



Radboud University



# Politicologenetmaal 2020

Radboud University, 11-12 June 2020

## CALL FOR PAPERS

On Thursday June 11 and Friday June 12 2020 the 'Politicologenetmaal' (24-hour Political Science Conference) is jointly organized for the nineteenth time by the Dutch Political Science Association (NKWP) and the Association for Political Science (VPW). This time the conference will be organized by the [Department of Political Science](#) of [Radboud University](#) in Nijmegen, the Netherlands. The conference begins on Thursday at noon and ends on Friday after lunch. The conference consists of 16 workshops, each with a different thematic focus, organized by a different team of workshop coordinators.

[The full list of workshops can be found below.](#)

Each workshop consists of ca. 8 to 12 paper presentations. 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. Workshop organizers are held in Dutch or in English.

On Thursday evening, after the workshop panels there will be a plenary session with a keynote speech from [Prof. Anand Menon](#) and an award ceremony for the best PhD thesis and MSc thesis of the year. This will be held in downtown Nijmegen in [LUX Nijmegen](#).

- If you are interested in presenting a paper at one of the workshops, please send your proposal directly to the workshop organizers indicated in the workshop description (see below).
- The deadline for paper proposals is **March 27, 2020**.
- Proposals should include author names, affiliation(s), contact e-mail, and abstract (max. 250 words).
- You will hear from the workshop coordinators whether your proposal is accepted by **April 10, 2020**.
- It is also possible to participate without presenting a paper. 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 10, 2020 until May 15, 2020. 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).

\*\* 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 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 15, 2020 deadline is only possible if spaces allow; in these cases there is an additional late registration fee of €50,-.

The organizing committee,

Dr. Maurits Meijers and Dr. Andrej Zaslove, Radboud University  
The Dutch Political Science Association (NKWP) and The Association for Political Science (VPW)



# Politicologenetmaal 2020

Radboud Universiteit, 11-12 juni 2020

## OPROEP VOOR PAPERS

Op donderdag 11 en vrijdag 12 juni 2020 organiseren de Nederlandse Kring voor Wetenschap der Politiek (NKWP) en de Vereniging voor Politieke Wetenschappen (VPW) voor de negentiende keer gezamenlijk het Politicologenetmaal. Het Etmaal wordt dit jaar georganiseerd door de afdeling [Politicologie](#) van de [Radboud Universiteit](#) in Nijmegen. De klemtoon van het Politicologenetmaal ligt op het werk in de workshop sessies (twee sessies op donderdagmiddag en twee sessies op vrijdagochtend). Het Etmaal bestaat uit 16 workshops, elk met een eigen thema en team van workshopvoorzitters.

[De lijst met workshops vindt u hieronder.](#)

Elke workshop kent twee sessies op donderdagmiddag en twee sessies op vrijdagochtend (ca. 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. Sessievoorzitters kunnen kiezen voor Nederlands of Engels als voertaal. Zoals gebruikelijk start het Etmaal op donderdag rond 12 uur en eindigt het op vrijdag na de lunch. Het Etmaal kent op donderdagavond een plenaire bijeenkomst mét keynote van [Prof. Anand Menon](#) en de uitreiking van prijzen voor het beste proefschrift en de beste masterscriptie in [LUX Nijmegen](#).

- Als u een paper wil indienen bij een workshop, wordt u verzocht ten laatste op **27 maart 2020** 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 hieronder).
- Ten laatste op **10 april 2020** 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 **10 april 2020 t/m 15 mei 2020**.

De bijdragen voor deelname zijn de volgende:

*Gereduceerd tarief (leden NKWP/VPW) \** €110,-

*Vol tarief* €175,-

*Studententarieff (Bachelor- en Masterstudenten) \*\** €50,-

\* Maak je als volgt lid: [VPW](#) (België) of [NKWP](#) (Nederland).

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

De conferentiebijdrage omvat 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 15 mei 2020 is alleen mogelijk indien er nog plekken beschikbaar zijn en tegen een met €50,- verhoogd tarief.

