



# Politicologenetmaal 2019

Universiteit Antwerpen, 13-14 juni 2019

## OPROEP VOOR PAPERS

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

Op donderdag 13 en vrijdag 14 juni 2019 organiseren de Vereniging voor Politieke Wetenschappen (VPW) en de Nederlandse Kring voor Wetenschap der Politiek (NKWP) voor de achttiende keer gezamenlijk het Politicologenetmaal. Het Etmaal wordt dit jaar georganiseerd door het [Departement Politieke Wetenschappen](#) van de Universiteit Antwerpen en zal plaatsvinden in het [Hof van Liere](#).

Het Etmaal start op donderdag tussen 12 en 13 uur en eindigt op vrijdagmiddag na de lunch. Het Etmaal bestaat uit 16 workshops, elk met een eigen thema en team van workshopvoorzitters. 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 actief 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 de lijst met workshops hieronder).

Na de donderdagsessies begeven we ons naar het prachtige [Amuz](#)—een pareltje van Antwerpse barok—voor het diner, een levendig debat over hete hangijzers in de politicologie en de uitreiking van prijzen voor het beste proefschrift en de beste masterscriptie van het afgelopen jaar.

Als u een paper wil indienen bij een workshop, wordt u verzocht ten laatste op **15 maart 2019** contact op te nemen met de workshoporganisatoren (met vermelding van uw naam, e-mailadres, affiliatie en een abstract van max. 250 woorden). De e-mailadressen van de organisatoren staan bij elke workshop vermeld (zie verder). Ten laatste op 31 maart 2019 hoort u van hen of uw paper geselecteerd is voor de workshop.

Het is ook mogelijk om deel te nemen zonder een paper te presenteren (indien er ruimte is in de betreffende workshop). U hoeft in dat geval geen contact op te nemen met de workshopvoorzitters. U kunt zich in dat geval direct inschrijven.

Alle deelnemers aan het Etmaal dienen zich in te schrijven via [www.politicologenetmaal.eu](http://www.politicologenetmaal.eu). Registratie is mogelijk van 1 april tot en met 31 mei 2019. De bijdragen voor deelname zijn de volgende:

<i>Gereduceerd tarief (leden NKWP/VPW) *</i>	€110,-
<i>Vol tarief</i>	€175,-
<i>Studententarieff (Bachelor- en Masterstudenten) **</i>	€50,-

\* Maak je als volgt lid: [VPW](#) (België) of [NKWP](#) (Nederland). De ledenbijdrage voor de VPW is €50,- (€30,- voor PhD's), voor de NKWP €29,-.

\*\* Bachelor- en Masterstudenten dienen een bewijs van inschrijving, studentenkaart of verklaring van hun scriptiebegeleider te kunnen overleggen.

De conferentiebijdrage omvat een deelnemersmap, koffie en thee tijdens de pauzes, lunches 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. Registratie na de deadline van 31 mei 2019 is alleen mogelijk indien er nog plekken beschikbaar zijn en tegen een met €50,- verhoogd tarief.

Het organiserend comité,

Pauline Ketelaars (VPW-vertegenwoordiger)

Arjan Schakel (NKWP-vertegenwoordiger)

Peter Van Aelst

Dirk De Bièvre

Bas Redert

Emile van Ommeren

Voor meer informatie, zie [www.politicologenetmaal.eu](http://www.politicologenetmaal.eu).

Voel u vrij om contact op te nemen met het organiserend comité als u nog vragen heeft: [politicologenetmaal2019@uantwerpen.be](mailto:politicologenetmaal2019@uantwerpen.be).



# Politicologenetmaal 2019

## University of Antwerp, 13-14 June 2019

### CALL FOR PAPERS

On Thursday June 13<sup>th</sup> and Friday June 14<sup>th</sup> 2019 the ‘Politicologenetmaal’ (24-hour Political Science Conference) is jointly organized for the eighteenth time by the Association for Political Science (VPW) and the Dutch Political Science Association (NKWP). This time the conference will be organized by the [Political Science Department](#) of the University of Antwerp and it will take place at the [Hof van Liere](#).

The conference begins on Thursday at noon and ends on Friday after lunch. The conference consists of 16 workshops, each with a different theme, organized by a different team of workshop coordinators. Each workshop consists of four panels and can accommodate 8 to 12 paper presentations (two panels take place on Thursday afternoon, two panels take place on Friday morning). To stimulate a constructive discussion on the workshop theme, participants are expected to attend and actively participate in 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 below).

After the workshop panels on Thursday we move to the beautiful [Amuz](#)—a little jewel of Antwerp baroque architecture—for dinner, a lively debate about hot topics in political science, and 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 (see below). The deadline for paper proposals is **March 15, 2019**. Proposals should include an abstract (max. 250 words), name, affiliation and contact e-mail. You will hear from the workshop coordinators whether your proposal is accepted by March 31<sup>st</sup> 2019.

It is also possible to participate without presenting a paper (subject to availability of space). In that case, you do not need to contact the workshop coordinators and you can register for the conference directly.

All conference participants need to register via [www.politicologenetmaal.eu](http://www.politicologenetmaal.eu). Registration will be possible from April 1<sup>st</sup> until May 31<sup>st</sup> 2019. Registration fees are as follows:

<i>Reduced rate (members of NKWP/VPW) *</i>	€110,-
<i>Regular rate</i>	€175,-
<i>Student rate (Bachelor and Master students) **</i>	€50,-

\* You can become a member here: [VPW](#) (Belgium) or [NKWP](#) (Netherlands). The membership fee for the VPW is €50,- (€30,- for PhD researchers), for the NKWP it is €29,-.

\*\* Bachelor and Master students need to provide a copy of their university registration, a student ID, or a letter from their thesis supervisor.

