



Universiteit  
Leiden



  
VERENIGING VOOR POLITIEKE WETENSCHAPPEN

## Politicologenetmaal 2018 Universiteit Leiden, 7-8 juni 2018 CALL FOR PAPERS

*(for English version of this call, please see below)*

Op donderdag 7 en vrijdag 8 juni 2018 organiseren de Nederlandse Kring voor Wetenschap der Politiek (NKWP) en de Vereniging voor Politieke Wetenschappen (VPW) voor de 17<sup>e</sup> keer gezamenlijk het Politicologenetmaal. Het Etmaal wordt dit jaar georganiseerd door het [Instituut Politieke Wetenschap van de Universiteit Leiden](#) in het [Pieter de la Court gebouw](#).

Het Etmaal start op donderdag tussen 12 en 13 uur en eindigt het op vrijdagmiddag na de lunch. Het Etmaal bestaat uit 18 workshops waarin onderzoekspapers worden gepresenteerd. Elke workshop kent twee sessies op donderdagmiddag en twee sessies op vrijdagochtend (8-12 papers in totaal). Deelnemers wonen in principe gedurende de gehele conferentie dezelfde workshop bij, zodat er een constructieve discussie rondom het workshopthema ontstaat. Hoewel de conferentie in beginsel Nederlandstalig is, zullen veel workshops in het Engels worden gehouden (zie omschrijving).

Na de donderdagsessies is er een plenaire bijeenkomst met de lezing *The Rise of Populism: What Does It Mean?* door Prof. [Cas Mudde](#) (University of Georgia) en de uitreiking van prijzen voor het beste proefschrift en de beste masterscriptie van het afgelopen jaar.

**Als u een papervoorstel wil indienen, dan wordt u verzocht vóór 15 maart 2018 contact op te nemen met de organisatoren van de workshops (met vermelding van uw naam, affiliatie en een abstract van 250 woorden). Hun emailadressen staan vermeld in deze 'call voor papers' (zie verder). Ten laatste op 31 maart 2018 hoort u van hen of uw paper geselecteerd is voor hun workshop.**

Het is ook mogelijk om aan het Etmaal deel te nemen zonder een paper te presenteren (indien er ruimte is in de betreffende workshop). Indien u aan een van de workshops wil deelnemen zonder een paper te presenteren, hoeft u geen contact op te nemen met de workshopvoorzitters. U kunt zich in dat geval direct inschrijven voor het Etmaal via de website [www.politicologenetmaal.eu](http://www.politicologenetmaal.eu).

Alle deelnemers aan het Etmaal dienen zich te registreren via [www.politicologenetmaal.eu](http://www.politicologenetmaal.eu). Registratie is mogelijk vanaf 1 april 2018 tot en met 24 mei 2018. De bijdragen voor deelname zijn de volgende:

*Gereduceerd tarief: Leden NKWP/VPW + Promovendi\**

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| <input type="radio"/> Donderdag en vrijdag         | € 100 |
| <input type="radio"/> Alleen donderdag (met diner) | € 90  |
| <input type="radio"/> Alleen vrijdag               | € 40  |

*Vol tarief*

- |  |       |
|--|-------|
| <input type="radio"/> Donderdag en vrijdag         | € 175 |
| <input type="radio"/> Alleen donderdag (met diner) | € 125 |
| <input type="radio"/> Alleen vrijdag               | € 75  |

*Studententarief: Bachelor- en Masterstudenten\*\**

- |  |      |
|--|------|
| <input type="radio"/> Donderdag en vrijdag         | € 50 |
| <input type="radio"/> Alleen donderdag (met diner) | € 40 |
| <input type="radio"/> Alleen vrijdag               | € 20 |

\* Lidmaatschap kan hier worden aangevraagd: [VPW](#) (België) of [NKWP](#) (Nederland). Promovendi dienen desgevraagd een bewijs van hun status te kunnen overleggen aan de organisatie.

\*\* Masterstudenten dienen een bewijs van inschrijving/collegekaart/verklaring van scriptiebegeleider te kunnen overleggen. Het aantal beschikbare plaatsen voor het studententarief is beperkt.

Registratie na de deadline van 24 mei 2018 is alleen mogelijk indien nog plekken beschikbaar zijn en tegen een met €50 verhoogd tarief.

Deze bijdragen omvatten een deelnemersmap, koffie en thee in de pauzes, een lunch op donderdag en vrijdag, en een borrel en diner op donderdag. Via het deelnameformulier kunnen deelnemers allergieën of voorkeuren in verband met het diner en de lunches kenbaar maken.

Het organiserend comité,  
Nicolas Blarel  
Corinna Jentzsch  
Pauline Ketelaars (VWP-vertegenwoordiger)  
Tom Louwerse  
Hans Vollaard (NKWP-vertegenwoordiger)



Universiteit  
Leiden



  
VERENIGING VOOR POLITIEKE WETENSCHAPPEN

## Politicologenetmaal 2018 Leiden University, 7-8 June 2018 CALL FOR PAPERS

The 'Politicologenetmaal' ('24-hour Political Science Conference') will be jointly organized for the 17th time by the Dutch Political Science Association (NKWP) and the Association for Political Science (VPW). This time the conference is organized by the [Political Science Department of Leiden University](#) and will take place on Thursday and Friday, June 7-8, 2018, at the [Pieter de la Court gebouw](#) in Leiden.

The conference will begin on Thursday at noon and end on Friday after lunch. The conference consists of 18 workshops, each with a different theme and each organized by a different team of workshop coordinators. Each workshop consists of four panels and can accommodate up to 12 paper presentations (two panels will take place on Thursday afternoon, two panels will take place on Friday morning). To stimulate a constructive discussion on the workshop theme, participants are expected to attend their chosen workshop for the full duration of the conference. The conference language is Dutch, but many workshops are held in English (please see the list of workshops for details).

After the workshop panels on Thursday, a plenary session will be held with a keynote address by Prof. [Cas Mudde](#) (University of Georgia), titled *The Rise of Populism: What Does It Mean?*, followed by an award ceremony for the best PhD thesis and MSc thesis of the year.

**If you are interested in presenting a paper at one of the workshops, please send your proposal directly to the contact person(s) indicated in the workshop description. Deadline for paper proposals is March 15, 2018. Proposals should include an abstract (max. 250 words), name, affiliation and contact email. You will hear from the workshop coordinators by 31 March 2018, whether your proposal was accepted.**

It is also possible to participate in the Etmaal without presenting a paper (subject to availability of space). If you are interested in one of the workshops but do not wish to present a paper, you do not need to contact the workshop coordinators. You can register directly through the conference website ([www.politicologenetmaal.eu](http://www.politicologenetmaal.eu)).