Het organiserend comité,

Dr. Maurits Meijers en Dr. Andrej Zaslove, Radboud Universiteit

De Nederlandse Kring voor Wetenschap der Politiek (NKWP) en De Vereniging voor Politieke Wetenschappen (VPW)

# Politicologenetmaal 2020

Radboud University, 11-12 June 2020

## WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

	Workshop title	Organizers
1	Academic freedom in the age of neoliberal authoritarianism	Van der Vleuten, Anna (Radboud University) Eimer, Thomas, (Radboud University) Sanne van Oosten (University of Amsterdam)
2	Advances in Political Psychology	Lala Muradova (University of Leuven) Martin Rosema (University of Twente)
3	Allies across Oceans: "Stranger Together"	Jordan Becker (VUB/U.S. Army)
4	Brede welvaart als richtsnoer: de kwaliteit van leven als maatschappelijke doelstelling	Dries Verlet (Statistiek Vlaanderen) Frank Bongers (Dialogic) Lisa van Dijk (KU Leuven)
5	Citizen involvement in political decision-making	Ramon van der Does (UC Louvain) Gijs Jan Brandsma (Utrecht University & University of Konstanz)
6	Continuity and Change in European (Dis)Integration	Markus Haverland, (Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam) <i>In collaboration with</i> Daniel Polman and Indra Römgens (Radboud U.)
7	Democratic values, social inequalities and/in political socialization	Paula Thijs (University of Amsterdam) Ellen Claes (KU Leuven)
8	Effects of Electoral Systems	Alexander Verdoes (Bergen University) Arjan Schakel (Bergen University)
9	Global Challenges and Global Crises in the 21st Century: Revisiting IPE perspectives?	Nana de Graaff (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) Adam Dixon (Maastricht University) Ferdé De Ville (Ghent University)
10	Global Order in Crisis? Exploring Contestations of International Organizations and Liberal Norms	Maria J. Debre (Maastricht University) Daniëlle Flonk (Hertie School of Governance)
11	Lokale politiek in een nieuw decennium	Peter Castenmiller (PBLQ / Universiteit Leiden) Herwig Reynaert (Universiteit Gent)
12	New Parties, New Divides, Mainstream Reactions and Their Effects	Laura Jacobs (Universiteit van Amsterdam) Patrick van Erkel (Universiteit Antwerpen) Joost van Spanje (Universiteit van Amsterdam)
13	NGOs in crisis mode: Making tough choices in times of pressure	Jutta Joachim (Radboud University) Sandra Resodihardjo (Radboud University)
14	Political Communication	Ine Goovaerts (KU Leuven) Emma Turkenburg (KU Leuven)
15	Political Socialization in Everyday Life	Agnes Akkerman (Radboud University) Bram Geurkink (Radboud University) Katerina Manevska (Radboud University)
16	Technology and Politics: Agency, Effects and the International	Malcolm Campbell-Verduyn (University of Groningen) Raluca Csernatoni (VUB) Marijn Hoijtink (VU Amsterdam)

# 1. Academic freedom in the age of neoliberal authoritarianism

<p><b>Chair(s)</b>          Van der Vleuten, Anna (RU)          Eimer, Thomas, (RU)</p> <p><b>Co-Chairs</b>          Topolski, Anya (RU)          Schor, Patricia (RU)          Kip, Maliene (RU)</p>	
<p><b>Contact person and email address</b>          Thomas R. Eimer (t.eimer@fm.ru.nl)</p>	
<p><b>Short description (max. 50 words)</b></p> <p>The goal of this mini-symposium is to discuss the risks of shrinking academic freedom, reflect upon their inter- and transnational roots, and to debate strategies to defend the academic deliberative space.</p>	
<p><b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b></p> <p>The goal of this mini-symposium is to discuss the risks of shrinking academic freedom, reflect upon their inter- and transnational roots and to debate strategies to defend the academic deliberative space. It is planned to invite up to five scholars from (semi-)authoritarian countries (Brazil, India, Turkey etc.) to discuss these questions in detail and to come up with possible steps towards more international academic solidarity. For this purpose, we will also discuss to what extent industrialized countries are co-responsible for the global trend towards authoritarianism (e.g., via trade policies). Most notably, the following questions will be discussed: What kind of limitations do scholars experience with regard to the freedom of academic speech? What are the causes for these limitations, both domestically and internationally? What can be done to defend and possibly even extent deliberative spaces?</p> <p>We plan to invite our international scholars to the Annual Convention of Dutch and Flemish Scientists (Politicologenetmaal) on June 11 and 12, 2020. On Friday, June 12, we will organize a Radboud Reflects debate for the broader public. This event will be co-organized with Dutch NGOs (e.g., Amnesty International, Both Ends). On Saturday (June 13), our guests are invited to discuss the above-mentioned questions in a smaller round with interested colleagues from Radboud University. Ideally, the mini-symposium will lead to a Radboud Declaration for Academic Freedom.</p> <p>Interested colleagues are invited to submit a short text (max 400 words) in which they describe their motivation to participate.</p>	
<p><b>Language papers:</b></p>	<p>English / Dutch (other languages also possible)</p>
<p><b>Language discussions</b></p>	<p>English</p>

