccination programs. Such controversies lead to what we call ‘emergent publics’: new social groups that organize collective action or advocacy in response to the discontent with current systems and decisions. The emergence of (new) publics can be traced back to the increased volatility of social structures in contemporary society and the ubiquity of ICT facilitating the organization of collective action.

In this panel we take the empirical phenomenon of emergent publics as a starting point to explore to what extent they provide opportunities for innovation and public policy. Emergent publics can be seen as vehicles for the articulation of public values that are perceived to be underrepresented in the way e.g. public services are fulfilled. Viewed as such, emergent publics provide a source of information about societal values and concerns. Emergent publics can furthermore be viewed as a new mode of public participation; as people organize and act, they challenge existing institutions and create new political spaces in which the traditional mode of operation in a particular sector is challenged and reshaped.

We welcome papers that address the emergence of publics and how they interact, challenge and/or (re)shape institutions from either an empirical and descriptive perspective, as well as more conceptual papers with a normative perspective. We also welcome papers with a methodological perspective, focusing on research methods to study interaction between emergent publics and institutions, as well as intervention methods.

Panel 12: The Spectre of Populism in Europe: Comparing Populist Currents in European Countries

Panel Convenors:

Göran Nilsson and Oriana Quaglietta, University of Essex, nilsson1983@gmail.com and ori_quaglietta@hotmail.it

Panel Proposal:

Even though the recent Austrian elections have confirmed the victory of a liberal candidate, several European countries are facing significant forms of populisms that may threaten the progress made in these last decades. France and the Netherlands are only two of the countries with serious populist candidates in their national elections of 2017. The aim of the panel should be to compare and contrast several populist parties with the object of identifying an overall pattern that may also explain to a certain extent their rise into prominence over the last years and predict their performance in national elections. Particular attention should be devoted to analysing how the concepts of national identity and national unity are regarded in specific countries and how these notions are engaged with by populists. The convenors mentioned above, for example, plan on presenting a paper comparing Sweden and Italy, which are thought of as being characterized as a united and fractured country, respectively. A secondary aim of this panel is to determine whether Laclau's theory of all things political being inherently populist can be applicable to the present European landscape. Accordingly, the political landscape is understood as a pendulum swing between bureaucracy and populism which is affected by the stability of identity and is interlinked with the ability to hegemonically stabilise these identities. While the main focus of the panel should be on European populist parties, globalisation is a force to be reckoned with in this context. As such, considerations regarding the foregrounding of the populist narrative at the global level should also be included in the papers presented and how representatives of different populist currents interact with each other (e.g. Trump and Farage) should be discussed as well.

Panel 13: Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse Theory and Hegemony

Panel Convenors:

Nicolina Montesano Montessori (Utrecht University) – n.montesanomontessori@gmail.com

Michael Farrelly (University of Hull) – M.Farely@hull.ac.uk

Panel Proposal:

This panel offers a forum for critical discourse approaches to policy analysis performed in combination with discourse theory (Laclau and Mouffe 1985 and beyond). Combining discourse theory and CDA is both challenging and productive. Challenging in the sense that both maintain different ontological views, rewarding because the theoretical orientation of DT and the methodological orientation of CDA complement each other very well. Papers may focus on any area of policy analysis, social change, social movements, hegemony and power and may adopt a range of approaches to textually oriented CDA combined with discourse theory. A key aim of the panel is to reflect on the challenges and possibilities of combining CDA and DT. Contributors are therefore encouraged to reflect explicitly on their research aims, reasons for combining CDA and DT, problems found and (not) resolved on the way, and implications for our understanding of the pitfalls and opportunities of this combined approach. Papers are welcome that combine CDA and DT and, for instance, focus on the following topics

Social and/or organisational change

- Social movements
- Social entrepreneurship
- Radical Democracy
- Hegemony
- Power
- Populism

Papers will variously ask: What are the features of discourse associated with areas of policy practices and/or processes of social change? What is the role of discourse in processes of social change - or its stagnation? How does a research approach that comprises CDA and DT help to understand the particular phenomenon that is being researched?

Panel 14: The pragmatic approach to the policy process

Panel Convenor:

Philippe Zittoun, Research Professor of Political Science, LAET, ENTPE, University of Lyon

Panel Proposal:

This panel will focus on the development of a pragmatic approach to the policy process (Zittoun, 2014). This approach is inspired by Pierce, James and Dewey, the founders of pragmatic philosophy, by Weber, the founder of the constructivist sociological approach, and also, more recently, by the German philosophy of the Frankfurt School (Habermas, Honneth, etc.) and the French pragmatic approach to sociology (Boltanski, Latour, etc.). The aim of this panel is to discuss the main characteristics of the policy process and to better grasp the contribution of this approach to this process. Drawing on the studies undertaken in sociology and political science over the last 20 years, this panel notes the emergence of five main characteristics of this approach. First, the pragmatic perspective is an empirical and comprehensive scientific approach which considers that inquiry at the micro-level is essential to observe, describe and understand the logic of policymakers' concrete practices. In this perspective, it is an actor-centered approach which pays specific attention to the supporter/defender role. Second, this approach attaches great importance to the cognitive, discursive and analytical skills of actors to define concepts and situations, argue, develop strategies, discuss, persuade and convince, reach agreements or disagree with others, give meaning to their purpose, adapt themselves to different contexts, etc. It is clearly inspired by the Weberian comprehensive and constructivist perspective. Third, the approach rejects the distinction between discourse and practice, and between an idea and interest; it considers that an idea is a discourse that cannot be separated from its user and its enunciation. It challenges the idea that it is possible to analyze discourse alone and privilege the discourse integrated within the social practice in which it is enunciated. This perspective evokes "ideas in action" or "meaning in action" to challenge all analytical tools which propose a separate or isolated analysis of both ideas and practices. Fourth, the approach considers that inquiry, experimentation, learning and the tests developed by the actors themselves when confronted by uncertainty are essential. Defining concepts, analyzing situations, making new proposals, arguing - actors first investigate to produce these and also test them within interactions which challenge them through criticism. During the challenging process, actors' definitions must be able to "resist", which implies both arguing and adapting. According to Boltanski, the pragmatist perspective attempts to describe the social world as a trial scene in which uncertain actors make inquiries, quote their interpretations in reports, establish labels and agree to test themselves (Boltanski, 2009, p. 48)). Fifth, it is essentially a non-deterministic approach which considers the uncertainty and the unexpected outcomes of any action and policy and rejects all determinist laws to grasp the policy process.