The conference fee includes a conference folder, coffee and tea during breaks, lunches on Thursday and Friday, and drinks and dinner on Thursday. Via the registration template, participants can inform the organizers about dietary restrictions. Registration after the May 31<sup>st</sup> 2019 deadline is only possible if spaces allow; in these cases there is an additional late registration fee of €50,-.

The organizing committee,

Pauline Ketelaars (VPW representative)

Arjan Schakel (NKWP representative)

Peter Van Aelst

Dirk De Bièvre

Bas Redert

Emile van Ommeren

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

Please feel free to contact the organizing committee if you have any questions:

[politicologenetmaal2019@uantwerpen.be](mailto:politicologenetmaal2019@uantwerpen.be).

# Politicologenetmaal 2019

University of Antwerp, 13-14 June 2019

## WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

*(Click on the title to go to the detailed workshop description)*

1. After the municipal elections; 'Business as usual?'
2. Alliance Management in the 21st Century: Strategy, Political Economy, and Defense Planning
3. Computational Political Science
4. EU meets politics: parties, voters and elections in a European multilevel system
5. Intra-party competition and the personalization of politics
6. Continuity and Change in European (Dis)Integration
7. Good bye, anarchy? Internet politics in the 21st century
8. Organized interests and the public interest: an imperfect relationship?
9. Understanding foreign policy: the interplay between domestic and international politics.
10. International Political Economy in the Low Countries – State of the Debate, Synergies and Future Directions
11. The Theory and Practice of the Rule of Law and Democracy in Europe
12. Between support and resistance: equality at a crossroads
13. The socialization and development of key liberal democratic values
14. Informatie en beleid: op welke informatie baseert men zich voor het beleid?
15. Electoral change
16. Political Theory Today

# 1. After the municipal elections; ‘Business as usual?’

<b>Chair(s)</b> Peter Castenmiller (PBLQ / Universiteit Leiden) Herwig Reynaert (Universiteit Gent)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Peter Castenmiller ( <a href="mailto:p.castenmiller@planet.nl">p.castenmiller@planet.nl</a> )	
<b>Short description</b> In deze workshop staan de veranderingen en stabiliteit centraal na de gemeenteraadsverkiezingen die in 2018 zowel in Nederland als Vlaanderen hebben plaatsgevonden. Tevens biedt de workshop een plek voor de uitwisseling van kennis, ervaringen en inzichten over lokale politiek.	
<b>Long abstract</b> In het voorjaar van 2018 vonden in Nederland verkiezingen voor de gemeenteraden plaats. In het najaar gold dat voor België, en daarmee ook voor Vlaanderen. Zoals altijd piekt rond dergelijke verkiezingen de belangstelling van de media voor de lokale politiek, en wordt driftig gespeculeerd over de grote veranderingen die met de verkiezingen gepaard zullen gaan. In de praktijk blijkt vaak dat er enkele maanden na de verkiezingen toch maar weinig is veranderd.  Ook wetenschappers profiteren van de extra aandacht vanwege de gemeenteraadsverkiezingen. In juni 2019 zullen de nodige nieuwe wetenschappelijke inzichten over de lokale politiek bekend raken. Alle aanleiding om deze te delen met andere wetenschappers die zich interesseren voor lokale politiek, en om gebruik te maken van eventuele kritische opmerkingen en aanvullingen. Want daarvoor is de ondertussen traditionele, langstlopende workshop tijdens het PoliticologenEetmaal, over lokale politiek, bij uitstek geschikt. Peter Castenmiller (PBLQ) en Herwig Reynaert (Universiteit Gent) zullen de workshop wederom organiseren. De workshop is dé ontmoetingsplaats voor alle politicologen in Nederland en Vlaanderen die zich bezig houden met het lokale bestuur. Onze insteek impliceert dat allerlei bijdragen over lokale politiek en bestuur meer dan welkom zijn. Het essentiële doel van onze workshop is immers om elke politicoloog die zich bezighoudt met lokale besturen een platform en ontmoetingsplaats te bieden waar kennis, ervaringen en inzichten uitgewisseld kunnen worden. Ook dit jaar, in Antwerpen, bieden wij weer graag de mogelijkheid om naast die uitwisseling van kennis en informatie ook de persoonlijke relaties te versterken.	
<b>Language papers</b>	Dutch and English
<b>Language discussions</b>	Dutch

## 2. Alliance Management in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Strategy, Political Economy, and Defense Planning

<b>Chair(s)</b> Jordan Becker (Institute for European Studies (VUB)/NATO International Military Staff)
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Jordan Becker ( <a href="mailto:jordan.becker21@gmail.com">jordan.becker21@gmail.com</a> )
<b>Short description</b> Multidisciplinary workshop including scholars studying the politics of alliances, coalitions and strategy from multiple theoretical and methodological approaches. The workshop will include a diverse set of scholars of political economy, international organizations, strategic culture, securitization, defense economics, strategy, and security studies, hailing from three continents, and with significant policy experience.
<b>Long abstract</b> Alliances have been and are likely to remain central to the study of international politics. Alliances are a key pillar of the liberal international order. The study of alliances is multidisciplinary, demanding, <i>inter alia</i> , scholarship in international security, strategic studies, political economy, and defense economics. Yet, these disciplines do not often engage with one another in any systematic way.  The proposed workshop, tentatively entitled “Alliance Management in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century: Strategy, Political Economy, and Defense Planning,” seeks to address this shortcoming by bringing together scholars from an array of disciplines, intellectual traditions, and methodological approaches.  Central to alliance politics is burden sharing, or “the distribution of costs among group members in support of common goals (Cimbala and Forster 2005).” Burden sharing, broadly conceived, is a multi-causal phenomenon, and those causes operate at multiple levels: systemic/structural, organizational, national, and sub-national. Future scholarship should continue to advance, empirically test, and refine new theories about the multi-level drivers of states’ behavior in alliances.  Scholarship on alliances should continue examining incentives and constraints affecting burden-sharing behavior, across multiple levels of governance, in both multilateral and bilateral contexts, and among both formal and de facto allies.  Driving questions include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How did the incentives to form and sustain alliances change over the first 100 years of IR, and how will they likely change in the future?</li><li>• What is the relationship between alliances and the liberal international order, if such a thing still exists?</li><li>• Is there such a thing as a “permanent alliance?”</li><li>• Do formal alliances still matter?</li><li>• How do allies influence one another’s behavior?</li><li>• How do differences in alliance geometry affect the behavior of alliance members and their rivals?</li><li>• How does multilevel governance affect alliance management?</li><li>• How does alliance management differ across multilateral and bilateral alliances?</li><li>• Is there a new paradigm for burden sharing in alliances?</li><li>• Has there been a “Trump effect” on alliance politics?</li></ul>