All conference participants will need to register via [www.politicologenetmaal.eu](http://www.politicologenetmaal.eu). Registration will be possible from 1 April until 24 May 2018. Registration fees are as follows:

*Reduced rate: Members of NKWP/VPW + PhD students\**

- o Thursday and Friday € 100
- o Only Thursday (with dinner) € 90
- o Only Friday € 40

*Regular rate*

- o Thursday and Friday € 175
- o Only Thursday (with dinner) € 125
- o Only Friday € 75

*Student rate: Bachelor and Master students\*\**

- o Thursday and Friday € 50
- o Only Thursday (with dinner) € 40
- o Only Friday € 20

\* You can become a member here: [VPW](#) (Belgium) of [NKWP](#) (Netherlands). PhD students need to be able to provide proof of their status upon registration for the reduced rate.

\*\* Bachelor/Master students need to provide a copy of their university registration, a student ID, or a letter from their thesis supervisor to benefit from the student discount. The number of student places is limited.

Registration after the 24 May 2018 deadline is only possible if spaces allow; in these cases there is an additional late registration fee of €50.

The fee includes a conference booklet, coffee/tea, lunch on Thursday and Friday, and drinks and dinner on Thursday. Via the registration template, participants can inform the organizers about dietary restrictions.

The organizing committee,  
Nicolas Blarel  
Corinna Jentzsch  
Pauline Ketelaars (VWP-vertegenwoordiger)  
Tom Louwerse  
Hans Vollaard (NKWP-vertegenwoordiger)

For more information: [www.politicologenetmaal.eu](http://www.politicologenetmaal.eu)

Please feel free to contact the organising committee if you have any questions:  
[politicologenetmaal2018@FSW.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:politicologenetmaal2018@FSW.leidenuniv.nl)

## Overview of workshops

*(click on title to get to the detailed workshop description)*

- 1 | Verkiezingen op het lokale vlak
- 2 | Populism is here! So what?
- 3 | Recent election campaigns: explaining and predicting turnout and party choice
- 4 | Democratic legitimacy: connecting the pieces of the puzzle
- 5 | The quality of representative democracy: revisiting 'old' standards, exploring new horizons
- 6 | Governing the political future of the european union
- 7 | The black box of international conflicts. Individual-level, domestic level, and multi-level perspectives
- 8 | New approaches in conflict and statebuilding research
- 9 | Political protest and social movements
- 10 | Political communication
- 11 | Post-democratic capitalism
- 12 | Lobbying in context: the organization and policy engagement of societal interests across time and space
- 13 | Advances in political psychology
- 14 | The political socialization of young people: comparative questions and a discussion on the future and of socialization
- 15 | Coping with terror: building resilience against the impact of terrorism on social cohesion
- 16 | Urban politics
- 17 | Waarom statistieken niet per definitie indicatoren zijn. Op naar een onafhankelijke statistiekproductie en –coördinatie binnen de overheid
- 18 | Advances in political science methodology - social profiling, micro-targeting and the use of big data

## Detailed workshop descriptions

### 1 | VERKIEZINGEN OP HET LOKALE VLAK

<b>Convenor</b> Peter Castenmiller (PBLQ) Herwig Reynaert (Universiteit Gent)	
<b>Contact person and email</b> Peter Castenmiller: <a href="mailto:p.castenmiller@planet.nl">p.castenmiller@planet.nl</a> Herwig Reynaert: <a href="mailto:Herwig.reynaert@ugent.be">Herwig.reynaert@ugent.be</a>	
<b>Short abstract</b> On the occasion of the 'Etmaal 2018' in Leiden, Peter Castenmiller (PBLQ) and Herwig Reynaert (Ghent University) are organizing once again a workshop on local politics. The essential aim of this workshop is to offer a platform to political scientists who deal with local politics and government. Here knowledge, experiences and insights can be exchanged. The approach implies that all kinds of contributions on local politics and government are welcome. Hence the workshop offers the opportunity to strengthen personal relationships between fellow scientists.	
<b>Long abstract</b> It doesn't often occur that both in the Netherlands and in Flanders the elections for the local councils are held in the same year. Yet, in 2018 this is the case. Besides, on the 14 <sup>th</sup> of October there will also be elections for the Belgian provinces. In Antwerp, the district councils will be elected in the same day. They will therefore also be of interest for the regional, federal and European elections of 2019. So, for political scientists that deal with local politics in the low countries, 2018 is of an enormous importance.  As always, local elections won't be the only topic of this workshop on local politics. All kind of contributions on local politics and government will get the attention of the participants of this workshop.  <i>Workshop participants are invited to contact the organizers <a href="mailto:Herwig.Reynaert@ugent.be">Herwig Reynaert</a> (<a href="mailto:herwig.reynaert@ugent.be">herwig.reynaert@ugent.be</a>) and <a href="mailto:p.castenmiller@planet.nl">Peter Castenmiller</a> (<a href="mailto:p.castenmiller@planet.nl">p.castenmiller@planet.nl</a>). Of course, we are also more than interested in paper proposals.</i>	
<b>Language papers</b>	Dutch or English
<b>Language discussions</b>	Dutch

## 2| POPULISM IS HERE! SO WHAT?

### Convenor

Andrej Zaslove (University of Nijmegen)  
Matthijs Rooduijn (University of Amsterdam)  
Steven Van Hauwaert (University of Mainz)

### Contact person and email

Andrej Zaslove ([a.zaslove@fm.ru.nl](mailto:a.zaslove@fm.ru.nl))  
Matthijs Rooduijn ([m.rooduijn@uva.nl](mailto:m.rooduijn@uva.nl))  
Steven Van Hauwaert ([vanhauwaert@politik.uni-mainz.de](mailto:vanhauwaert@politik.uni-mainz.de))

### Short abstract

This workshop examines populism in its different forms, across different contexts, as a cause or consequence; but, most importantly, this workshop sets out to examine questions surrounding the implications of populism. We know populism is (widely) present. Yet, to what extent is this relevant for different aspects of politics?

### Long abstract

The recent election of populism as 2017's word of the year is not surprising (although perhaps misplaced) considering its systematic coverage across countries. Think only about the US presidential campaigns and subsequent election and the French/Dutch national elections, to name but a few examples. While populism certainly is not new, it is arguably much more pervasive, visible and controversial today than it has ever been. This, of course, comes with an equal amount of misconceptions, misunderstandings and challenges. Therefore, more than ever, its study is important.

Populism has gradually become a permanent feature across the vast majority of European democracies. Even though most populism research focuses on political parties, it is (should) no longer be restricted to this. Recent academic developments highlight the role of populism amongst individuals, as part of traditional institutions and mainstream political actors, and across the political spectrum and irrespective of political colour. At the same time, many European democracies are undergoing sizeable changes, from the systematic decline of social democracy (or social democratic parties) to the polarisation of European democracies and more structural institutional evolutions, such as the immigration/refugee crisis and a potential Brexit. Many of these trends, whether dramatic or gradual, are often related to populism and the rise or persistence of this phenomenon. The real question, however, remains: To what extent is populism to blame? And, if populism plays a factor, is it as an input or an output?