Taking into account all five of these characteristics, this panel will primarily discuss the methods, concepts, hypotheses and interest of a pragmatic approach to the policy process. All papers that might contribute theoretically, methodologically or empirically to this approach are welcome.

Panel 15: Populism, agency and the dynamics of collective action in times of crisis

Panel Convenors:

Konstantinos Roussos, PhD Student in the Department of Government, University of Essex:

Email: k.roussos@essex.ac.uk

Ryan Flitcroft, PhD Student in Ideology and Discourse Analysis, University of Essex:

Email: rflitc@essex.ac.uk

Panel Proposal:

This panel seeks to grapple with a set of interrelated queries concerning the role and dynamics of collective action and alleged forms of populism in transforming and restructuring the current political terrain in Western liberal democracies. The term populism has been mobilised and widely deployed by journalists, politicians and academics alike to describe many recent political events and, although it is still very much a contentious concept, it is beginning to form a key role in contemporary political debate. In addition, in this conjuncture of great recession and political instability, we have also witnessed an unprecedented proliferation of protest mobilizations against austerity policies and dominant elites: from the Arab world to North America, and travelling through the European South. In the aftermath of these protest waves, several solidarity initiatives and grassroots local ventures have emerged seeking to contest neoliberal crisis by imagining and prefiguring alternative ways of being and doing in common. It comes as no surprise then that the emergence of populism and the diffusion of grassroots collective action are treated often in a similar vein, as responses to the crisis of representation and technocratization of governance in liberal democracies. Seeking to combine theoretical reflection with empirical research this panel aspires to grasp with three interconnected sets of questions:

1. Populism, institutional political agents and transformative potential.
2. New forms of protest and change in the repertoires of collective action during the recent crisis.
3. The interconnections and engagement of grassroots collective action with institutional politics and agents, as well as their impact on a process of policy co-production.

Panel 16: Trusted expert(ise) in populist times

Panel Convenors:

Chair: Tamara Metze (Wageningen University and Research), t.metze-burghouts@wur.nl

Practitioners: RIVM (The Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment), Jeroen Devilee, Andre Krom

Co-organizers: Katharina T. Paul (University of Vienna), David Laws (University of Amsterdam (UvA)), Imrat Verhoeven (UvA), Nanke Verloo (UvA)

Panel Proposal:

Injections with nano-compounds that ‘manipulate’ our pears or tomatoes, flames from the drinking water tap due to hydraulic fracturing, and artificial turf on soccer-fields causing cancer are but three examples of influential images of contested technologies. Engaged citizens, experts, politicians, industry and others defend, develop or challenge technologies in passionate ways. They frame facts and uncertainties in accordance with their subject positions, values and beliefs. These framing processes often result in the creation of images and imaginaries (Jasanoff and Kim 2013) either visually or in words. Especially in the age of social media and other internet technologies these images travel across the world, and some become pervasive. These can hinder or contribute to the responsible development, societal acceptability, and democratic governance of innovative technologies. One way for experts and others to cope with these framing processes is attempting to maintain the integrity of facts by educating the public and by better communicating the facts. This corresponds to the role of a ‘pure scientists’ who remains at distance from decision making (e.g. Pielke 2007, Turnhout et al 2013). However, this often seems to lead to the opposite response: citizens challenge both experts and facts. Or, they will find and create counter-expertise.

In this practice seminar, we want to explore the dilemmas of a ‘trusted expert’ and ‘trusted expertise’ in an increasingly populist, globalized and connected world in which the ‘eye’ – seeing – is becoming as important as speaking and acting (Green 2010). Together with practitioners from the Dutch National Institute of Public Health and the Environment, and building on the knowledge, lessons, and insights we co-created in community of practice on this very topic – we want to further explore the dilemmas of experts, and other governing actors, including those from civil society and industry in trying to cope with these challenges. In addition, we aim to further build on and explore new strategies that better take into account framing dynamics, populists, but also elitists responses by activists to experts, and vice versa. Empirical areas of interest may include environmental and health technologies.

We kindly invite people to participate in this practice seminar which will have an interactive format – such as a world cafe. Everyone is welcome, and is asked to bring their expertise and experience with similar issues to the room. In preparation you may contribute by submitting your dilemma as ‘trusted expert or advisor’. We will integrate this in our session. However, this preparation is not required.

We will aim to collaborate with the academic panel on Framing (Kasja Weenink, UvA).

References

Green, J. E. (2010) *Eyes of the People: Democracy in an Age of Spectatorship*, Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Jasanoff, S. and S-H Kim (2013) ‘Sociotechnical Imaginaries and National Energy Policies’, *Science as Culture*, 22 (2), 189 – 196.

Pielke, R. (2007). *The Honest Broker: Making Sense of Science in Policy and Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press

Turnhout, E., M. Stuiver, J. Klostermann, B. Harms and C. Leeuwis (2013) ‘New roles of science in society: Different repertoires of knowledge brokering’ *Science and Public Policy* 40 (3): 354-365.

Panel 17: Contested Extractive Frontiers

Panel Convenors:

Dr. Cristina Espinosa, Panel Co-convenor, Senior Researcher and Director of the cluster “Politics of Natural Resources” at the Arnold-Bergstraesser-Institute for Cultural Studies, University of Freiburg, Germany.