## 2. Advances in Political Psychology

<b>Chair(s)</b>	
Sanne van Oosten (University of Amsterdam) Lala Muradova (University of Leuven) Martin Rosema (University of Twente)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b>	
Sanne van Oosten (s.b.vanoosten@uva.nl) Lala Muradova (lala.muradova@kuleuven.be) Martin Rosema (m.rosema@utwente.nl)	
<b>Short description (max. 50 words)</b>	
This workshop invites theoretical and empirical (both qualitative and quantitative) papers by senior and junior scholars that showcase cutting edge research developments in the field of political psychology.	
<b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b>	
The influence of psychological processes on politics informs many research questions in the field of political science. More and more political science researchers interact with the wide array of literatures within this discipline and the political psychology community is growing in the Low Countries. Research within the field of political psychology focusses on individual characteristics and concepts such as attitudes, emotions, identities and personality. These individual characteristics influence a wide array of phenomena such as: political participation, political efficacy, prejudice, discrimination, stereotypes, elite decision making, responses to political campaigns, democratic deliberation, threat responses, intergroup conflict and relations, grievances and calls to collective action. Our objective in convening this workshop is to advance discussion and research upon the above mentioned sub-topics (and beyond) that share a common research interest: the understanding of the role of psychology in politics. Both theoretical and empirical (qualitative, quantitative or mixed) papers that showcase cutting edge research developments in the field of emotions and political psychology are welcome.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English OR Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

### 3. Allies across Oceans: “Stranger Together”

<p><b>Chair(s)</b> Jordan Becker (Institute for European Studies (VUB)/U.S. Army)</p>
<p><b>Contact person and email address</b> Jordan Becker (<a href="mailto:jordan.becker21@gmail.com">jordan.becker21@gmail.com</a>)</p>
<p><b>Short description (max. 50 words)</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.</p>
<p><b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b> A key pillar of the current international order, alliances remain a central topic in international studies, and are under particular strain at present. The study of alliances is multidisciplinary, demanding, <i>inter alia</i>, scholarship in international relations, security and strategic studies, political economy, comparative politics, and defense and peace economics. Yet, these disciplines do not often engage with one another in any systematic way. The workshop “Allies across Oceans: ‘Stranger Together’” seeks to address this shortcoming by bringing together scholars from an array of disciplines, intellectual traditions, and methodological approaches. Alliance politics address grand strategy, domestic political economies, and nearly everything in between. State behavior in alliances 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 the strategic choices states, ranging from with whom to ally to how to allocate resources, across multiple levels of governance, in both multilateral and bilateral contexts, and among both formal and de facto allies.</p> <p>Driving questions include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How have incentives to form and sustain alliances changed since the birth of IR as a discipline, 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>• To what extent does the nuclear deterrence dimension of alliances entail additional and unique challenges for alliance management?</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> <li>• Are allies’ responses to threats changing, and are they likely to change further?</li> <li>• How does strategic culture affect alliance management?</li> <li>• What is the relationship between national political economies and alliance politics?</li> <li>• What is the relationship between regional political economies and alliance politics?</li> <li>• How does defense industrial policy interact with alliance politics?</li> <li>• What are the implications of the recent wave of populism for alliance politics?</li> </ul>

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.