- Are allies' responses to threats changing, and are they likely to change further?
- How does strategic culture affect alliance management?
- What is the relationship between national political economies and alliance politics?
- What is the relationship between regional political economies and alliance politics?
- How does defense industrial policy interact with alliance politics?
- What are the implications of the recent wave of populism for alliance politics?

This workshop aims to explore new avenues to bring together diverse scholarship addressing these questions by bringing together an array of scholars from various disciplines and methodological backgrounds.

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



### 3. Computational Political Science

<b>Chair(s)</b> Mariken van der Velden (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) Rebekah Tromble (Universiteit Leiden)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Mariken van der Velden ( <a href="mailto:m.a.c.g.vander.velden@vu.nl">m.a.c.g.vander.velden@vu.nl</a> )	
<b>Short description</b> Language is the medium for political actors to express themselves. This workshop offers a venue to discuss best practices in applied approaches to computational (text) analyses as well as papers with a focus on methodological innovation. We are interested in applications of computational approaches in the broad field of political science.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Language is the medium for political actors to express themselves: political candidates propose policy pledges, elected representatives debate and write legislation, lobby groups reveal their preferences verbally, nations and (N)GO's negotiate and sign treaties, etcetera. In sum, to understand what politics is about, we need to know what political actors are saying and writing. Scholars increasingly apply computational approaches to study texts. Yet, simultaneously, researchers are confronted with pitfalls of computational text analyses. For example, how well do dictionaries measuring sentiment perform? Can machine learning improve this? And can we use the same approach to compare text documents written for different purposes or documents using different languages?  This workshop offers a venue to discuss best practices in applied approaches to computational text analyses as well as papers with a focus on methodological innovation. We are interested in applications of computational approaches in the broad field of political science: from political behavior to international relations utilizing text data to answer new or existing questions and/or make methodological improvements. We aim to reach out to scholars who, for instance, apply a textual approach to study how information influx affects elite decision-making, how complexity or emotional language influences behavior of elites and masses, legislative behavior in (European) parliament or (European) committees, how defining economic growth is a political motivated choice, whether statements made by nations or NGO's are belligerent or peaceful, or how lobby groups affect the political agenda.  In short, we warmly invite papers using computational approaches methods like - but not limited to - topic modeling, sentiment analyses, comparative approaches to text analysis, or visualization of texts. Thereby, our workshop continues recent initiatives bringing scholars working with computational approaches together, such as the successful workshop series on computational text analysis organized by colleagues from Amsterdam (2016) and the text analysis workshop at the Politicologenetmaal 2017 in Leiden. The political science community in the Low Countries has developed an interest in these techniques, for example in the area of the analysis of party manifestos and government agreements, the development of voting advice applications, the study of parliamentary speech and questions as well as the analysis of open-ended survey questions. We are therefore confident that our workshop will attract a sizeable group of scholars interested in the topic of computational (text) analysis. The proposed working language is English.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 4. EU meets politics: parties, voters and elections in a European multilevel system

<b>Chair(s)</b> Gilles Pittoors (UGent) Isabelle De Coninck (KU Leuven)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Gilles Pittoors ( <a href="mailto:gilles.pittoors@ugent.be">gilles.pittoors@ugent.be</a> )	
<b>Short description</b> This workshop aims to explore both theoretically and empirically the way national politics engage with the European level. Contributions should address the question of how parties (organisation and finance), voters (behaviour and turnout) and elections (campaigns and candidates) function in the multilevel system that the EU now poses.	
<b>Long abstract</b> This workshop aims to explore both theoretically and empirically the way national politics engage with the European level. The May 2019 European Parliament elections present a challenge to political forces at both the national and European levels, with the likely growth and/or introduction of (new) populist and eurosceptic parties in the European Parliament. The ascendance to government of radical-right and populist parties in Italy and Austria, for example, is not unlikely to also have repercussions for representation in the European Parliament. On the other side of the political spectrum, the popularity and success of Emmanuel Macron's new political movement is shaking up the way traditional and pro-EU parties address their electorates. Moreover, the possible cooperation between France's Macron and the Netherland's Rutte might spell the end of one of the European Parliament's landmark veterans, the liberal group leader Guy Verhofstadt. These developments invoke the emergence of new alliances and majorities, and, possibly, a new type of politics in the EU.  Therefore, this workshop aims to bring together scholars who study the way the EU meets politics. While it approaches this topic in a broad sense — addressing parties, voters and elections — the workshop welcomes contributions which focus on one or more of the following research topics: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Party activity beyond the national system, focussing particularly on cooperation within the framework of the Europarties and the <i>Spitzenkandidaten</i> process.</li> <li>2. The process of candidate selection and turnover in the context of European Parliament elections.</li> <li>3. The organisation of both national and European political parties vis-à-vis the EU.</li> <li>4. Voter behaviour and voter turnout in the context of European Parliament elections.</li> <li>5. The europeanisation of national campaigns for European elections.</li> </ol> Contributions should address the question of how parties, voters and elections function in the multilevel system that the EU now poses. The workshop accepts papers that address this both theoretically or empirically, quantitatively as well as qualitatively.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English and Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 5. Intra-party competition and the personalization of politics