While the issue of populism is of course a broad one and its (supposed) impact quite comprehensive, this workshop particularly seeks contributions that address the consequences of populism at its different analytical levels. While we do not distinguish in terms of methodologies, empirical approaches or research designs, we do favour papers that provide particular theoretical insights into the larger puzzle that currently can be described as populism is here, so what? To what extent does populism affect mainstream parties, either in terms of electoral success or coalition potential? How does populism play a role in the increasing fragmentation and polarisation dynamics we see in European (pseudo) democracies? To what extent can populism reduce the widening democratic deficit or improve general dynamics of representation? Should populism alarm (liberal) democracies or can they serve as a stimulus for (necessary) democratic reform?

This workshop does not favour any specific methodological approach, but we are particularly interested in mixed-method, comparative and innovative approaches. The workshop is supported by the ECPR's Standing Group on Extremism and Democracy (<http://extremism-and-democracy.com>) and Team Populism (<https://populism.byu.edu>).

<b>Language papers</b>	ENGLISH
<b>Language discussions</b>	ENGLISH

### 3 | RECENT ELECTION CAMPAIGNS: EXPLAINING AND PREDICTING TURNOUT AND PARTY CHOICE

**Convenor**

Prof. dr. Jan Kleinnijenhuis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam  
Prof. dr. Stefaan Walgrave, Universiteit Antwerpen

**Contact person and email**

[j.kleinnijenhuis@vu.nl](mailto:j.kleinnijenhuis@vu.nl)  
[stefaan.walgrave@uantwerpen.be](mailto:stefaan.walgrave@uantwerpen.be)

**Short abstract**

What are the trends and patterns in the most recent election campaigns, and what is their explanation? The session aims at the discussion of empirical research papers about interactions between parties, media and voters that explain turnout and party choice.

**Long abstract**

The most recent Dutch elections were held in March 2017, the most recent elections for the Flemish and Wallonian Parliaments in March 2014. In the Netherlands the VVD remained largest in spite of a loss, but its social-democratic coalition partner, the PvdA, suffered a historic defeat. At the 2014 Flemish elections the NV-A did win to the detriment of the anti-immigrant party VB. In Wallonia the Parti Socialiste of incumbent prime minister Elio di Rupo lost, whereas the MR headed by the current prime minister Charles Michel was among the winners. Recent election campaigns elsewhere were no less surprising, e.g. in the US (2016-11, Trump: wall along the southern border), France (2017-6, Macron wins with a pro-EU stance), Germany (2017-9, CDU/CSU loses but remains largest, AfD gains less than 2016 polls predicted) and Austria (2017-11, ÖVP headed by Sebastian Kurz wins, FPÖ only third in row).

What are the trends and patterns here, and what is their explanation? The session aims at the discussion of empirical research papers about interactions between parties, media and voters in these recent election campaigns, with the possibility to discuss expected developments in future national election campaigns.

We welcome especially papers based on representative (panel) surveys or survey-embedded experiments to describe and explain the media use and party preferences of voters, preferably but not necessarily in combination with content analyses to reveal the messages of parties (manifestoes, tweets, party websites) and/or media (e.g. newspapers, television, social media). The politicologenetmaal 2018 is the first etmaal to discuss papers based on the Dutch Parliamentary Election Study 2017.

We expect papers about a broad variety of topics and theoretical and empirical perspectives, such as:

1. Issues and prospective issue voting (e.g. proximity, direction, discounting, issue ownership, issue convergence), Including the role of specific issues (e.g. refugees, the EU, populist promises) and the role of overarching political dimensions (e.g. left-right, pro-con globalization).
2. Retrospective voting (e.g. attribution of positive/negative developments either to incumbents or to exogenous factors)
3. neglecting, supporting or attacking specific other parties, including hiding preferences, advancing or rejecting future government coalitions with specific other parties.
4. the role of party leaders, including the role of populist leaders
5. the role of televised debates and opinion polls in attributing momentum in the horse race,

- gains or losses, success or failure to political candidates and their parties
- 6. advice from Vote Advice Applications
- 7. media content (newspapers, tv, social media) with respect to the visibility and tone of news focusing on 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 in self-selected media, and of its effects on voters

The papers may focus on specific parties or specific party families, or on the role of specific media. Because of the focus on recent elections, we do neither expect purely theoretical papers, nor papers based on laboratory experiments, papers based on interviews, or other purely descriptive papers that do not deliver an explanation of voter turnout and/or party choice in a recent election. Keywords: parties, media, voters, campaigns, recent national elections

<b>Language papers</b>	English (possibly Dutch paper with English presentation)
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 4 | DEMOCRATIC LEGITIMACY: CONNECTING THE PIECES OF THE PUZZLE

### Convenors

Lisanne de Blok, University of Amsterdam  
Hannah Werner, University of Leuven

### Contact person and email

Hannah Werner ([Hannah.werner@kuleuven.be](mailto:Hannah.werner@kuleuven.be))

### Short abstract

In this workshop we invite scholars working on democratic legitimacy to present their work and discuss overarching questions on the meaning, causes and consequences of democratic legitimacy and related concepts. We want to provide a platform to connect theoretical and empirical work as well as qualitative and quantitative studies.

### Long abstract

For decades, democratic legitimacy has played a central role in theories and studies of political systems. It is considered to be an important indicator of a healthy civic and democratic political culture and essential to the survival and stability of democratic regimes. Inherent to the notion of democratic legitimacy is the assumption that low levels of citizens support pose a threat to democratic systems. Currently, there is a fierce debate in political science literature on whether or not democratic legitimacy is eroding. On the one hand, a vast number of scholars have argued that the legitimacy of politics is declining in established democracies, some even referring to a legitimacy crisis. On the other hand, there are also more optimistic scholars on democratic legitimacy who argue that such a decline is not as widespread.

Whether or not there is a legitimacy crisis, the study of democratic legitimacy has occupied many researchers since the 1970s. This resulted in a broad body of research which is however fragmented and often disconnected. We believe it is time for research on legitimacy to take a step forward and connect those different pieces of the puzzle.

We identify mainly three cleavages within the study of democratic legitimacy. Firstly, there appears to be a strong divide between theoretical work and empirical studies on democratic legitimacy. Discussions are often either theoretically or empirically oriented, even though the two branches could strongly benefit from closer collaboration. Tied to the divide between theory and empirics is the divide between work on normative legitimacy and subjective legitimacy. Secondly, there is disagreement on the meaning and measurement of subjective democratic legitimacy. This multifaceted concept has been studied from various perspectives, including political trust, satisfaction with democracy, procedural fairness, decision acceptance, and consent. A dialogue between these different perspectives would contribute to a better understanding of the fuzzy concept of democratic legitimacy. Thirdly, studies have predominantly focused on either the determinants or the consequences of democratic legitimacy. These two perspectives form two sides of the same coin, yet they are rarely studied together.