Email: cristina.espinosa@abi.uni-freiburg.de

Fabricio Rodríguez, Panel Co-convenor, Researcher BMBF-Project “BioInequalities”, University of Jena, Germany.

Email: fabricio.rodriguez@uni-jena.de

Panel Proposal:

Since the 1990s, natural resource extraction has expanded and intensified in remote culturally and biologically sensitive territories, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, Southeast, and Central Asia, and Latin America. Massive amounts of minerals and hydrocarbons have been extracted from the Earth’s crust, large swaths of forests have been transformed into agricultural fields, and dam construction and river diversion have enabled the use of water for irrigation, sanitation and energy generation. Transnational and state actors have been at the forefront of these developments, enabled by policies coming from a wide ideological spectrum. While neoliberal governments have justified recent extractive endeavours with populist promises of economic growth and modernization, post-neoliberal regimes have legitimized them by overstated appeals to sovereignty, social equity and redistribution. Not surprisingly, recent investments in extractive activities have triggered multi-scalar activism in solidarity with indigenous peoples and traditionally marginalized communities whose territories often overlap the areas given in concession for exploitation. In some cases, activist initiative stress distributional issues about the risks and benefits derived from the appropriation and commodification of nature. In other cases, struggles are about democratic participation and rights to secure access to and control of nature to ensure cultural reproduction and conservation. It therefore becomes evident that while struggles around the expansion of extractive activities have a material basis, what is centrally at stake is the creation, thickening or discarding of meanings to legitimize and authorize competing interests, knowledge systems, practices, and identities. In this panel we invite contributions exploring issues of power, meaning and knowledge entangled in struggles around the re-drawing of extractive frontiers, and connected to the following questions:

- Which competing meaning structures, interpretations and rhetorical strategies are configured with the expansion of extractive frontiers?
- What types of activism are assembled in processes of resistance and opposition to the expansion of extractive frontiers?
- How do resistance and opposition to extractive activities affect democratic processes?
- How are knowledge politics reaffirmed or contested with the expansion of resource frontiers?
- To which extent and through which practices are asymmetric power dynamics underpinning the expansion of extractive frontiers leveraged?

The panel aims to foster interdisciplinary exchange among researchers harnessing the interpretive strength of qualitative methods. The four selected contributions should focus on cases and processes connected to extractive frontiers in the Global South and the Global North, or unfolding at the intersection of transnational and global scales.

Panel 18: The instabilities of expertise: power and knowledge in populist times

Panel Convenors:

John Clarke, The Open University, UK (john.clarke@open.ac.uk)

Paul Stubbs, The Institute of Economics, Zagreb, Croatia (pstubbs@eizg.hr)

Mislav Zitko, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences, The University of Zagreb, Croatia (mislav.zitko@gmail.com)

Panel Proposal:

The recent resurgence of populist politics has called into question the place of expertise in political and policy processes. Indeed, new forms of populism have found it politically productive to contest established formations of expertise on, for example, the necessities of economic policy, the ever closer union of Europe, the workings of constitutional law and climate change. In many parts of the overdeveloped world, politicians have played the populist card, insisting that it is better to trust the wisdom of “the people” rather than rely on scientific, technocratic or expert judgement. Paradoxically, these same politicians are not averse to authoritarian measures to subdue the will of the same “people” when it threatens their hegemony.

We see these disruptions of relationships between power, knowledge and politics as marking a distinctive shift in political discourse and creating new possibilities and contradictions in processes of governing, albeit with echoes in previous iterations of ‘authoritarian populism’. Crucially, they reconfigure imaginaries of what it means to govern and be governed, sharing a perverse resonance with radical critiques of ‘evidence-based policies’ and challenging constructions of there being ‘no alternative’.

In this panel we aim to explore these disruptions of established formations of knowledge, power and politics, and we welcome papers, both historical and contemporary, that explore:

- Populist incursions against established expertise;
 - Populist formations of knowledge-power;
 - The implications for established knowledge-power formations;
- and/or
- The possibilities of counter-knowledges that might be articulated with alternative forms of radical politics.

Panel 19: Reinterpreting activism

Panel Convenors:

David Laws, University of Amsterdam

Tamara Metze, Wageningen University

Imrat Verhoeven, University of Amsterdam

Nanke Verloo, University of Amsterdam

Jennifer Dodge, University at Albany, SUNY

Panel Proposal:

Activism is classically associated with social movement organizations and NGOs. Recent developments have pulled into this picture ad hoc citizen action groups that make claims and push for social, economic, and political change through protest (Tilly & Tarrow 2007). Such activism is alive and well in large protests such as Black Lives Matter or the Spanish Indignados and when citizen-residents protest against fracking or windmill projects. In this panel we push to look outside these boundaries at forms of activism that confound conventional analytic vocabularies and create practical difficulties and deficits.

We are thinking, for example, of what unfolds when groups try to influence elites through more lobbying, the mobilization of knowledge, and other subtle forms of activism. Something new may also unfold when ‘practivist’ citizens, having identified a problem (Dewey), start acting together to enhance care or open space in their neighborhood, to reduce crime, or manage access to and use of energy. In academia ‘issue advocates’ (Pielke 2007) may work to promote political views in public debate and openly express support or participate in NGOs and SMOs. Those with a more pragmatic turn of mind may work to enhance the fact regarding character of decision making and the quality of debate and deliberation by organizing forms of action science and joint fact finding. There are also innovations in conservative activism that include “guerrilla” public relations, the co-optation of leftist activist strategies, and corporate “news” production.

In this panel we seek to explore these often neglected practices by analyzing cases and discussing how concepts and frameworks help us reflect on and make sense of them and the role that they play in contemporary policy development. We invite empirical papers and conceptual theoretical papers that draw on interpretive approaches to reinterpret activism in new and fruitful ways.