Language papers	English
Language discussions	English

## 4. Brede welvaart als richtsnoer: de kwaliteit van leven als maatschappelijke doelstelling

<p><b>Chair(s)</b> Dries Verlet (Statistiek Vlaanderen) &amp; Frank Bongers (Dialogic)</p>
<p><b>Contact person and email address</b> Dries Verlet (<a href="mailto:Dries.Verlet@vlaanderen.be">Dries.Verlet@vlaanderen.be</a>)</p>
<p><b>Short description</b></p> <p>Met deze workshop beogen we het bijeenbrengen van de ervaring rond het meten van de kwaliteit van het leven. Inhoudelijk zijn er alvast thema's genoeg waar we ons in de workshop kunnen over buigen: conceptueel, uit de praktijk of een combinatie. Wat verstaan we onder brede welvaart, de kwaliteit van het leven en het subjectief welzijn? Hoe kunnen we dat meten? Hoe verhouden economische welvaart en subjectief welzijn zich tegenover elkaar en ten aanzien van andere aspecten van de kwaliteit van leven? In welke mate zijn het compatibele maatschappelijke en politieke doelstellingen? Wat is bepalend voor het subjectief welzijn? Wat zijn de handvaten voor de overheid om in te spelen op het subjectief welzijn? Wat zijn de uitdagingen voor overheden bij het inzetten om subjectief welzijn? Worden we hier economisch beter van?</p>
<p><b>Long abstract</b></p> <p>De discussies omtrent het BNP als indicator voor economische welvaart zijn al even oud als de term zelf. Ook in de zoektocht naar "de" kwaliteit van het leven, ligt de dominante positie van BNP als maatstaf voor maatschappelijke vooruitgang onder vuur. Naast intrinsieke beperkingen van economische aard, is de basiskritiek dat noch de sociale noch de ecologische dimensie in BNP goed wordt weerspiegeld. Deze stellingname komt overeen met het streven naar een bredere kijk op het concept welvaart. Gelijkaardige initiatieven werden ontwikkeld in de schoot van de Europese Commissie (Eurostat), de OESO en de VN. Zo heeft de OESO binnen het "Better Life Initiative" aandacht voor, terwijl zowel binnen Eurostat als de OESO ook aandacht voor het welbevinden of subjectief welzijn. De VN publiceren jaarlijks het "World Happiness Report" dat aandacht geeft aan hoe gelukkig de gemiddelde inwoner van landen zijn.</p> <p>Deze invulling kan niet los gezien worden van de manier waarop men de kwaliteit van het leven in kaart brengt. Klassiek is er de benadering waarin economische indicatoren voorop staan. Men verruimde het gezichtsveld met andere sociale indicatoren. Een derde benadering legt de nadruk op het gebruik van subjectieve indicatoren, teneinde de gepercipieerde kwaliteit van het leven (of het zogenaamde subjectief welzijn) in kaart te brengen. Verder komt de discussie omtrent het gebruik van zogenaamde objectieve en subjectieve indicatoren aan bod.</p> <p>Centraal in de discussies omtrent de kwaliteit van het leven is de vraag of we de juiste dingen meten om maatschappelijke welvaart te meten. Maar ook omtrent de meting van economische welvaart op zich zijn de meningen verdeeld. Verder staat economische welvaart niet garant voor geluk. We zien dan ook meer initiatieven om dit subjectief welzijn te meten. In een aantal gevallen schuift men het ook expliciet naar voor als politieke doelstelling. Hoewel we kunnen aannemen dat we met economische welvaart en subjectief verschillende aspecten van de kwaliteit van het leven meten, blijft de link tussen beiden onduidelijk.</p> <p>Met deze workshop beogen we het bijeenbrengen van de ervaring rond het meten van de kwaliteit van het leven. Inhoudelijk zijn er alvast thema's genoeg waar we ons in de workshop kunnen over buigen: conceptueel, uit de praktijk of een combinatie. Wat verstaan we onder brede welvaart, de kwaliteit van het leven en het subjectief welzijn? Hoe kunnen we dat meten? Hoe verhouden economische welvaart en subjectief welzijn zich tegenover elkaar en ten aanzien van andere aspecten van de kwaliteit van leven? In welke mate zijn het</p>

compatibele maatschappelijke en politieke doelstellingen? Wat is bepalend voor het subjectief welzijn? Wat zijn de handvaten voor de overheid om in te spelen op het subjectief welzijn? Wat zijn de uitdagingen voor overheden bij het inzetten om subjectief welzijn? Worden we hier economisch beter van?

Met deze workshop willen we academici en ervaringsdeskundigen uit diverse beleids- en onderzoeksdomeinen samenbrengen. We kijken ook uit naar casestudies, uit allerlei sectoren en van allerlei beleidsniveaus.