To move towards a collective understanding of democratic legitimacy, it is essential that findings are exchanged and connected within these three debates, but also between these three debates. We therefore believe it is fruitful and important to stimulate dialogue between all perspectives on democratic legitimacy. In this workshop, we invite papers that provide theoretical and/or empirical insights into these debates on democratic legitimacy. We welcome both qualitative and quantitative studies, as well as single case studies and comparative studies. Furthermore, we urge researchers to think of the relevance of their findings to the overarching understanding on

democratic legitimacy.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English or Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 5 | THE QUALITY OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY: REVISITING ‘OLD’ STANDARDS, EXPLORING NEW HORIZONS

### Convenors

Eline Severs, Vrije Universiteit Brussel  
Robin Devroe, Universiteit Gent  
Sanne van Oosten, Universiteit van Amsterdam

### Contact person and email

Eline Severs ([Eline.Severs@vub.be](mailto:Eline.Severs@vub.be))

### Short abstract

This workshop draws upon the contemporary reconceptualization of political representation as a process of claim-making, and seeks to update and complement our standards for measuring the quality of political representation. It welcomes contributions that deal with either systemic or actor-level considerations of good, democratic representation.

### Long abstract

Traditionally, political representation was conceptualised as a principal-agent relationship structured by elections, and its quality was conceived in terms of congruencies between the preferences of electoral constituents and parliamentarians’ actions. Increasingly, however, this conceptualisation is found to be lacking. The mobilisation of non-territorial and non-partisan identities (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, sexuality, etc.) demonstrated the limitations of accountability mechanisms structured by elections (Williams 1998; Phillips 1995). The variety of societal actors (e.g., NGOs, celebrities, citizen-representatives, and online platforms) claiming to represent the people further demonstrated the need for updating traditional accounts of representation.

The re-conceptualization of representation as a process of claim-making comprising the activities of a multitude of actors (Saward 2010) adequately captures contemporary representation practices. But this reconceptualization also raises new normative challenges. The insight that representation co-constitutes political reality led scholars to abandon citizens’ preferences as objective benchmarks for democratic representation, and redirected normative concerns to the systemic conditions that allow citizens to judge their representatives and hold them accountable (Disch 2011). Most recently, scholars (Severs & Dovi 2018) have argued, that this ‘systemic turn’ should not cause us to turn a ‘blind eye’ to individual representatives: they function as gate-keepers to decision-making and, depending on their status, set the terms of political debates. This workshop, therefore, welcomes contributions that deal with either systemic or actor-level considerations of good representation. *A first range of questions relates to electoral mechanisms of representation.* If not citizens’ preferences, what standards should we use to evaluate parliamentarians? Furthermore, in times of waning party membership bases, how do parties establish relationships with constituents? To what extent can social media offer an alternative? *A second set of questions speaks to the inclusiveness of our representative systems.* What are the preconditions to inclusive systems? What do we understand by “inclusion”, which groups should be included, and how do we measure inclusiveness? *A third range of questions relates to non-electoral forms of representation.* Without mechanisms of electoral authorisation, how can non-electoral representatives claim representativeness? Under what circumstances can these forms of representation contribute to democracy? What kind of non-electoral claims are taken up by electoral politics, and why?

The workshop invites papers dealing with the quality of political representation at the

(sub)national or supranational level. Papers may have a theoretical, methodological and/or empirical approach but should deal with the core normative concerns outlined here.

**Language papers**

English and Dutch

**Language discussions**

English

## 6 | GOVERNING THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

<p><b>Convenors</b>            Sebastiaan Princen (Utrecht University)            Anna van der Vleuten (Radboud University)</p>	
<p><b>Contact person and email</b>            Sebastiaan Princen: <a href="mailto:s.b.m.princen@uu.nl">s.b.m.princen@uu.nl</a>            Anna van der Vleuten: <a href="mailto:a.vandervleuten@fm.ru.nl">a.vandervleuten@fm.ru.nl</a></p>	
<p><b>Short abstract</b>            This workshop seeks to bring together conceptual, theoretical and empirical papers that deal with the political challenges facing the EU. We hope to include both empirical and normative approaches, with a view to stimulating a wider debate on what political science/IR can contribute to the debates surrounding today's European Union.</p>	
<p><b>Long abstract</b>            The European Union faces a range of pressing political issues. These include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to deal with the persistent levels of Euroscepticism among many citizens.</li> <li>• Scenarios for and the likelihood of European disintegration, either through other 'exits' after Brexit or through the overall disbandment of the EU.</li> <li>• How to manage cooperation and integration in a Union that spans 27 member states and how to overcome, or at least manage, differences and tensions between this variety of member states.</li> <li>• Whether and how to carve out a greater role in social policies, alongside the traditional 'hard core' of market integration.</li> <li>• How to deal with threats to the rule of law, human rights and democracy within member states.</li> <li>• How to deal in a more unified way with insecurity and state/non-state violence at its borders and in neighbouring regions.</li> </ul> <p>In this workshop, we invite contributions by political scientists, and scholars working in related fields, that focus on these and other issues concerning the political challenges facing the EU. The workshop is open to both conceptual, theoretical and empirical studies. We also hope to bring together researchers taking normative and empirical approaches, with a view to stimulating a wider debate on what political science/IR can contribute to the debates surrounding the European Union today.</p>	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 7 | THE BLACK BOX OF INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS. INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL, DOMESTIC LEVEL, AND MULTI-LEVEL PERSPECTIVES

<p><b>Convenors</b>  Femke E. Bakker (Leiden University)  Daan Fonck (KU Leuven)</p>	
<p><b>Contact person and email</b>  Femke E. Bakker (<a href="mailto:f.e.bakker@fsw.leidenuniv.nl">f.e.bakker@fsw.leidenuniv.nl</a>)</p>	
<p><b>Short abstract</b>  This workshop aims to contribute to a more interdisciplinary approach to the study of international conflict. We invite papers from IR, peace and conflict studies, EU studies, leadership studies, (Comparative) Foreign Policy Analysis and Comparative Politics that embrace the domestic turn in the study of international conflict, as well as its democratic repercussions.</p>	
<p><b>Long abstract</b>  Over the last two decades, research in conflict and security studies has (re-)focused on the complex interplay between domestic politics and international security, in an attempt to narrow the gap between international relations and comparative politics studies. Within comparative politics, a reappraisal on the importance of democratic control on foreign and security policies has surfaced, including research on parliamentary actors in foreign and security policies, party political behavior and impact on security policies, and the role of democratic norms in structuring security policies. From FPA or IR disciplines, equally a ‘domestic turn’ can be witnessed in the study of international security policy and conflict management, where attention is yielded to the roles of multi-level governance, domestic institutions and structures, public opinion and perception, political culture, and to the role of individual actors.</p> <p>Moreover, a range of previously ‘domestic’ issues are increasingly confronted with, and therefore affected by, an international security dimension (such as immigration, environment/climate or energy). Therefore, their treatment as an intrinsic domestic policy can no longer be taken for granted, neither can they be exclusively studied as an international policy domain. These academic debates are all the more relevant in the light of a rapidly changing international context.</p> <p>Opening the black box of international conflicts brings about many different perspectives and even more potential explanatory factors. Analytical challenges lie in linking different levels of analysis, addressing the interplay between actor-centric and structure-centric approaches, and in bridging the influence of multiple levels of governance with domestic factors.</p> <p>This workshop aims to contribute to a more interdisciplinary approach to the study of international conflict. We invite papers from IR, peace and conflict studies, EU studies, leadership studies, (Comparative) Foreign Policy Analysis and Comparative Politics that embrace the domestic turn in the study of international conflict, as well as its democratic repercussions. For this workshop, we use a broad notion of security that includes traditional questions of defense policy as well as anti-terrorism policy and forms of soft security policies. While papers should address the core theme of the workshop, we welcome both qualitative and quantitative studies as well as conceptual papers. The working language of this workshop will be English.</p>	
<b>Language papers</b>	English OR Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	English OR Dutch