References

Pielke, R. (2007) *The Honest Broker: Making Sense of Science in Policy and Politics*, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press

Tilly, C. and S. Tarrow (2007) *Contentious Politics*, Boulder: paradigm Publishers.

Panel 20: Public Policies in Latin America and the Cognitive Approach: Paradigms, Actors and Coalitions

Panel Convenors:

Melina De Souza Rocha Lukic (melinarocha@hotmail.com), Professor of Fundação Getúlio Vargas, Escola de Direito Rio (Brazil)

Mauricio Fronzaglia (mfronzaglia@hotmail.com), Professor of Mackenzie Presbyterian University (Brazil)

Panel Proposal:

This panel addresses researches about Latin America made through the "Cognitive Approach of Public Policy". This theoretical framework is based on analysis of public policy that relies on a cognitive and normative perspective, especially through the concepts of paradigm, frame of reference and advocacy coalition. In this sense, what were the paradigms followed by the Latin American public policies lately? How paradigms have responded to economic and political changes occurred in the region? How have they changed over time? The panel also intends to discuss about the actors and coalitions on Latin America public policies. If the state used to be the main protagonist of public action, a number of other actors, coalitions and institutions have emerged in the last years to substitute state in a large number of areas. Who are they and who do they represent? How do they influence the agenda setting of Latin America public policy? What are their strategies and their roles in the formulation and implementation of public policies? We encourage proposals that combine conceptual discussion and empirical analysis. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to: social policy (social security, health care, social care, child protection, education policy), fiscal policy, cultural policy, development policy and environmental policy.

Key Words

Public Policy, Latin America, Cognitive Approach

Panel 21: Boundary work in systemic governance transformations to sustainability

Panel Convenor:

Severine van Bommel, Wageningen University, severine.vanbommel@wur.nl

Panel Proposal:

“What is the “good” that President Trump could work for us?” That was the question that Otto Scharmer posed in his article in the Huffington post after the US elections. He then proceeded to answer his own question in the following way: “Letting go of any illusion that the necessary changes of our time will originate from the White House or any other top-down structure. It will come instead from a new global movement of local and multi-local change makers that apply the mindset of Michelle Obama (open mind, heart, will) onto the transformation of the collective.” This quote illustrates a more general call among researchers and policy makers for transformative change at a system level. A shared idea is that due to scale and scope of sustainability problems, incremental change in prevailing systems will not suffice. It is claimed that i) neo-liberal market thinking draws system boundaries inappropriately, creating new forms of systemic risk; ii) the current focus on ‘transformative technologies’ externalises (unsustainable) costs that threaten bio-physical and ecological functioning and vulnerable social actors worldwide; iii) different boundary judgements are needed that open pathways towards alternative, less risky and robust transformations; iv) the required change will have to come from a potentially broad range of actors linked (as individuals and/or in organisations) in networks, groups, platforms etc. that by-pass the dominant governance system.

Boundaries can create divisions and be a source of separation, fragmentation, disconnection, and misunderstanding. Yet, they can also be areas of unusual learning, places where perspectives meet and new possibilities arise. Radically new insights often arise at the boundaries between communities. This raises the following questions with regard to systemic governance transformations to sustainability:

- How are system boundaries between the ‘old’ system and the ‘new’ initiative demarcated and governed, and by whom? Because ‘what’ and ‘who’ is taken into account is constitutive of the kinds of change that emerges, who benefits and who loses from the change process, and how the governance of such change processes is performed.
- How are practices coordinated within the boundaries of the new initiative? Coordination must accommodate the practices involved without burdening others with the details of one practice and provide enough standardization for people to know how to deal with them locally. How do the material, cognitive and symbolic elements of practices travel? How do local socio-material practices relate to the elements of which they are composed? How do related temporalities of circulation affect the transformation and persistence of social practices?

This panel welcomes theoretical and empirical papers that might include, but are not limited to, the topics and questions mentioned above. Authors may choose among the following options for their presentations:

- talk with/without power point
- talk built around pictures, diagrams or intermediary objects
- a guided ‘kitchen table’ conversation

Panel 22: “Rethinking Cultural Policy: Power, Politics and Public Contestation”

Panel Convenors:

Christina Maags, PhD Student, Goethe University Frankfurt/ Oxford University, Maags@soz.uni-frankfurt.de, cmaags@hotmail.de

Gabriela Toledo Silva, PhD in Public Administration and Government Center for Public Administration and Government Studies, Fundação Getulio Vargas, gatoledosilva@gmail.com

Ioan Trifu, Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Goethe University Frankfurt, ioan.trifu@gmail.com

Panel Proposal:

Cultural policy is a platform of power struggles and activism. It not only contributes to the shaping of our collective identity and perception of history, but cultural policy is also used to disseminate value claims through selecting and promoting sanctioned forms of culture. These claims are contested and fought over particularly when related to religion, ethnicity, democracy or cultural diversity. Competing public debates surrounding the public cultural sphere, historical sites and museums as well as cultural relations and diplomacy lead to state and public action, providing fertile ground for debate, activism and populism. The fear of foreign “alien” cultural influence, for instance, triggers cultural nationalist movements aimed at preserving a “pure” and homogenous society. Despite cultural policy’s manifold faces and effects, it is commonly overlooked as a subject of scientific inquiry. While some work has attempted to advance the conceptualization of cultural policy (e.g. Kevin Mulcahy 2006, 2016; Gray 2010), we need to further discuss how to develop concepts, theories and methods in the field. In addition, there is a need to examine the different roles of state and various non-state actors who engage in public action concerning domestic and transnational cultural issues. Power struggles and processes of framing and contestation unfold at the subnational, national and supranational level, both in formal and informal manners. We also need to shift our attention to cultural policy in non-Western contexts and how the global circulation of norms, discourses and policy instruments within and across these different levels lead to similarities, differences and exchanges in the realm of cultural policy. We welcome papers dealing with the above questions. We particularly seek contributions which critically discuss how to advance the analysis of cultural policy through theoretically or methodologically innovative research.