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

## 5. Citizen involvement in political decision-making

<b>Chair(s)</b> Lisa van Dijk (KU Leuven) Ramon van der Does (UC Louvain)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Lisa van Dijk ( <a href="mailto:lisa.vandijk@kuleuven.be">lisa.vandijk@kuleuven.be</a> ) Ramon van der Does ( <a href="mailto:ramon.vanderdoes@uclouvain.be">ramon.vanderdoes@uclouvain.be</a> )	
<b>Short description (max. 50 words)</b> Citizen involvement in political decision-making is increasingly common in Western democracies. While the academic literature on such ‘democratic innovations’ has boomed over the past years, questions regarding their drivers, designs and consequences remain. We welcome junior and senior scholars to submit their empirical (qualitative, quantitative, mixed) and normative contributions.	
<b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b> Procedural arrangements that facilitate citizen involvement in political decision-making are increasingly common in Western democracies (e.g. Qvortrup, 2017). These include a wide variety of instruments, ranging from direct democratic devices such as referendums to deliberative tools like citizens’ assemblies and participatory instruments like participatory budgeting (e.g. Smith, 2009). While the academic literature on such ‘democratic innovations’ has boomed over the past years, many questions regarding their drivers, designs and consequences remain.  To begin with, citizens’ motives for supporting participatory reforms are far from clear. So far, the process preference literature has focused on individual-level drivers such as dissatisfaction with democracy as well as political interest and skills (e.g. Bowler, Donovan & Karp, 2007). Yet, what type(s) of dissatisfaction is(are) fueling process preferences? That is, discontent with <i>whom</i> or <i>what</i> drives a demand for institutional change? What other considerations can be relevant for citizens’ attitudes towards democratic innovations (e.g. instrumental considerations; Werner, 2019)?  In a next step, scholars have started to explore citizens’ preferences for the design of democratic innovations. For instance, how would the ideal design of a referendum look like according to citizens, and is this different for particular types of citizens? Moreover, other studies dive into the effect of democratic innovations on political support and public opinion formation (Boulianne, 2019; Ingham & Levin, 2018). To what extent can participatory reforms indeed foster citizens’ legitimacy perceptions – and if so, how or why, and under what circumstances?  Moving away from citizens’ attitudes towards democratic innovations, a broad range of research angles can shed more light on the workings and effects of such processes. For instance, to what extent do political elites support democratic innovations – and why (e.g. Niessen, 2019)? Does this standpoint change once a party enters government? What are rationales for governments to facilitate citizen involvement in decision-making, and what consequences does this have for the empowering potential of such reforms? Under what conditions can democratic innovations have discernable effects on policy-making?  We welcome both empirical (qualitative, quantitative, mixed) and normative contributions on these questions. We especially encourage contributions that attempt to make a link to wider debates in the disciplines of political science and public administration.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

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

<p><b>Chair(s)</b> Name (Affiliation)</p> <p>Dr Gijs Jan Brandsma, Utrecht University &amp; University of Konstanz</p> <p>Prof dr Markus Haverland, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam</p> <p><i>In collaboration with</i> Daniel Polman (Radboud U.) Indra Römgens (Radboud U.)</p>
<p><b>Contact person and email address</b> Name (email address)</p> <p>Dr Gijs Jan Brandsma, <a href="mailto:g.j.brandsma@uu.nl">g.j.brandsma@uu.nl</a></p>
<p><b>Short description (max. 50 words)</b></p> <p>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 Institutions</li> <li>• EU Policy-making</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 (max. 400 words)</b></p> <p>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 became vividly clear in the Eurozone crisis and the migration crisis and has turned into a European crisis at times when new challenges such as climate change intensify. Deep rifts over the way to handle the crises started to emerge in the European bloc. The EU is split, for instance 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</li> <li>• Representation</li> <li>• Political Bargaining</li> <li>• Political Institutions</li> <li>• EU-member state relations</li> <li>• EU Agenda setting, decision-making, implementation and compliance</li> <li>• Legitimacy</li> </ul>

- Processes of Integration and Disintegration

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.