## 8 | NEW APPROACHES IN CONFLICT AND STATEBUILDING RESEARCH

<b>Convenors</b> Corinna Jentzsch (Leiden University) Abbey Steele (University of Amsterdam)	
<b>Contact person and email</b> Corinna Jentzsch ( <a href="mailto:c.jentzsch@fsw.leidenuniv.nl">c.jentzsch@fsw.leidenuniv.nl</a> ) Abbey Steele ( <a href="mailto:a.a.steele@uva.nl">a.a.steele@uva.nl</a> )	
<b>Short abstract</b> This session is conceived as an opportunity for presenters to “workshop” a new research question or theory, and to generate ideas for case selection, operationalization, and data collection and analysis with participants. Alternately, a presenter could share some new, original data to brainstorm ideas for new research questions and theories. Substantively, we invite papers that probe some dimension of civil wars, political violence, or state building.	
<b>Long abstract</b> This workshop focuses on the discussion of new projects in conflict and statebuilding studies. Usually, conferences do not leave much room for brainstorming initial ideas, new research opportunities, or research design issues for new projects. We would like to offer a forum that provides an opportunity for presenters to “workshop” a new research question or theory, and to generate ideas for case selection, operationalization, and data collection and analysis with workshop participants. Alternately, a presenter could share some new, original data to brainstorm ideas for new research questions and theories. The idea is that participants learn from each other about new, original data sources, methods of data collection and/or analysis and, by brainstorming about a specific project, get ideas for their own. Substantively, we invite papers that probe some dimension of civil wars, political violence, or state building. In contrast to the usual conference format, we don’t ask for complete papers, but for short project overviews.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 9 | POLITICAL PROTEST AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

<b>Convenors</b> Ali Honari (VU University Amsterdam); Pauline Ketelaars (University of Antwerp); Jasper Muis (VU University Amsterdam)	
<b>Contact person and email</b> Jasper Muis ( <a href="mailto:j.c.muis@vu.nl">j.c.muis@vu.nl</a> )	
<b>Short abstract</b> Any papers on protest behaviour and social movements are welcome. Contributions can be theoretical or empirical, and based on qualitative or quantitative research. We especially look forward to papers about ‘democracy protests’, activism of the populist radical right, and contributions that bridge the fields of political science, communication, and sociology.	
<b>Long abstract</b> This session aims to provide a more prominent place for the study of protest behaviour and social movements within Dutch and Flemish political science. Much of political science focuses on institutionalized politics, such as legislation, institutions, political parties, and established interest groups. Accordingly, the main American political science journals rarely contain work on social movements. Most of what Van Deth (2014) calls “Political Participation-II” is largely left to sociology and communication science. However, “when it comes to understanding the major waves of democratization, the rise of new political values and issues, as well as the current threats to democracy, there are hardly any political actors that are more relevant to study than social movements” (Koopmans 2007: 704-705).  Any papers on protest behaviour and social movements are welcome in this panel. Contributions can be theoretical or empirical, and they can be based on qualitative or quantitative research, or both. We especially look forward to papers that advance our understanding in the following three contemporary issues in the field of ‘contentious politics’. First, we are interested in so-called ‘democracy protests’ and the role of social movement actors in political change and the process of democratization. Take for instance the Euromaidan protests in Ukraine (2014), ‘Umbrella Protests’ in Hong Kong (2014) or the ‘Twitter Revolution’ and Green Movement in Iran (2009) (Brancati 2016; Honari 2013). Second, we especially welcome papers on what Caiani (2012:4) calls the ‘bad side’ of social movement activism. Certain social movements arguably figure prominently among democracy’s current threats. In Western Europe, until 2015 the populist radical right was almost exclusively a party phenomenon and street politics was the domain of only marginal, sometimes violent, extreme right groups (Mudde 2017). In recent years, more influential and prominent extra-parliamentary groups have emerged, such as the English Defence League and PEGIDA. Third, we look forward to contributions that bridge the fields of political science, communication, and sociology. We are particularly interested in the role of social media in political contention and how the Internet gives rise to ‘unstructured’, ‘leaderless’ social movements – a model of activism that characterized for instance the Arab Spring uprisings in 2011 (Bayat 2013).	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 10 | POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

<b>Convenors</b> Loes Aaldering (University of Vienna) Daphne van der Pas (University of Amsterdam) Mariken van der Velden (University of Zurich)	
<b>Contact person and email</b> Loes Aaldering ( <a href="mailto:loes.aaldering@univie.ac.at">loes.aaldering@univie.ac.at</a> ) Daphne van der Pas ( <a href="mailto:d.j.vanderpas@uva.nl">d.j.vanderpas@uva.nl</a> ) Mariken van der Velden ( <a href="mailto:vandervelden@ipz.uzh.ch">vandervelden@ipz.uzh.ch</a> )	
<b>Short abstract</b> This workshop invites papers focusing on political communication in the broadest sense possible, including party communication, electoral or attitudinal media effects, campaigns, social media and politics, and political journalism.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Communication is an integral aspect of politics: It is the way for political actors to express themselves. Hence, the importance of communication research for political science cannot be overstated. Political communication deals with, among other things, the way (political) information is communicated to the electorate, how media cover parties and politicians, the way issues in the media affect politics, how political actors communicate with each other, and interpersonal communication on political topics.  This workshop offers a venue to discuss best practices in political communication research. We aim to reach out to scholars of political communication in the broadest sense possible, including research on (internal and external) party communication, the influence of media coverage on political behavior or attitudes, election campaigns, social media in a political context, and political journalism.  In short, we warmly invite papers on the broad topic of political communication. We welcome papers employing experimental designs, survey studies, content analyses or other relevant methods. Papers that explicitly aim to strengthen our understanding of the causality involved in communication effects are encouraged. In addition, we are also particularly interested in papers that employ cutting-edge research methods to study political communication in an automated fashion. The proposed working language is English.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 11 | POST-DEMOCRATIC CAPITALISM