Panel 23: Innovations in Spatial Planning. Towards the Emergence and Mobility of Novel Approaches in Urban and Regional Planning

Panel Conveners:

Prof. Dr. Gabriela Christmann, Leibniz Institute for Research on Society and Space (IRS), gabriela.christmann@leibniz-irs.de

Thomas Honeck, Leibniz Institute for Research on Society and Space (IRS), thomas.honeck@leibniz-irs.de

Panel Proposal:

Major societal challenges such as social unevenness, climate protection or economic and demographic changes show their effects in urban agglomerations as well as in rural areas. At the same time, there is a general distrust towards the existent forms of governance and the established models of political engagement. In this situation, planners and local policy makers are called to develop novel and likewise broadly accepted solutions

Starting from these observations, this panel discusses how novel approaches of place governance emerge, and how they come to more general significances. Innovation theory provides one perspective to develop a deeper understanding of such processes. It emphasises that a novel planning approach or a policy is (i) strikingly different to previous ones, (ii) that it has been institutionalised to a certain extent and (iii) that it has spatially spread, i.e. that it shows translocal mobility. These assumptions lead to several questions: Which conditions favour the emergence of novel approaches in urban and regional planning? How do such novelties come to an acceptance under circumstances increasingly characterised by distrust towards the established forms of policymaking? Which types of actors are involved and which strategies do they pursue? Furthermore, it is an empirical question in how far innovation processes develop similarly or differently regarding various problem statements and in various spatial contexts.

Since the panel's central questions have attracted the interest of scholars from different disciplines and conceptual backgrounds, it is not least a question how different perspectives can be combined. Both theoretical and empirical contributions from fields such as planning, political science, geography and sociology are welcome to the discussion.

Panel 24: Hegemony, Governmentality, and the Trajectory of Democracy Project

Panel Convenors:

Attasit Sittidumrong, PhD Student in Government at the University of Essex

Email: as16100@essex.ac.uk

Daniel Smith, M.A. Student in Ideology and Discourse Analysis at the University of Essex

Email: dsmithk@essex.ac.uk

Joash Tapiheru, PhD Student in Government at the University of Essex

Email: jt16605@essex.ac.uk

Panel Proposal:

This panel aims to create a critical discussion, simultaneously, on two issues: first, the applicability of the notions of hegemony and governmentality, not only to explain, but also to contribute to the constitution of democratic project amidst the current neo-liberal crisis, second, the possibility of critique as the form of action beyond the horizon of neoliberalism.

The current neo-liberal crisis has been marked by challenges against previously broadly believed and held representations of democracy. Numerous alternative discourses of democracy have come to the fore through various movements that, more than ever, linked to one another in global-wide networks of activism. These movements, however, are comprised of various diverse elements. They are motivated by different values and principles. The main factor that unifies them has been their common disillusionment toward the horizon of neo-liberal democracy. However, these movements have been default to promote the alternative imagination from neoliberalism. This result might come from the theoretical inadequacy in demonstrating how the logic of neoliberalism affects the institutional process of policy making and the everyday politics of citizen. This panel is designed to propose that the notion of hegemony and governmentality can be employed as tools to offer explanations on the logics and operation of neoliberalism in contemporary politics. In this respect, the notion of hegemony and governmentality can help us to critique and broaden our horizon beyond the influence of neoliberalism. Therefore, the papers which convey an analysis either at empirical case or at the theoretical level, within the framework of hegemony, will be welcomed in this panel, addressing, but not limited to following points:

- How diverse elements are orchestrated into coordinated political movements.
- How these orchestration are maintained as political movements throughout fluid and contingent moments.
- How the notion of hegemony and governmentality can be used to elucidate the logics of neoliberal crisis.
- How thinking on the notion of hegemony and governmentality can offer alternative ideals of living outside the horizon of neoliberalism.

Panel 25: Worlds between words. The politics of intra-European movement discourses

Panel Convenor:

Mark van Ostaijen (vanostaijen@fsw.eur.nl), Department of Public Administration and Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam

Panel Proposal:

The freedom of movement in Europe is heavily contested. In France, the 'Polish plumber' played a significant role in the rejection of the EU constitution in 2005, the Dutch vice-prime minister called upon a 'Code Orange' for a better awareness on the 'shadow sides' of free movement in 2013 while obviously, it was one of the main arguments for British voters to favour a 'Brexit'. But how does migration mean (Yanow, 1996)?

From a discursive perspective, concepts like 'migration' and 'mobility' are not self-evident, descriptive or apolitical phenomena but are politicized in various ways on different governmental levels. While European member-states mainly refer to 'migrants' and their 'integration', European institutions mainly refer to the importance of 'European mobility' for 'mobile workers' and the 'Single market'. As such, migration and mobility are by no means neutral, descriptive or obvious phenomena. Instead, 'migration' and 'mobility' can be seen as non-self-evident, politicized and contested concepts, which is also more and more acknowledged in the literature. Such insights demands more political sensitivity in the scholarly usage of 'migration' and 'mobility' grammar.

But acknowledging this 'politics of migration' should not only account for transformations of the ones who move, but also account for transformations of the ones who re-articulate that movement. By acknowledging 'migration' as political mediated concept, it is not the migration phenomenon itself that holds importance, but the way in which (research) actors make sense and discursively construct a phenomenon as migration and 'make up people' by concepts such as migrants, migration and mobility (Hacking 2002; Latour, 2000). By such acknowledgment, scholars should no longer only point at politics as external to research (by particular states, nations or transnational organisations) but also at politics as within research (Jasanoff, 2000; Salter, 1988). For instance, some showed the limited-reflexivity of migration researchers on state-related influences causing state-specific discourses within migration research (Lavenex, 2006; de Haas, 2014; Wimmer & Glick-Schiller, 2003; Bommers & Maas, 2006).