Language papers	English
Language discussions	English

## 7. Democratic values, social inequalities and/in political socialization

<p><b>Chair(s)</b>          Paula Thijs (Department of Sociology, University of Amsterdam)          Ellen Claes (Centrum voor Politicologie, KU Leuven)</p>
<p><b>Contact person and email address</b>          Paula Thijs          p.e.thijs@uva.nl</p>
<p><b>Short description (max. 50 words)</b></p> <p>This workshop focuses on (inequalities in) support for democratic values and political and civic engagement. We welcome papers that concentrate on (the development of) support for democratic values, inequalities herein, explanations for such inequalities (e.g. political socialization) and initiatives to address these inequalities (e.g. citizenship education).</p>
<p><b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b></p> <p>Democratic societies benefit from a strong commitment of citizens to the core values of liberal democracy. Recently, concerns have been raised about the erosion of liberal democratic values, especially among the younger generations. Although these concerns have been challenged and contested, it has generated scholarly attention to the political and democratic socialization and development of democratic values of young people.</p> <p>For a resilient democratic society, it is not only important that citizens endorse the core values of democracy but also that these values are more or less evenly distributed in the population. However, there are signs that considerable variation exists in support for democratic values and political and civic engagement within and between democratic societies. Such differences become problematic when they are related to individual or group-related characteristics (e.g. sex, educational level, socioeconomic background or migration background). These differences between groups may lead to political underrepresentation and could eventually undermine the legitimacy of mature democracies.</p> <p>Social differences in the endorsement of democratic values, and political and civic engagement may be rooted in uneven political socialization of young people. For example, children from more advantageous socioeconomic backgrounds may discuss politics more frequently with their parents or may be more likely to attend advantageous schools in terms of financial resources, school composition, teachers, school climate, and opportunities to participate in (extra-)curricular citizenship education programmes. Questions we would like to address in this workshop are: to what extent are differences in support for democratic values and political engagement related to social inequalities? Where do disadvantages accumulate (who are the people that are least supportive of democracy and its core values)? How can these differences and inequalities be explained, for example by uneven political socialization processes, unequal access to resources and certain (educational) characteristics (e.g. tracking)?</p> <p>Schools and state sponsored (citizenship) education programmes are often mentioned as possible agents to compensate for existing differences in young people's endorsement of democratic values or political engagement. We therefore also welcome contributions that address questions like to what extent socializing agents, such as schools or formal/informal (citizenship) education programs compensate/accelerate social inequalities in democratic values and political engagement.</p> <p>We invite scholars from different disciplines (e.g. political science, sociology, educational science) to share their insights on: (1) the relationship between social inequalities and (differences in) support for democratic values</p>

or different forms of political and civic engagement, (2) the influence of socializing agents and political socialization processes, and (3) possible pathways to challenge social inequalities.

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

## 8. Effects of Electoral Systems

<b>Chair(s)</b> Alexander Verdoes (Bergen University) and Arjan Schakel (Bergen University)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Alexander Verdoes ( <a href="mailto:alexander.verdoes@uib.no">alexander.verdoes@uib.no</a> )	
<b>Short description (max. 50 words)</b> This workshop examines the effects of electoral systems. Topics that can be addressed in this workshop include the impact of electoral systems on: the party system, government formation, party behaviour, candidate behaviour, voter behaviour, or other related topics.	
<b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b> Electoral systems have a large impact on voters (e.g. strategic versus sincere voting), politicians (e.g. role perceptions, personalised campaigns, relation with voters), parties (e.g. internal party discipline), and party systems (e.g. entry/exit of parties, number of parties). The effects of different types of electoral systems are well studied but often scholars use relatively crude measures which differentiate proportional from majoritarian rule or which tap into the district magnitude. The lack of sophistication in measurement does not do justice to the wide variation found between and especially within countries. For example, a multilevel perspective on electoral systems invites scholars to look at the effects of holding different types of elections simultaneously (i.e. holding European, national, regional or local elections at the same date) which has a huge impact on the nationalisation of the party systems found at the different levels.  In this workshop we welcome papers that study the impact of electoral systems which we define as the set of institutions and rules which regulate the conduct of elections and which translate votes into seats. Papers can focus on a wide range of different institutions or rules –e.g. thresholds, district magnitudes, electoral timing, open/closed lists, and so forth—and on a large variety of impacts at the voter, politician, party, or party system levels. Papers can be quantitative or qualitative and we especially welcome papers that focus on multilevel electoral systems.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English or Dutch
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 9. Global Challenges and Global Crises in the 21st Century: Revisiting IPE perspectives?