<b>Convenor</b> David Hollanders (University of Amsterdam) Bram Mellink (University of Amsterdam) Arjen Noordhof (University of Amsterdam) Naomi Woltring (Utrecht University)	
<b>Contact person and email</b> David Hollanders ( <a href="mailto:d.a.hollanders@uva.nl">d.a.hollanders@uva.nl</a> )	
<b>Short abstract</b> This workshop discusses the thesis that democracy is being undermined within contemporaneous capitalism, and assesses the wider consequences of this claim. It aims to discuss the extent of the problem, to what extent it is a reversible phenomenon and what kinds of social action would be required to change course.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Several political scientists propose that the 1945-shotgun marriage between democracy and capitalism is breaking up. According to this perspective, capital has broken loose from the Keynesian social-democratic compromise that marked the <i>Trente Glorieuses</i> in Western Europe and the United States. In the so-called 'debt-state' (Wolfgang Streeck), firms and wealthy individuals evade taxation by the state, while lending to the state, which thereby hands over financial sovereignty to creditors and an international plethora of debt-collectors. Democratic institutions do remain in place, but are emptied of their former substance.  This workshop discusses the thesis that democracy is being undermined within contemporaneous capitalism, and assesses the wider consequences of this claim. The aim is to discuss the extent of the problem, to what extent it is a reversible phenomenon and what kinds of social action would be required to change course. Regarding the latter, Melinda Cooper for example argues for a new truly emancipatory embedding of the market which goes beyond conservative left wing nostalgia for the (implicitly male) Fordist family wage which formalized (hetero)sexual preferences into the nuclear family. The struggle against 'neoliberalism', often underpinned by an idealized interpretation of the past, is therefore not unambiguous in its outcomes and requires further examination.  We welcome papers or essays on recent developments (e.g. neoliberalization, financialization) of and in capitalism –be it from a political, historical, economic, philosophical or psychological perspective-, that don't shy away from discussing what the next likely and/or desirable capitalistic stage will be.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English AND Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	English AND Dutch

## 12 | LOBBYING IN CONTEXT: THE ORGANIZATION AND POLICY ENGAGEMENT OF SOCIETAL INTERESTS ACROSS TIME AND SPACE

### Convenor

Ellis Aizenberg (University of Amsterdam)  
Adrià Albareda (Leiden University)  
Bert Fraussen (Leiden University)  
Marcel Hanegraaff (University of Amsterdam)  
Patrick Statsch (University of Amsterdam)

### Contact person and email

Ellis Aizenberg ([e.aizenberg@uva.nl](mailto:e.aizenberg@uva.nl))  
Adrià Albareda ([a.albareda@fgga.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:a.albareda@fgga.leidenuniv.nl))  
Patrick Statsch ([p.d.statsch@uva.nl](mailto:p.d.statsch@uva.nl))

### Short abstract

This panel welcomes papers that examine the organization and policy engagement of different societal interests across time and space. Societal interests here refers to a variety of organizations, such as interest groups (NGOs, trade unions and business associations), firms and social movements.

### Long abstract

During the last decades, the study of organized interests has received increasing societal and scholarly attention. Across different disciplines, a broad range of approaches have been applied to study the behavior of these key intermediary organizations, such as interest groups and social movements, yet also non-membership organizations that engage in lobbying such as firms and non-profits.

In explaining the organization and policy engagement of these organizations that represent different societal interests, scholars have become increasingly attentive to a variety of contextual factors. As a result, our knowledge of how different environmental conditions (such as variation across institutional venues, competition among organized interests, the stage of the policy process, salience and issue complexity) shape lobbying and advocacy practices, has increased considerably. Yet, the progress of the discipline has also led to a rather scattered research field, as scholars typically employ mid-range theories tailored to their specific needs.

The aim of this panel is to ensure a better integration of these different approaches and perspectives, as this will lead to a more coherent field of research. Therefore, we specifically invite papers that examine the organization and policy engagement of different organized interests across space (different countries and/or institutional arenas) and time (phases of the policy process and/or changes in issue salience), as well as work that includes a variety of interest organizations (such as firms and interest groups, or social movements and non-profits). In this way, this panel aims to integrate and accumulate knowledge related to questions such as *why and how do organized interests adapt their structure and strategies in different institutional environments? What explains the political mobilization of existing organizations (across time, policy sectors, or different phases of the policy cycle)? How do institutional variation, issue characteristics (e.g. salience, public opinion) and lobbying competition affect the chances of policy success?*

Contributions can be conceptual or empirical, descriptive or explanatory and qualitative or quantitative.

<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 13 | ADVANCES IN POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

<b>Convenors</b> Annemarie Walter, University of Nottingham Cecil Meeusen, KU Leuven Martin Rosema, University of Twente	
<b>Contact person and email</b> Annemarie Walter, <a href="mailto:annemarie.walter@nottingham.ac.uk">annemarie.walter@nottingham.ac.uk</a>	
<b>Short abstract</b> This workshop is about all psychological processes related to political phenomena. We welcome papers that develop new theory or apply innovative methods, as well as papers that use existing theories and established methods of qualitative or quantitative research in political psychology and apply these to the study of politics.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Political psychology is a fascinating interdisciplinary field of research that focuses on psychological processes in order to understand and explain political phenomena. Its scholars typically analyse the attitudes, beliefs, norms, values, emotions, identities and behavior of individuals in specific political systems. Political psychology provides valuable insights into contemporary political and social problems by analysing, for example, how citizens and politicians react to threats such as terrorism or problems like immigration, why intergroup conflicts often persist, how prejudice and stereotypes influence political behaviour, when and how citizens become politically active in protest or political parties, and how personality affects political attitudes and behaviour among both political elites and ordinary citizens. In this workshop we invite papers that deal with the psychological processes related to political phenomena. We welcome papers that develop new theory or apply innovative methods, as well as papers that use existing theories and established methods of qualitative or quantitative research in political psychology and apply these to the study of politics. Scholars with a different background than political science (e.g. psychology, sociology, economics, etc.) who provide insights that are relevant for political research are also encouraged to join.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English OR Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 14 | THE POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE: COMPARATIVE QUESTIONS AND A DISCUSSION ON THE FUTURE AND OF SOCIALIZATION

<p><b>Convenors</b>  Dorien Sampermans (KU.Leuven)  Lies Maurissen (KU.Leuven)  Anke Munniksma (UvA)</p>	
<p><b>Contact person and email</b>  Dorien Sampermans (<a href="mailto:dorien.sampermans@kuleuven.be">dorien.sampermans@kuleuven.be</a>)  Lies Maurissen (<a href="mailto:lies.maurissen@kuleuven.be">lies.maurissen@kuleuven.be</a>)</p>	
<p><b>Short abstract</b>  In this workshop we will discuss the political socialization of young people in the contemporary society. If we perceive the community as more diverse and polarized, it is important to know how socialization is perceived today. How do we socialize young people in this new context? What are international differences?</p>	
<p><b>Long abstract</b>  Observing the results of a comparative study such as the recent ICCS 2016 study, we can see different kinds of outcomes across the participating countries. In Finland, the press released a positive message claiming that the Finish teenagers still provide a 'high standard of civic knowledge.' Also, the Flemish media was happy to announce that the Flemish students know more compared to the ICCS results in 2009. Although they also mentioned that Flemish youngsters remain passive when it comes to participation and community engagement.</p> <p>In this observation of high knowledge scores and low engagement among students important questions arise. On the one hand, one can pose <b>comparative questions</b>. Why do Scandinavian students score high on the knowledge and behavior scales? What causes passivity among students in the rest of Europe? How do the economic crisis, polarization, and the use of social media influence political trust and other civic outcomes differently in the participating countries? Does the refugee crisis affect young peoples' tolerance attitudes differently in different countries?</p> <p>On the other hand, also the overarching questions about <b>the political socialization potential</b> arise. Can citizenship education influence students' attitudes or political behavior? Which factors are effective to motivate students to become engaged politically? Why is heightening students' civic knowledge alone not a premise for further engagement? If there is an engagement and a civic knowledge gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students, can good citizenship education close this gap?</p> <p>During this politicologenetmaal workshop we will discuss these questions on the political socialization of young people. We welcome quantitative and qualitative studies and contributions from political sciences as well as educational sciences or developmental psychology. The working language of the panel is English.</p>	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 15 | COPING WITH TERROR: BUILDING RESILIENCE AGAINST THE IMPACT OF TERRORISM ON SOCIAL COHESION