The aim of the proposed panel is to gather papers which interpretively investigate, critically problematize or empirically substantiate migration and mobility. By this aim, this panel welcomes theoretical and empirical approaches which articulate discursive constructions of migration and mobility and offer new conceptual approaches. Such perspectives may contribute to a better understanding of migration, mobility and 'free movement' as politically mediated concepts.

Panel 26: Narrativizing institutional crises

Panel Convenors:

Karel Čada, Charles University, Prague

Email: karel.cada@fsv.cuni.cz

Simon Smith, Charles University, Prague

Email: simesmith@gmail.com

Panel Proposal:

Many institutions in modern societies are often and repeatedly described as failing and dysfunctional. In the media, different institutions, ranging from child protection to global order, are repeatedly being drawn into publicly defending themselves against accusation and critique. Such a situation prompts questions about what kind of narratives emerge in these controversies and what effects these narratives might have. The panel focuses on how narratives of crisis change and shape institutions and organizational fields and it analyses the role of narratives and narrating in institutionalization and institutional change.

Narratives of crisis refer to accounts of failure and disorder in normal development both in politics as well as policy. Such narratives always take the perspective of one side (and incite a counter-narrative from the 'other side') and include claims about necessary institutional reconstructions, suggesting a way to restore meaningful progression.

Analysing the ways in which public policy narratives interconnect with politics allows us to better understand how actors in public affairs justify themselves. It helps us contemplate policy making not only as a process of solving public problems but also as a means of defining and disputing the legitimacy of institutional arrangements, and, vice versa, it helps us read politics as a mediating field in which policy makers stake out their positions and claim a mandate for promoting institutional change and arguments thus pass into more stable discursive configurations.

This panel examines the mutual relation, interplay and possible contradictions between institutions and narratives of crisis in politics and policy. Three angles/perspectives are particularly welcome: (1) how crises are constructed or managed through narrativization; (2) how institutions are reflected in narratives of crisis; and (3) how narratives of crisis maintain or change institutions.

Panel 27: Critical Discourse Analysis and Policy

Panel Convenors:

Michael Farrelly, University of Hull, UK m.farrelly@hull.ac.uk

Nicolina Montesano Montessori, Utrecht University n.montesanomontessori@gmail.com

Panel Proposal:

This panel offers a forum for critical discourse approaches to policy analysis. A distinctive feature of this approach is its incorporation of a theory of discourse with a detailed text analytical framework which aims not just at interpreting the discursive aspects of political and policy practices but also at explicitly critiquing them.

Papers may focus on any area of policy analysis and critique, and may adopt a range of approaches to textually oriented CDA. A key aim of the panel is to provide a space to discuss the contribution of CDA as one approach to critical policy analysis and to address practical issues of method in applying critical discourse analysis to IPA. Contributors are therefore encouraged to reflect explicitly on the theoretical and methodological decisions made during their research.

Exploration of the role of discourse/semiosis in influencing, enacting, or responding to any area of policy is encouraged, including:

- Discourse, democracy and activism
- Energy and the environment
- Citizenship and education
- Immigration, asylum, and race relations
- Health and social care
- Austerity and economic crisis

Papers will variously ask: What are the features of discourse associated with areas of policy and political practices? Do these features of discursive practice impose constraints or present affordances in the social practices examined? How do particular conflicts, contradictions, and shifting power relations play out?

Panel 28: 'Framing the future. Policy change and controversies in uncertain democracies'

Panel Convenors:

Kasja Weenink, University of Amsterdam k.weenink@uva.nl

Tamara Metze, Wageningen University tamara.metze-burghouts@wur.nl

Imrat Verhoeven, University of Amsterdam i.verhoeven@uva.nl

Maartje van Lieshout, Radboud University m.vanlieshout@fm.ru.nl

Panel Proposal:

As a result of the wide availability of information in contemporary society we see different interests presenting divergent and contrasting views, frames and facts in policy conflicts. For example, varying actors in the US elections and the Brexit campaign, but also anti-vaccination activists are framing facts in accordance to their subject positions, values and beliefs in order to reduce uncertainties and win the debate. As soon as facts enter the public domain and decision making processes, they are differently interpreted and framed (Rein and Schön 1993). These framing processes often result in divergent and conflicting imaginaries and policy solutions (Jasanoff and Kim 2013). Together with framings of democratic procedures, the framing of facts, alternative futures, emotional appeals and framed imaginaries all influence controversies and change governance practices. Recursive governance, analyzed as processes of recursive frame analysis, studies the accommodation and the channeling of such frames, facts and imaginaries in the policy process, and can provide an interesting angle to understand policy change in cases of controversy (Crozier 2007, Chenail 1995).

This panel continues the practice of organizing a framing panel at the IPA conference, and in relation to the IPA 2017 theme it specifically welcomes contributions which apply framing analysis and related language-centered approaches that seek to understand policy change in cases of controversy. In the panel we aim to understand and discuss the processes of alteration, reframing and the role of diverging imaginaries in current policy conflicts.

Panel 29: Creative City Strategies and Mutations in ‘non-Western’ contexts – Exploring Policy Trajectories

Panel Convenor:

Christiaan De Beukelaer, Lecturer in Cultural Policy, University of Melbourne,
Christiaan.DeBeukelaer@unimelb.edu.au

Deborah Stevenson, Western Sydney University, Australia,
D.Stevenson@westernsydney.edu.au

Panel Proposal:

The narrative of ‘creative cities’ has significantly influenced urban and cultural policies since the early 2000s. This has largely built on the optimistic – albeit often discredited and challenged – work of famed (and disgraced) consultant-academics. As this narrative has spread around the globe, it has evolved and adapted to accommodate existing challenges in particular contexts. This panel aims to explore how these mutations have occurred by probing the role of non-state actors in the negotiation of policy priorities and implementations. We welcome empirical contributions to the understanding of how this policy narrative has been embraced, adapted, rejected, questioned, lobbied for, and/or rallied against by non-state actors in ‘non-Western’ contexts. We thereby aim to move beyond a binary approach to ‘creative city’ narratives and policies to expose the complexity of the iterative process.