<b>Chair(s)</b> Gert-Jan Put (KU Leuven) Felix-Christopher von Nostitz (Université Catholique de Lille)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Gert-Jan Put ( <a href="mailto:gertjan.put@kuleuven.be">gertjan.put@kuleuven.be</a> )	
<b>Short description</b> This workshop brings together scholars working on personalization of politics and/or intra-party competition. We invite conceptual, theoretical and empirical papers dealing with related topics including but not limited to candidate success, candidate choice, campaign behaviour, preference voting, campaign finance, party nomination strategies, candidate selection and citizen attitudes on candidates and parties.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Over the last decades, electoral strategies of candidates and parties have drastically changed as a result of the general trend towards a greater ‘personalization of politics’ (Karvonen, 2010). In many list proportional representation (PR) systems, the importance of individual politicians was even further reinforced by personalizing electoral reforms (Renwick and Pilet, 2016).  Candidates are now increasingly running individualized election campaigns through the use of personalized campaign means (De Winter and Baudewyns, 2015; Lutz and Selb, 2010) or by exhibiting personal vote-earning attributes such as political experience, name recognition and local ties, which serve as information shortcuts for voters (Shugart et al., 2005; Arter, 2014; Tavits, 2010). The personalization of politics also changed party elites’ candidate preferences and nomination strategies (Crisp et al., 2013). Specifically, parties are interested in selecting candidates with strong vote-earning capacity and individual support bases (André et al., 2017).  This trend towards greater personalization enhances the position of individual candidates and has far-reaching consequences for the intra-party balance of power. Party elites need to spend more time on managing their candidates and MPs, who are becoming more independent in their policy positions, have strong individual bases of support and are thus more inclined to defect from the party line (Tavits, 2009). Parties might reconsider their candidate selection methods as to manage the level of intra-party competition (e.g. Vandeleene and Sandri, 2019). Changing patterns of intra-party competition also have consequences for the future of intra-party democracy and parties’ external perception among citizens and supporters (Greene and Haber, 2015; Shomer et al., 2016).  The workshop aims at the discussion of conceptual, theoretical and empirical research papers related to the personalization of politics and intra-party competition. We are particularly interested in contributions discussing the link between these two contentious topics in comparative politics.  Paper topics may include but are not limited to candidate success, candidate choice, campaign behaviour, preference voting, campaign finance, party nomination strategies, candidate selection, intra-party democracy and citizen views on candidates and parties. This workshop does not favor any specific methodological approach and will be conducted in English.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 6. Continuity and Change in European (Dis)Integration

<p><b>Chair(s)</b>          Dr Gijs Jan Brandsma (Utrecht University &amp; University of Konstanz)          Prof dr Catherine de Vries (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)</p>	
<p><b>Contact person and email address</b>          Prof dr Catherine de Vries (<a href="mailto:c.e.de.vries@vu.nl">c.e.de.vries@vu.nl</a>)</p>	
<p><b>Short description</b>          This workshop invites empirical or normative papers on EU politics. The topics include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public opinion and Mass Media</li> <li>• Political Parties and Representation</li> <li>• Political Bargaining and Political Institutions</li> <li>• Processes of Integration and Disintegration</li> </ul> <p>These topics can be approached from different methodological standpoints and levels of analysis.</p>	
<p><b>Long abstract</b>          The European Union (EU) is at a cross-roads: not often in its history have challenges been so profound. Over the years, the EU has moved from a largely elite-led diplomatic project to a system of multilevel governance, in which member states share policy-making with supranational institutions, and has become contested among political elites and the public alike. Since the early 2000s, we have witnessed increasing public contention over European matters in election campaigns and party and media discourse. The shift in the power balance between national governments and supranational institutions started to influence the attitudes and behaviour of political parties and ordinary citizens. The deep economic and political interdependence in Europe, created especially but not exclusively by the single currency, became vividly clear even to the least politically aware in the Eurozone crisis. What started as a sovereign debt crisis swiftly turned into a European crisis. Deep rifts over the way to handle the crisis started to emerge in the European bloc. The EU is split from North to South about questions of redistribution of resources and power, and from East to West about the core values underlying the European project.</p> <p>This workshop aims to bring together contributions about the core challenges that the EU faces today. We invite papers about a variety of topics, including, but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public opinion and Mass Media</li> <li>• Political Parties and Representation</li> <li>• Political Bargaining and Political Institutions</li> <li>• Processes of Integration and Disintegration</li> </ul> <p>These topics can be approached from an empirical or normative angle, from a variety of methodological standpoints and levels of analysis, including the regional, national and European level. Next to discussing the state of the art in EU politics, this workshop is also aimed at building a more permanent scholarly network for EU studies in the Netherlands and Belgium. We will dedicate time to developing an integrated research agenda that hopefully can feature in future iterations of the conference and beyond.</p>	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 7. Good bye, anarchy? Internet politics in the 21<sup>st</sup> century