<b>Chair(s)</b> Nana de Graaff (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) Adam Dixon (Maastricht University) Ferdie De Ville (Ghent University)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Nana de Graaff ( <a href="mailto:n.a.de.graaff@vu.nl">n.a.de.graaff@vu.nl</a> ) Adam Dixon ( <a href="mailto:a.dixon@maastrichtuniversity.nl">a.dixon@maastrichtuniversity.nl</a> ) Ferdie De Ville ( <a href="mailto:ferdie.deville@ugent.be">ferdie.deville@ugent.be</a> )	
<b>Short description</b>  We invite papers that explore global challenges and crises from an international political economy perspective broadly defined, as well as papers that explore how these global challenges and crises are changing our understanding of and approaches to international political economy. Such challenges and crises include, but are not limited to, the rise of China, the decline of the liberal international order, climate change, populism, and inequality.	
<b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b>  The current world order is in major flux. The liberal international order is being challenged from within and without. China is recognizing its role as a world power, enticing many developing countries to follow its distinctive state-led mode of capitalism. The advanced democracies are seeing the growth of populist politics, which is challenging faith in market capitalism. Inequality within and across countries is tearing at the seams of the social fabric, after a decade of austerity and the ongoing engorgement of the wealthy. And since the signing of the Paris Accord in 2015, global carbon emissions continue to break records, suggesting that efforts to slow climate change are likely to be too little and too late. These challenges and crises interrogate international political economists to provide explanations (and solutions) and may call for a rethink of our existing perspectives. For example, the rise of China and other explicitly 'statist' political economies have elicited growing debate on whether we are seeing the rise of a new 'state capitalism' and how to conceptualize this. The rise of a new type of political leaders in major Western economies who claim to speak for globalization's victims reveals the crisis of neoliberalism and of the elite leadership in mainstream politics, but leaves open the question of with what - which configuration of social forces and ideas - it can and will be replaced. Technological developments and artificial intelligence are heralding a revolution in all domains of the (global) political economy, but its effects are just barely understood. The climate change crisis is creating new (or reinforcing existing) cleavages within and between states, but the impact of this on domestic and international politics remains uncertain. The growing power of 'superstar firms' is increasing calls for government action, but it is unclear if this will result in multilateral or unilateral measures, and if the heavy-lifting will be done by trade, competition or tax policies.  In this workshop we aim to have a pluralist dialogue among scholars of international political economy on how these and other current global challenges and crises can be understood by IPE approaches and how they are or should be forcing us to reassess how we approach political economy. We invite contributions from a wide and diverse range of theoretical, empirical, and normative angles in IPE and cognate fields.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 10. Global Order in Crisis? Exploring Contestations of International Organizations and Liberal Norms

<b>Chair(s)</b> Maria J. Debre (Maastricht University) Daniëlle Flonk (Hertie School)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Maria J. Debre ( <a href="mailto:m.debre@maastrichtuniversity.nl">m.debre@maastrichtuniversity.nl</a> ) Daniëlle Flonk ( <a href="mailto:flonk@hertie-school.org">flonk@hertie-school.org</a> )	
<b>Short description (max. 50 words)</b> This workshop aims to explore causes and consequences of contemporary challenges to the international liberal order at the intersection between international relations and comparative politics. How do these challenges manifest? What are the causes of contemporary contestation? What is the role of regime type in explaining these developments? And finally, what are the consequences for norms and institutions?	
<b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b> The contemporary liberal international order is under unprecedented threat: populist parties and politicians across the globe question the value of multilateral cooperation, emerging powers attempt to create competitive institutions that resemble the current global power distribution, and authoritarian rulers band together to weaken human rights. Since the Trump administration took power, the United States has threatened to pull out of NATO, has left UNESCO and cut all its funding to the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees (UNRWA). Emerging powers such as India, Brazil and South Africa attempt to shift existing regimes to UN auspices where they have more influence on decision-making procedures under ‘one country, one vote’-principles. Authoritarian leaders increasingly cooperate with each other on a regional level to establish alternative regional norms, support each other in times of crisis and influence international regimes. For instance, China and Russia have built and expanded the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, and the Gulf States use the Gulf Cooperation Council to coordinate strategies. Hence, the existing international liberal international order is contested from within and the outside. An alternative, fragmented order is emerging that is based on a broader set of rules and norms.  The proposed workshop aims to explore causes and consequences of these contemporary challenges to the international liberal order. In order to do so, we focus on the intersection between international relations and comparative politics. The workshop is especially interested in contributions that deal with one of four main research questions. First, how do challenges of the liberal order manifest with regard to global (il-)liberal discourse, state withdrawal from established fora, or rescinding material and ideational support for international organizations? Second, what are the causes of contemporary contestation and how is growing populism, global inequality or the spread of authoritarian-style politics fueling this contestation? Third, what is the role of regime type in explaining the challenging of norms and organizations, and (vice versa) how are processes of re-autocratization and democratic backsliding affected by a changing international order? Fourth, what are consequences for liberal norms, international cooperation and the functioning of international organizations? By exploring these four questions, the workshop aims to assemble contributions that take the international liberal order as either dependent or independent variable, thereby exploring further how international and domestic political processes are intertwined. We invite applications from different empirical (both quantitative and qualitative), conceptual, and normative backgrounds as well as different disciplinary perspectives to represent the plurality of research on this topic.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 11. Lokale politiek in een nieuw decennium