Panel 30: Intersectionality in Public Policy Making and Analysis

Panel Convenor:

Chitranshu Mathur, PhD candidate, Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad

Email ID: chitranshum@iima.ac.in

Panel Proposal:

Intersectionality as a concept has been increasingly accepted by activists around the world since it was first defined by Crenshaw (1989). It has especially found currency in today's world where hyphenated, complex and overlapping identities are being asserted through social movements. However, the relevance of intersectionality to public policy making and analysis has been examined to a lesser degree (e.g. Hankivsky & Cormier, 2011), especially in challenging the dominant paradigm of understanding social justice as distributive justice. Although the critique of such reduction of social justice to distributive justice and the study of systems of oppression is not new (Young, 1990), there is still scope for examining its application to current public policy making. At the same time, the rising influence and even electoral victories of authoritarian leaders, parties and ideas in various countries around the world in the last few years, and the journalistic framing of these events as a 'backlash' of the 'people' against 'political correctness' and the 'liberal elite' has called into question the relevance of current forms and practices of activism. A common form of rejection of intersectional politics is through assertion of 'universal' truisms such as 'all humans are equal', thus negating the real differences and lived experiences of various marginalized groups and their continued oppression under the existing hierarchies. Moreover, the disagreements between different marginalized groups with differing worldviews and identities are often being magnified as interminable conflicts in the popular imagination. With this background, this panel invites both theoretical and empirical papers from any geographic or historical context around the world which critically reflect on the relevance of intersectionality in public policy making and analysis.

Panel 31: Building issues and mobilising concepts in conflicting policy processes

Panel Convenors:

Hal Colebatch, The University of New South Wales (Hal@Colebatch.com)

Michal Sedlacko, University of Applied Science FH Campus Wien (michal.sedlacko@fh-campuswien.ac.at)

Peter Spink, Getulio Vargas Foundation, São Paulo (peter.spink@fgv.br)

Panel Proposal:

There is an underlying tendency in much applied social science to see democratic public policy processes as normatively guided by notions of participation and deliberation. Hence controversies should lead to consensus or at least acceptance and where policy fields are not level, attempts should be made to make up the differences. In contrast, Young's (2000) decentred and contested approach made the case for the importance of "struggle"; to raise issues, to define terms, to get views heard and to persuade others in situations where fairness is non-existent.

How then are issues built up in settings of conflict, where highly uneven hybrid arenas are the norm rather than the exception? How are concepts mobilised, socialities and materialities fused and transformed, and kinds of "people" (Hacking, 2007) and other "socio-material beings" made up (Latour, 2005), including the publics themselves (Marres, 2005)? Do attempts to articulate authoritative (political) claims also perform institutional entities such as the state, the public, or nature?

Critical to these highly contingent processes of mobilisation, fusing and transformation in "building" issues in policy, seem to be: control over boundaries of settings of conflict; construction of "spokespersonship"; as well as versatility in the strategies through which specific resistances are overcome and the authority for establishing collective orders is developed (Voß, 2016).

Approaching conflict also means approaching research. How do we perform "research as a struggle", grabbing bits of documents, presentations, debates, newspaper cuttings, protests and other fragments of circulating meanings and feeding them into conversations that may last minutes or take place over several weeks or months?

The panel would like to bring together scholars from different critical perspectives to share how they approach conflict from the sharp end of empirical studies, where things often don't work out as planned, where the performance of governing and public action goes in many directions (Hoppe & Colebatch, 2016) and where power is assembled from many sources.

Panel 32: “Interpretive Teaching and Bringing Critical Participatory Processes into the Classroom”

Panel Convenor:

Richard Holtzman, Associate Professor of Political Science, Bryant University, Smithfield, Rhode Island, USA
(rholtzma@bryant.edu)

Panel Proposal:

At four of the last five IPA conferences, in roundtable discussions and research panels, we have raised the question whether an interpretive perspective lends itself to - or even demands - a particular style of teaching. These experiences have resulted in a publication (Dodge, Holtzman, van Hulst, and Yanow, “What Does it Mean to Teach Interpretively?” *Learning and Teaching: International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences* 9:1 (2016): 73-84) and a strong desire to continue and broaden the discussion. At the 2017 IPA conference in Leicester, we hope to do so by taking a closer look at one of the three specific questions that guided our panel last year:

- How do or can we try to open critical participatory processes in the classroom?

This question is particularly relevant as we seek to adjust our teaching practices to an environment that, as the 2017 IPA Program description argues, has been “marked by a major challenge to accepted values, institutions, styles of policymaking, forms of governance and modes of political engagement.” How can we best equip our students with the critical tools necessary to navigate these complexities? And what can an interpretive approach to teaching contribute to our efforts to cultivate active and critical participants, both in the classroom and well beyond it?

Contributions addressing this topic or other relevant areas should be grounded in classroom experiences and/or connect interpretive thinking (in one of its multiple versions) to teaching practices. That is, we are not looking for theoretical contributions, but empirical ones. Our aim is to facilitate lively presentations and discussions that not only benefit presenters but involve the audience as well. RATHER THAN TRADITIONAL PRESENTATION STYLES, WE ARE PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN PRESENTATIONS THAT ENACT THE VERY THING THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT.

Panel 33: Activism in liminal spaces: the rise of the ‘boundary spanner’ in Gypsy/Traveller protest, policy, research and practice.