<b>Chair(s)</b> Thomas R. Eimer (Radboud Universiteit) Daniëlle Flonk (Hertie School of Governance)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Thomas R. Eimer ( <a href="mailto:t.eimer@fm.ru.nl">t.eimer@fm.ru.nl</a> ) Daniëlle Flonk ( <a href="mailto:flonk@hertie-school.org">flonk@hertie-school.org</a> )	
<b>Short description</b> Our panel aims at unfolding the tensions around the regulation of the internet. Which actors try to limit internet freedoms, which actors try to defend them, and what are their motivations? What is the institutional context of their contestations? And finally, what could the internet look like in the future?	
<b>Long abstract</b> Conventional wisdom perceives the internet as a free harbor for all kinds of social, cultural, and economic interactions. At least implicitly, this perception is linked to the internet pioneers' vision of a digital sphere of freedom and independence. Empirically, however, this perception can hardly be upheld anymore. National and international authorities are increasingly interfering with the internet via regulation in various fields. The prevention of hate speech and fake news upright to online censorship are the most prominently discussed examples. But international organizations and bureaucracies also limit the openness of the internet by intellectual property and privacy regulations, the persecution of cybercrime and cyberterrorism, and intermediary liability regulation. At the same time, large private companies (e.g. Google, Facebook) are increasingly dominating the most popular spaces within the internet and create entry barriers for newcomers.  At the same time, however, we are witnessing countervailing dynamics. For instance, the European Commission refers to antitrust measures to avoid oligopolistic strictures, and the European Parliament understands itself as the guardian of net neutrality. Simultaneously, civil society actors defend the openness of the internet both inside and outside the institutionalized decision-making structures. While their engagement for internet freedom is essentially based on idealistic motivations, many dark net participants also have commercial reasons to insist on an uncontrolled digital sphere.  Our panel aims at unfolding the tensions around the regulation of the digital sphere. Which actors try to limit internet freedoms, which actors try to defend them, and what are their motivations? What is the institutional context (national, international, global) of their contestations? And finally, what are the immediate consequences, and what could the internet look like in the future? We are looking forward to empirical (both quantitative and qualitative), conceptual, and normative contributions.	
<b>Language paper</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 8. Organized interests and the public interest: an imperfect relationship?

**Chair(s)**

Evelien Willems (University of Antwerp)  
Moritz Müller (Leiden University)  
Sharon Belli (University of Antwerp)  
Caelesta Braun (Leiden University)

**Contact person and email address:**

Evelien Willems ([evelien.willems@uantwerpen.be](mailto:evelien.willems@uantwerpen.be))  
Moritz Müller ([m.muller@fgga.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:m.muller@fgga.leidenuniv.nl))  
Sharon Belli ([sharon.belli@uantwerpen.be](mailto:sharon.belli@uantwerpen.be))

**Short description**

Can organized interests represent the public interests? By examining both the extent to which organized interests represent the public interest and how organized interest mobilization and success is affected by different political-administrative venues, this panel aims to address how the conditions under which the public interest can be represented by organized interests.

**Long abstract**

One important criterion to evaluate the democratic contribution of interest representation, is the degree to which policy outcomes reflect public interests. Organized interests are often assumed to function as intermediaries between the general public and policy outcomes. For such an intermediary potential to materialize, two key aspects are important to consider: the extent to which organized interests represent the public interest, and second, the degree to which mobilization bias and lobby success are affected by different political-administrative venues.

First, the degree to which organized interests represent the public interest depends on different policy characteristics (such as salience, issue complexity) and organizational factors (resources, constituency involvement) as they affect organized interests' abilities to represent public preferences. Taken together, these factors affect the degree of bias organized interests bring into the political decision-making process and hence are important to consider for an assessment of the degree to which and why organized interests can represent the public interest.

Second, organized interest mobilization and success has been shown to vary throughout different political-administrative venues. Yet, in order to impact public policy, interest organizations need to interact with multiple public officials and gaining public support through the media can be considered a crucial asset for lobbying success. So, strategizing across different venues is crucial for lobby success, yet, each political-administrative venue affects organized interest mobilization and success differently.

By bringing together studies that examine the extent to which organized interests represent the public interest and how organized interest mobilization and success is affected by different political-administrative venues, this panel aims to address one overall core theme of interest representation: how the public interest can be represented by organized interests across different political-administrative venues.

To address this broader theme and, more specifically, the alignment with the public interests and the degree of bias throughout political-administrative venues, we solicit papers addressing one or multiple of the following themes:

1. Organized interests in relation to public opinion
2. Organized interests in relation to legislative politics

3. Organized interests in relation to executive politics

4. Organized interests in relation to the media

In addressing these themes, the panel aims to contribute to a growing body of studies that strive for synergy between the literatures on interest groups, party politics, public administration, and political communication, employing a variety of methods and theoretical approaches. We welcome conceptual or qualitative and quantitative empirical contributions.

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

## 9. Understanding foreign policy: the interplay between domestic and international politics.

<b>Chair(s)</b> Tim Haesebrouck (Universiteit Gent) Hilde van Meegdenburg (Universiteit Leiden)	
<b>Contact person and email address:</b> Hilde van Meegdenburg ( <a href="mailto:h.van.meegdenburg@fsw.leidenuniv.nl">h.van.meegdenburg@fsw.leidenuniv.nl</a> )	
<b>Short description</b> This workshop aims to further our understanding of the interplay between domestic politics and international relations in informing state foreign policy. We invite papers from all political scientific sub-disciplines and encourage perspectives that combine elements from both levels of analysis to arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of foreign policy and international relations.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Although US Senator Vandenberg's 1947 assertion that "politics stops at the water's edge" is a popular quote amongst International Relations (IR) scholars, research into actual international relations often includes domestic-level explanations. In fact, domestic factors were constitutive to the sub-field of Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA), are prominent in liberal and constructivist theories, and even realist scholars are increasingly incorporating domestic-level explanations in their theories. Over the past two decades, research exploring the role of domestic institutions and societal norms, political party positions, public opinion, civil society and the media has illustrated the value of taking domestic factors into account when researching foreign policy decisions. This 'domestic-turn', however, also comes with a particular challenge: How can we combine domestic and international level explanations into a sophisticated, integrated framework that captures the complex interplay between these two levels?  In this workshop, we invite papers that further our understanding of this interplay. We aim to bring together scholars with diverse substantive backgrounds -- with, for instance, expertise on international security, trade, aid and development or the European Union or international organizations -- that share the aim of studying state foreign policy as shaped by both domestic and international contexts and factors. We welcome both theoretical and empirical contributions from scholar at all academic career stages. Rather than focussing on individual conditions, papers are encouraged to combine domestic and international factors, or to think through how these could be combined most fruitfully, and to aim to arrive at a more holistic approach to studying foreign policy and international relations.  The workshop is open to all methodological and ontological approaches but innovative and multi-method papers are strongly encouraged. To that end, we also welcome papers that drawn on frameworks and approaches beyond the traditional IR-theories, integrating concepts and theories from adjacent fields (from public policy to psychology and sociology). The working language of this workshop will be English.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English