### Convenors

Amélie Godefroidt (Centre for Research on Peace and Development, KU Leuven)

Maarten Schroyens (Centre for Research on Peace and Development, KU Leuven)

### Contact person and email

Amélie Godefroidt ([amelie.godefroidt@kuleuven.be](mailto:amelie.godefroidt@kuleuven.be))

### Short abstract

Terrorism is arguably one of the most severe challenges facing societies nowadays. By evoking a culture of fear, attacks are often aimed at damaging the social fabric of societies. In this workshop, we aim to (1) take stock of the **social-psychological and –political consequences** of terrorism and (2) unravel individual and societal **resilience-building** factors.

### Long abstract

Terrorism is arguably one of the most severe challenges facing societies nowadays. By evoking a culture of fear, attacks are usually aimed at damaging the social fabric and cohesion of societies. A large and growing body of literature has investigated this relation between (fearing) terrorism and a wide range of social cohesion measures. These studies have demonstrated increases in authoritarianism, right-wing support, and political intolerance (e.g., Echebarria-Echabe and Fernández-Guede 2006; Cohrs et al. 2005; Skitka, Bauman, and Mullen 2004; Vergani and Tacchi 2016) as well as in xenophobia, prejudices, and even aggression towards Arabs, Muslims, and immigrants (e.g., Ciftci 2012; Panagopoulos 2006; Legewie 2013; Hopkins 2010; Huddy, Khatib, and Capelos 2002; Argyrides and Downey 2004) in response to terrorism. However, evidence from recent case studies challenge this perspective by showing positive changes in societal life in the aftermath of traumas (Calhoun & Tedeschi, 2014), such as increased civic engagement of child soldiers in Uganda (Blattman, 2009), higher levels of trust for victims of displacement in Sierra Leone (Bellows & Miguel, 2006; 2009) and post-traumatic growth among Israeli youth exposed to terror (Laufer, Solomon & Levine, 2010). Trust and civic engagement was also found to be reinforced in the Norwegian society in the aftermath of the Utoya terror attack (Wollebaek et al., 2012), while more positive worldviews were reported after 9/11 (Milam et al., 2004; Butler et al., 2005). Hence, it is still unclear how terrorism exactly affects different individuals or societies, which individuals or societies are more resilient to the threat of terrorism, and why.

Against this background, this workshop aims to stimulate discussion on social, political, economic, and other significant factors increasing resilience towards the psychological warfare of terrorism. We are particularly interested in papers that theoretically and/or empirically explore to what extent and under what conditions terrorism is related to changes in social cohesion in different societies. What helps us to explain the resilience –or the lack thereof– of different societies against the ongoing threats of terrorism? And, knowing this, how can societies become or be made more resilient to the damaging impact of terrorism on social cohesion? Possible topics include the role of intergroup contact, commemorations, religion and religiosity, media exposure and government communication, teachers and parents, ... in explaining the relation between terrorism and social cohesion. These are a couple of general questions and topics that fit into the workshop's main objectives: **(1) Taking stock of social-psychological and –political consequences of terrorism and (2) unraveling individual or societal resilience-building factors.**

We would like to emphasize **theoretical and methodological plurality** and wish to bring together new research from the fields of political science, sociology, psychology, law and criminology, communication, economics, anthropology, philosophy, and other disciplines. In doing so, we hope

to bring about an inspiring intellectual exchange between scientists from various backgrounds to reach a better understanding of the dynamics of terrorism and social cohesion in the world today.

<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

<b>Convenors</b> Bart van Leeuwen (Radboud University) Margo Trappenburg (Utrecht University)	
<b>Contact person and email</b> Bart van Leeuwen (b.vanleeuwen@fm.ru.nl) Margo Trappenburg, (m.j.trappenburg@uu.nl)	
<b>Short abstract</b> Urbanization is rapidly changing the way in which most citizens of contemporary states live. The objective of this workshop is to examine a number of (normative) questions that are timely and relevant in the light of this development, such as concerning urban citizenship, segregation, gentrification, homelessness, neighborly help, civil inattention, cosmopolitanism.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Urbanization is rapidly changing the way in which most citizens of contemporary states live. This massive shift from a spread-out pattern of human settlement to one of concentration in urban centers represents ‘a new and fundamental step in man’s social evolution’ (Kingsley Davis, ‘The Urbanization of the Human Population,’ 1965). Many citizens now live in large and dense agglomerations that involve a degree of human contact and of social complexity never before known.  The objective of this workshop is to examine a number of (normative) questions that are timely and relevant in the light of these developments. Urbanites have been characterized as blasé (Simmel), indifferent (Wirth) and as living side-by-side (Tonkiss). To what extent is this typical city dweller a challenge for citizenship? And relatedly, should we slow down the process of ethnic clustering and segregation in order to avoid incivility and ‘the fall of public man’ (Sennett) or should we accept voluntary residential clustering (Young)? Furthermore, gentrification is transforming many contemporary urban neighborhoods. Is this a problem? And what to think of people living in our urban centers without a home, sometimes as a result of such processes of gentrification? Should we allow homelessness? Present-day welfare states often aim for neighborhood help to vulnerable citizens (the elderly, people with disabilities). Is this desirable and feasible in urban settings? Do people pay attention to other people’s needs or do they adhere to the norm of civil inattention (Goffman)? Do urbanites live in cities because they like anonymity and fleeting contacts or do they aim for community, like village dwellers? Is it possible and desirable to engineer closer contacts between big city residents?  Could cities be more just if there would be a different division of labor between city government and state or even supra-state levels? Finally, should modern, highly interconnected cities play a bigger role on the world stage in tackling problems that transcend national boundaries? Should ‘mayors rule the world’ (Barber)?  In this workshop we want to combine empirical papers about urban life with papers addressing normative questions evaluating urban life using the central themes of political theory — e.g. liberalism, agonism, citizenship, politics of difference, care-ethics, justice, cosmopolitanism.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English OR Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	English OR Dutch

## 17 | WAAROM STATISTIEKEN NIET PER DEFINITIE INDICATOREN ZIJN. OP NAAR EEN ONAFHANKELIJKE STATISTIEKPRODUCTIE EN –COÖRDINATIE BINNEN DE OVERHEID

### Convenor

Dries Verlet (Statistiek Vlaanderen) en Frank Bongers (Dialogic)

### Contact person and email

Dries Verlet ([Dries.Verlet@vlaanderen.be](mailto:Dries.Verlet@vlaanderen.be))

### Short abstract

In deze workshop willen we kennis en expertise bijeenbrengen over (de uitbouw van) de statistiekfunctie binnen overheden. Inhoudelijk zijn er alvast thema's genoeg waar we ons in de workshop kunnen over buigen: conceptueel (wat, waarom, hoe, waarvoor), technisch en bovenal de praktijkervaring bij bijvoorbeeld het uitbouwen en borgen van de statistiekfunctie.