Panel Convenors:

Professor Jo Richardson (Lead convenor), Director of the Centre for Comparative Housing Research, De Montfort University, Leicester. jrichardson@dmu.ac.uk @socialhousing

Janie Codona MBE, part-time PhD student at De Montfort University, Leicester and Romany Gypsy activist and advocate

Panel Proposal:

Traditionally, protests surround Gypsies and Travellers rather than include them. This can be seen in visible protests against unauthorised developments or proposals for new sites where ‘concerned local residents’ demonstrate their objection. Protests can become performances, sometimes proactively for sites, as was seen with environmental protestors coming to demonstrate on Dale Farm during the eviction in 2011[1]. Beyond this, there are different types of activism which see collaborations between Gypsy and Traveller community members and ‘representatives’, researchers, advocates working in charitable organisations and interested politicians try to shape and improve accepted political practices in order to address societal challenges like social cohesion.

A variety of complex challenges face Gypsies and Travellers, particularly related to their accommodation – practically on sites and in the broadest sense of the word in society. In order to negotiate such problems Gypsies and Travellers have needed to become expert, rather than rely on traditional expertise. Sometimes this sees community members undertaking programmes of professional education to become qualified expert (and this can result in the professional identity becoming more prominent than the identity of Gypsy/Traveller). In other scenarios, ‘boundary spanners’ work in the spaces between formally constituted organisations and groups, translating the needs and aspirations of one group and the hierarchical formalised, often professional coded language of another.

This panel seeks to question what is meant by ‘activism’ in the realm of Gypsy and Traveller politics of accommodation and identity and to better understand the impact of that on traditional notions of politics and policy making. The convenors intend to actively seek papers from a wide range of potential contributors from academia, Gypsy and Traveller activists/advocates as well as policy makers and practitioners from the public and charitable sector to debate political engagement in this area.

[1] Richardson, J (2016) ‘Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Performance of Conflict and Protest; Sites of Protest’ in Price, S and Sanz Sabido, R Sites of Protest, London: Rowman and Littlefield International Ltd

Panel 34: Transforming the 'local': critical approaches to the study of local government

Panel Convenors:

Neil Barnett (Leeds Beckett)

Steven Griggs (De Montfort University)

Helen Sullivan (Australian National University)

Panel Proposal:

Local government, like many other areas, is a broad and relatively porous field of study. In recent years, a plethora of critical perspectives have indeed been brought to bear on how we theorize 'local' politics and policy-making. These perspectives, be it from practice theory, political anthropology, social and political geography, urban studies or critical policy analysis, have challenged the 'taken-for-granted' concepts that have traditionally inhabited the toolbox of local government studies. New understandings of political practice and agency, scale and spatial dynamics, contingency and contestation, and democratic representation and community, have come to rekindle discussions of how we account for the transformation of the 'local', taking on particular salience under conditions of austerity, shifts in centre-local relations, and the alleged disaggregation and marketization of the local state. But, at the same time, such understandings have undoubtedly served to critique long-standing defences of, and justifications, for local government, leaving questions regarding the extent to which they can be replaced.

This panel aims to evaluate the lessons and insights generated by these new and emerging critical understandings of the 'local'. There has been relatively little discussion as to the common ground between such critical perspectives, as well as the normative implications for local democracy that might emerge from their insights. Seeking to advance such debates, this panel thus offers a pluralist space in which to discuss new perspectives in and around the field of local government studies, welcoming interdisciplinary, multi-theoretical and comparative contributions. We examine the categorisations, problematisations and methods of enquiry that inform different explanations of local transformations and how each generates distinct normative settlements and institutional designs for the future of 'local' government. Most importantly, we aim to explore the potential cross-fertilisations between perspectives, asking whether we have witnessed, or are in the process of witnessing, the emergence of what might be termed a new critical approach to local government studies.

Panel 35: Achieving integrated food policy: slim pickings or feast of possibilities?

Panel Convenors:

Raquel Ajates Gonzalez, Teaching Fellow, Centre for Food Policy, City University of London and Post-Doctoral Researcher at University of Dundee - Raquel.ajates@city.ac.uk

Kelly Parsons, PhD student at the Centre for Food Policy, City University of London - Kelly.Parsons.1@city.ac.uk

Rebecca Wells, Teaching Fellow, Centre for Food Policy, City University of London - Rebecca.Wells.1@city.ac.uk

Panel Proposal:

Food policy currently suffers from fragmentation: horizontally between portfolios of government; vertically between the multiple levels of food governance; along the stages of the food supply chain; as well as between policymakers and the people impacted by their decision-making.

It is widely acknowledged that the gaps, overlaps and inconsistencies resulting from a disjointed approach are hindering attempts to address the current environmental, public health and social crises of the food system, and a more integrated approach, which forges new alliances, is required to overcome this 'wicked problem'.

For the purposes of this panel, integrated policy is defined as policy where health, environmental, economic and other relevant objectives are brought together in a jointly-formulated approach across these often competing domains, covering all stages of the food supply chain. However, we are also interested in approaches and ideas covering the related concepts of policy coordination and policy coherence.

The panel will discuss what food policy integration could/should look like at different levels:

- Horizontal, within national cross-department policy programmes
- Vertically, from local to global (e.g. National frameworks for municipal level food policy)
- Integration of policies designed to improve different food systems outcomes (e.g. integration between sustainability and human health)
- The comparison of integrative approaches in more affluent versus developing societies.

Papers are therefore invited from academic and civil society colleagues in response to the following questions:

- What methods can help us map and analyse food policy integration?
- What feasible and credible policy processes and institutions can achieve integration?
- What have been the most significant examples of policy integration attempts:
How have different elements of food policy been successfully integrated to date? What can we learn from failed attempts?
- What type of integrative approaches can ensure people's lived experiences feed into policy-making processes?
- How best can activists working to improve different areas of the food system integrate their own asks to governments for more effective impacts?