# 10. International Political Economy in the Low Countries – State of the Debate, Synergies and Future Directions

<p><b>Chair(s)</b>                  Dirk De Bièvre (Universiteit Antwerpen)                  Nana de Graaff (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)</p>	
<p><b>Contact person and email address:</b>                  Dirk De Bièvre (<a href="mailto:dirk.debievre@uantwerpen.be">dirk.debievre@uantwerpen.be</a>)                  Nana de Graaff (<a href="mailto:n.a.de.graaff@vu.nl">n.a.de.graaff@vu.nl</a>)</p>	
<p><b>Short description</b>                  The aim of this panel is to bring together scholars active within the political science sub-discipline of international political economy in the Low Countries. We invite papers on how politics and institutions affect international economic outcomes and how economic forces influence politics in order to foster interaction and future collaborations.</p>	
<p><b>Long abstract</b>                  Dutch and Flemish universities host a considerable critical mass of International Political Economy (IPE) scholars. Yet, interaction between them is relatively rare, the acknowledgement of mutual complementarities underexplored, and the potential for peer learning and collaboration clearly there. This workshop therefore invites contributions within this political science sub-discipline that focuses on how politics and institutions affect international economic outcomes and how economic forces influence politics. We welcome papers on the policy fields of e.g. trade, anti-trust/competition policy, (sustainable) energy, security, inequality, monetary affairs, technology (incl. big data and artificial intelligence), financial and social regulation, whether European or worldwide. Clearly, the (re)emergence of economic nationalism, the recurrent yet varying ways and intensities of politicization of economic decisions (e.g. on trade agreements, or on responses to the Euro crisis) offer important empirical inroads into the subject matter. In addition we welcome papers that address the ongoing global shift in which non-Western powers – China upfront - are gaining increased influence and leverage, while the liberal (rules-based) order, the longstanding transatlantic alliance and the EU-ropean project are under severe pressure due emerging authoritarian powers as well as challenges ‘from within’ with the election of Donald Trump, Brexit etc. But also more enduring theoretical topics would seem to deserve attention, such as the role and/or limits of international economic institutions, institutional choice in the design of national and/or regional supranational authorities, or the institutional interplay within regime complexes.</p> <p>We explicitly invite contributions from a wide and diverse range of normative and theoretical angles, ranging from explanatory analyses, (controlled) cross-case comparisons and/or statistical methods, as well as critical, liberal, or neo-Marxist approaches. It is our conviction that this diversity of approaches constitutes the richness of IPE in the Low Countries. Deep familiarity with normative, substantive and methodological differences within IPE – and political science more generally – fosters our understandings of the advantages and downsides of each and every type of approach to questions of IPE. We hope to engage in a productive debate that can result in a collection of essays or articles to be published as a special issue or an edited volume on the theme of IPE in the Low Countries.</p>	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

# 11. The Theory and Practice of the Rule of Law and Democracy in Europe

<b>Chair(s)</b> Dr. J.E. Keman (VU) Mr. P. Bakker M.A. (RUG)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Hans Keman ( <a href="mailto:hans.keman@vu.nl">hans.keman@vu.nl</a> )	
<b>Short description</b> Rule of Law is essential for the functioning of democracy and restricting state powers. Yet, theory and practice do not always correlate. Since democracy is seen as a ‘universal’ value, the Rechtsstaat is crucial for the study of democracy. This Workshop will focus on the relation between the Rule of Law and Democratic Performance.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Rule of Law is considered to be essential for the functioning of democracy and restricting state powers in terms of the Trias Politica. The quality of democracy is often measured by observing to what extent the distribution and relative weight of the division of powers are in theory and practice contributing to the quality of democracy. Yet, theory and practice do not always correlate. Nor are the installed ‘Checks and Balances’ always operating as projected. Since democracy is seen as a ‘universal’ value and expected to converge with Equality and Justice, the role and working of the Rechtsstaat is crucial for the study of democracy. This Section is intended to encourage research the relationship between the Rule of Law and Democratic Performance in theory and practice.  In this workshop we propose to discuss the relationship of Rule of Law and Democratic Performance across Europe. We propose the following three themes: 1. <u>Constitutional Development and the Emergence of Democracy.</u> Constitutional arrangements often emerged before the democratisation of Europe. These defined the relationship between the ‘monarch’ and the subjects, trading off the right for the monarch to collect revenues in return for (limited) autonomy and individual rights for citizens. This development led to the democratic Rechtsstaat across Europe. The question is how the relation between constitutional development and democratic performance has been shaped. 2. <u>The relative weight of Rule of Law in view of the Protection of the citizen.</u> ‘Due process’ signifies the power of the Rule of Law to do justice to protect the individual person from abuse by the state. However, mistrials occur and are often caused by a lack of ‘due process’. Important in this respect is the role of reviewing bodies like Supreme, High Courts or Constitutional Councils. Comparative analysis is needed to investigate to what extent ‘due process’ and related effects occur. 3. <u>The Rule of Law and the Maintenance of Political &amp; Civil Rights in EUrope.</u> The accession criteria, or Copenhagen criteria, are the essential conditions all candidate countries must satisfy to become EU member. The recent addition of new members has shown that the democratic performance is often under pressure. The question is how effectively the EU can correct these developments.  We invite papers focussing on the theory and practice of the Rule of Law, either comparative or case studies, analysing contemporary or historical developments of the relationship between the Rule of Law and Democratic performance across Europe.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English and Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	English and Dutch