### Long abstract

Conform de Europese praktijkcode voor statistiek, maken meer en meer overheden werk van een uitgebouwde statistiekfunctie. Toonvoorbeeld hier is het Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek in Nederland dat sinds 1899 instaat voor het verzamelen en produceren van officiële statistieken. Naast de initiatieven op nationaal niveau, zien we dat ook regio's zich positioneren in het statistieklandschap. Zo keurde de Vlaamse regering in februari 2016 het decreet Vlaamse openbare statistieken goed en werd in december 2017 het netwerk Statistiek Vlaanderen boven de doopfond gehouden.

Achterliggend idee is dat de samenleving beschikt over betrouwbare statistische informatie op grond waarvan maatschappelijke debatten kunnen worden gevoerd. Dit vergt organisatorisch een kader dat toelaat om te komen tot onafhankelijk vorm en inhoud gegeven statistieken. Ingrediënten in dat verhaal zijn onafhankelijke, transparante en kwaliteitsvolle productie en verspreiding van statistiek. In de praktijk houdt dat in dat op grond van de consultatie van een brede waaier aan gebruikers van openbare statistieken er wordt gewerkt met afgesproken programma's en een agenda wat de publicatie van statistieken betreft.

Bijzondere aandacht gaat hierbij naar de rol van de politiek in het gebeuren. Hoewel de politiek een belangrijke gebruiker is en blijft, mag deze geen gatekeeper zijn wat het verzamelen en verspreiden van statistische gegevens betreft. Daarnaast is het de vraag hoe deze statistieken kunnen ingezet worden bij het opvolgen en voorbereiden van beleid. Hoe borgen we organisatorisch de objectiviteit van het aanleveren van statistische gegevens? Hoe staat het met de realisatie van de achterliggende ideeën in de verschillende sectoren? Wat is de rol van Europese instellingen hierin?

Daarnaast maakt de overheid ook steeds meer deel uit van een (digitaal) geconnecteerde samenleving die talloze nieuwe databronnen aanbiedt, waardoor de rol en functie van "traditioneel" statistische informatie verandert. Statistiek- en onderzoeksafdelingen kunnen met de datastroom die de talloze aan internet verbonden apparaten genereert maatschappelijke fenomenen anders/beter in kaart brengen. Het is daarbij wel de vraag hoe dat dan zou kunnen gebeuren en onder welke voorwaarden. Ook kan het de rol van onderzoeksafdelingen veranderen, bijvoorbeeld van het aanleveren van statistische informatie naar het evalueren in welke mate deze nieuwe (veelal externe) databronnen betrouwbaar en valide zijn.

Met deze workshop beogen we het bijeenbrengen van de ervaring met de statistiekfunctie binnen overheden. Inhoudelijk zijn er alvast thema's genoeg waar we ons in de workshop kunnen over

buigen: conceptueel (wat, waarom, hoe, waarvoor), technisch en bovenal de praktijkervaring bij bijvoorbeeld het uitbouwen en borgen van de statistiekfunctie. Hoe borgen we deze rol? Wat is de rol van diverse Europese en andere kaders hierbij? Hoe geven we vorm aan de partnerschappen die mee instaan voor de coördinatie en productie van de statistieken? Hoe ontsluiten we deze het best op een publiek en toegankelijk portaal?

Met deze workshop willen we ervaringsdeskundigen uit diverse beleids- en onderzoeksdomeinen samenbrengen. We kijken ook uit naar casestudies, uit allerlei sectoren en van allerlei beleidsniveaus. We richten ons daarmee vooral op mensen uit de praktijk, maar evengoed bestuurskundigen en beleidswetenschappers.

<b>Language papers</b>	English OR Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	Dutch

## 18 | ADVANCES IN POLITICAL SCIENCE METHODOLOGY - SOCIAL PROFILING, MICRO-TARGETING AND THE USE OF BIG DATA

### Convenor

Joost Smits (Political Academy, Amsterdam), Tom Verthé (Ghent University)

### Contact person and email

Joost Smits ([joost@politiekeacademie.eu](mailto:joost@politiekeacademie.eu)), Tom Verthé ([Tom.Verthe@UGent.be](mailto:Tom.Verthe@UGent.be))

### Short abstract

Previous editions of the Politicologenetmaal dealt with dealigned voters, partisan dealignment, democratic deficits and other challenges. The perceived unpredictability of voters contrasts with advances in research and technology to find or influence voter groups. This workshop will investigate methodologies, like social profiling, microtargeting and the use of Big Data.

### Long abstract

In the past few decades, party competition and voting behaviour in Western Europe have undergone fundamental changes. Processes of dealignment between the electorate and the political parties have disrupted a once quite stable environment governed by frozen cleavages. Many countries, including The Netherlands and Belgium, show high levels of voter volatility. However, much of this volatility seems to vary according to the applied research method. Taagepera (himself and together with Shugart or Laakso) provides a mechanism behind the “Game of Elections” that seems much more stable than the perceived high volatility from one election to another. Building on Butler and Stokes and Johnston, when applying linear regressions of two elections on Dutch election outcomes per voting location in repeated series, we see high geographical stability, and volatility mostly limited in time and to certain parties. Other research shows voters may switch parties, but stay within an ideological bloc. Voters are apparently more loyal to their preferences than presumed.

The success of new trends such as social profiling and micro-targeting, in fact, hinges on voters being predictable and identifiable. Regarding those two aspects, some advances have been made since the end of the last century. The use of Bayesian statistics to overcome issues of ecological inference by Gary King, for example.

The subject of this workshop is linked to questions such as: how loyal or unpredictable are voters (or are these two qualifications not mutually exclusive)? Which methods can be applied to target and/or influence voters? How can voters be found/identified? How effective is micro-targeting or social profiling? And are these strategies more effective for mobilizing voters rather than influencing their opinions, preferences or vote choice (in other words: what are the consequences)?

The workshop is open to academics and other professionals who deal with finding or influencing (subsets of) voters, identifying voter opinions and voter preferences, etc. Papers can also address factors that provide stability, such as the conversion of voter preferences into votes (social choice), and votes into seats (electoral system).

We particularly encourage contributions that focus on the empirical mechanisms behind social profiling and micro-targeting. Papers should preferably not merely describe cases and applications in a vacuum, but show how they contrast with earlier and competing attempts and where they fit into the state-of-the-art. This means we welcome papers that use different kinds of data (individual-level or aggregate). Papers can be single case studies in one country, or comparative

case studies between or within countries.

The workshop discussions and presentations will be in English, but papers may be submitted in either Dutch or English.

<b>Language papers</b>	Preferably English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English