## 12. Between support and resistance: equality at a crossroads

<b>Chair(s)</b> Silvia Erzeel (Vrije Universiteit Brussel) Petra Meier (Universiteit Antwerpen)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Silvia Erzeel ( <a href="mailto:silvia.erzeel@vub.be">silvia.erzeel@vub.be</a> ) Petra Meier ( <a href="mailto:petra.meier@uantwerpen.be">petra.meier@uantwerpen.be</a> )	
<b>Short description</b> Equality is at a crossroads. While great progress has been made to support the equality of men and women or LGBTQI people, various oppositional forces attack this progress. This workshop asks what these dynamics mean for the study of gender, LGBTQI and other forms of equality in Europe today.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Gender and sexual equality is currently at a crossroads in Europe. On the one hand, great progress has been made to remove barriers and to promote the equal access and treatment of men and women as intersectional beings in public and private life. Equality policies in various domains have been successfully adopted and implemented. Progressive women's and LGBTQI movements have found allies in various national and local government actors to pursue a progressive agenda. And international organizations like the EU and the UN increasingly act as important sites for gendered, feminist, and sexualized mobilization.  On the other hand, however, the region is facing a populist moment and, partly joint to it, a wave of opposition to gender and sexual equality that seems to be slowing down or even reversing this steady progress. Massive 'anti-gender' movements have arisen, referenda on fundamental rights are countless, and numerous threats to equality policies and equal opportunity structures have occurred. These forms of opposition target a broad range of issues, including challenges to abortion, transgender rights, marriage equality, antidiscrimination policies, feminism, women in politics, and even the notion of gender itself.  In this context, this workshop asks what it means and takes to pursue an equality agenda in Europe today, from a gender and/or sexuality perspective, but also in intersection with other social markers as migration and/or Muslim background. Giving up on the notion that Europe is on an unstoppable way towards 'full' gender equality, what are political, social or other factors that either encourage or limit gender and sexual equality? How do changes in political and public life influence gender(ed) and/or sexual(ized) social norms and practices? How do oppositions to equality get articulated by different actors including social movements, political parties, political elites and/or ordinary citizens? How is populism related to this? And how do these oppositions and resistances change our understanding of gender and sexual politics? What norms are we dealing with? What are we renegotiating?  The workshop invites scholars to submit contributions that tackle one or more of the issues described above, especially in an intersectional approach, either from a theoretical, methodological or empirical perspective. We welcome papers using a variety of methods and data. We also aim to ensure a balanced representation of scholars at different career stages.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English and Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 13. The socialization and development of key liberal democratic values

<p><b>Chair(s)</b>          Tom van der Meer (Political Science, University of Amsterdam)          Laura Mulder (Political Science, University of Amsterdam)          Frank Wanders (Sociology, University of Amsterdam)          Paula Thijs (Sociology, University of Amsterdam)          Maria Kranendonk (Political Science, University of Amsterdam)</p>	
<p><b>Contact person and email address</b>          Laura Mulder (<a href="mailto:l.e.m.mulder@uva.nl">l.e.m.mulder@uva.nl</a>)</p>	
<p><b>Short description</b>          This workshop focuses on the socialization and development of democratic values . We welcome papers that concentrate on (1) (the development of) democratic values (e.g. support for democracy and its institutions, freedom of speech, political interest, citizenship competences), (2) the influence of socializing agents and (3) social inequalities.</p>	
<p><b>Long abstract</b>          Resilient democracies benefit from a strong attachment to democratic values among their citizens. Recently, concerns are raised in public and scientific debates about a possible democratic deconsolidation: the erosion of liberal democratic values would undermine the stability and even survival of democratic societies. In these debates, special attention is devoted to young people, since they are considered to be crucial for retaining a stable and thriving democracy. Socialization of democratic values and behaviors is therefore very important.</p> <p>To a large extent the political socialization literature has focused on political values, such as political interest or political trust, or citizenship related values. Less is known about the endorsement of <b>democratic values</b>, such as freedom of speech, majority decision making or <i>trias politica</i>. We are not only interested in the endorsement of these values in abstract terms, but especially in concrete situations or when these values contradict one another. Interesting questions would be: how, by whom and when are citizens (e.g. adolescents or immigrants) socialized into democratic values? How does the endorsement of democratic values relate to specific situations or conditions?</p> <p>Longitudinal studies on the <b>development</b> of such values are even scarcer. Questions we would like to answer are: How do democratic values develop during the life course? What socializing agents play a role in which phase?</p> <p>Research into these topics points to differences in the endorsement of democratic values. These differences become problematic when they are not randomly distributed among the population, but are related to individual or group-related characteristics, such as gender, educational level, socioeconomic background or migration background. Schools and state sponsored programs are often mentioned as possible agents to compensate for these <b>inequalities</b>. To what extent can socializing agents, such as schools or state sponsored programs, compensate for or increase social inequalities in democratic values?</p> <p>We invite scholars from different disciplines (e.g. political science, sociology, educational science) to share their insights.</p>	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 14. Informatie en beleid: op welke informatie baseert men zich voor het beleid?

<b>Chair(s)</b> Dries Verlet (Statistiek Vlaanderen) Frank Bongers (Dialogic)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Dries Verlet ( <a href="mailto:Dries.Verlet@vlaanderen.be">Dries.Verlet@vlaanderen.be</a> )	
<b>Short description</b> In deze workshop willen we de informatiedoorstroming naar beleid bestuderen. Er is de opkomst van “fake news” en de onmacht van overheden om hiermee om te gaan. Daarnaast zien we ook een dalend respect voor en geloof in experts, alsook de gelijkschakeling van leken- en expertkennis.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Het lijkt op het eerste zicht paradoxaal: in tijden waar informatie nog nooit zo makkelijk voor iedereen beschikbaar is als nu, staat het gebruik van informatie in beleidscontext meer dan ooit ter discussie. Of is de makkelijke online beschikbaarheid net het probleem? Informatie komt ons altijd en overal tegemoet en is divers wat de kwaliteit betreft. De filters lijken afwezig of toch alvast verzadigd. Er is de opkomst van “fake news”, “alternative facts” en de onmacht van overheden om hiermee om te gaan. Daarnaast zien we ook een dalend respect voor en geloof in experts, alsook de gelijkschakeling van leken- en expertkennis.  In deze workshop willen we de informatiedoorstroming naar beleid bestuderen. Met deze workshop beogen we het bijeenbrengen van de ervaring rond de informatiedoorstroming naar het beleid. Inhoudelijk zijn er alvast thema’s genoeg waar we ons in de workshop kunnen over buigen: conceptueel (wat is geïnformeerd beleid? welke tendensen zijn er?) en uit de praktijk (hoe gebeurt de informatiedoorstroming binnen specifieke organisaties en hoe waken we over de kwaliteit? Wat zijn de uitdagingen waar overheden voor staan wat het geïnformeerd beleid betreft? Wat is de rol van experts en leken hierbij?)  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 op mensen uit de praktijk, maar evengoed bestuurskundigen en beleidswetenschappers.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English and Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	Dutch

## 15. Electoral change

<p><b>Chair(s)</b>  Wouter van der Brug (Universiteit van Amsterdam)  Stefaan Walgrave (Universiteit van Antwerpen)</p>	
<p><b>Contact person and email address</b>  Wouter van der Brug (<a href="mailto:w.vanderbrug@uva.nl">w.vanderbrug@uva.nl</a>)</p>	
<p><b>Short description</b>  Over the past decades, election outcomes in ‘established democracies’ have been highly volatile. Support for centrist parties seems to be particularly vulnerable. This workshop invites papers which seek to explain patterns of electoral change, with a particular focus on the political behaviour of citizens.</p>	
<p><b>Long abstract</b>  Over the past three decades, parties with governing potential in so called ‘established democracies’ have lost support to populist or extremist parties of the left and right, or to protest parties without a clear ideological profile, such as the Five Star Movement in Italy. These developments can be observed in most all established democracies, except for a country like the US, where the electoral system prevents the rise of new parties, but where radical alternatives become organised within the ‘mainstream’ parties. In the wake of the financial crisis and the refugee crisis of 2015, the problems of party democracy seem to have deepened. There are several examples of radical parties at the left and right that were a decade ago very small or did not exist, which are now among the largest parties in their countries, either in the polls or in reality: Syriza in Greece, the PVV in the Netherlands, and FN in France.</p> <p>Political scientists have proposed different perspectives on these developments, which can be summarised under the labels of realignment and de-alignment. De-alignment would indicate that long-term stable party-voter attachments do not exist anymore. So, elections would be pretty much decided on the basis of the issues that are salient during election campaigns, as well as evaluations of individual candidates. So, we would expect a gradual shift from long-term determinants of the vote to short-term determinants.</p> <p>Others see the loss of centre parties and the rise of radical populist parties as a signal that party systems are realigning along a new conflict line (winners versus losers of globalisation). To the extent that these new conflicts lead to the formation of stable party attachments, we see new political cleavages developing.</p> <p>This workshop invites papers which speak to these broader questions on the basis of analyses of (the drivers of) electoral choices in recent elections, or electoral change over a longer period of time. The idea of the workshop is to be inclusive with regards to different subthemes (campaigns, leaders, the role of the media, the economy, ideology and issues), as long as the paper focuses on voting behaviour.</p>	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 16. Political Theory Today

<b>Chair(s)</b> Dr Eric Boot (Universiteit Leiden) Dr Johan Olsthoorn (KU Leuven / Universiteit van Amsterdam)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Johan Olsthoorn ( <a href="mailto:johan.olsthoorn@kuleuven.be">johan.olsthoorn@kuleuven.be</a> )	
<b>Short description</b> Political theory is both thematically and methodologically a highly diverse field of study today, leading at times to compartmentalization and a lack of dialogue across subfields. This panel offers a platform for political theorists working in the Low Countries and beyond to discuss their latest research and to reflect on recent methodological developments.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Political theory is both thematically and methodologically a highly diverse field of study today, leading at times to compartmentalization and a lack of dialogue across subfields. At the same time, and relatedly, methodological debates are increasingly prominent in political theory, so much so that some have begun to talk about a <i>Methodenstreit</i> (e.g. between ideal and non-ideal theory, realism and moralism, etc.). Methodological preferences have aligned themselves along thematic lines: while the debate on global justice is dominated by ‘moralist’ political philosophers, debates on the ways political power structures subjecthood seem a stronghold of critical theorists.  This panel offers a platform for political theorists working in the Low Countries and beyond to discuss their work-in-progress and to reflect on recent methodological developments. The workshop aims to collect papers that approach important questions in political theory today from sundry approaches, including but not restricted to: critical theory, continental political theory, normative political philosophy, realist political theory, and historically-informed political theory. Ethics, legal philosophy, and purely historical studies of political ideas fall outside the scope of this workshop.  It has been a few years, we have been told, since a political theory workshop was last part of the Politicologenetmaal. Political theory is a core part of political science and we deem it important that political theorists continue to meet at this annual gathering to critically discuss their latest research findings and thereby foster mutual understanding and appreciation of the many different themes and approaches that are currently inspiring normative political reflection.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English