<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 (max. 50 words)</b> In deze workshop staan de veranderingen en stabiliteit in het lokaal bestuur in Nederland en Vlaanderen centraal. Tevens biedt de workshop een plek voor de uitwisseling van kennis, ervaringen en inzichten over lokale politiek.	
<b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b> De westerse democratie lijkt in veel landen onder druk te staan. Er zijn grote maatschappelijke uitdagingen (vergrijzing, (kinder)armoede, vereenzaming,...) en er zijn ook vele ontevreden burgers (cfr de (gemeenteraads)verkiezingen), terwijl er sprake lijkt van een ogenschijnlijk onmachtige overheid. Het lokaal niveau zou, volgens de leer, die uitdagingen bij uitstek moeten ervaren. Bovendien worden van de lokale overheid ook als eerste 'oplossingen' verwacht, zoals in de energietransitie of in zorg en welzijn. Staat ook het lokale bestuur onder druk, en hoe gaat dan het lokaal bestuur met deze uitdagingen om? Aan uitdagingen zeker geen gebrek. Denken we maar aan de verdere discussie over de fusies van gemeenten, wat met het provinciale niveau, evolueren we naar stadsregio's,... De ondertussen traditionele, langstlopende workshop tijdens het PoliticologenEtmaal, over lokale politiek, biedt ook dit jaar, in Nijmegen, weer een platform om hierover van gedachten te wisselen. 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. Bovendien 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/or English
<b>Language discussions</b>	Dutch

## 12. New Parties, New Divides, Mainstream Reactions and Their Effects

<b>Chair(s)</b> Laura Jacobs (Universiteit van Amsterdam) Patrick van Erkel (Universiteit Antwerpen) Joost van Spanje (Universiteit van Amsterdam)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Laura Jacobs (Universiteit van Amsterdam): <a href="mailto:l.c.n.jacobs@uva.nl">l.c.n.jacobs@uva.nl</a>	
<b>Short description</b> This workshop invites papers that investigate the causes of rising extremism (e.g. polarization) and new parties, how established elites respond to the emergence of these new parties and new divides, and/or the effects of such responses for public opinion, democratic attitudes, political behavior and electoral support.	
<b>Long abstract</b> Norris and Inglehart (2019) point to a newly emerging political reality in which new, often extremist, political players have gained support at the expense of established parties. For instance, in both Belgium and the Netherlands, the classic tripartite coalition of the three traditional parties (liberals, socialists and Christian-democrats) does not hold a majority of parliamentary seats anymore. The success of these new extremist parties has been linked to larger societal developments such as rising volatility in Western Europe and an increasing polarization in society. At the same time, established (political) actors such as media practitioners, legal authorities, and mature parties, need to react to these challengers. Still, many questions on how to interpret this new political reality are left unanswered.  First, the causes explaining the increasing popularity of new extremist players are multi-fold and complex. The process of dealignment would have resulted in increasing volatility, making issue-based voting and leaders more important rather than big ideologies. Newly emerging issues (e.g., immigration, climate) have led to new cleavages, which could intensify polarization in many societies. Generally, it remains unclear how the rise of extremist parties is linked to broader societal developments, such as volatility and polarization.  Second, established political parties need to find ways to respond to these new political currents. The establishment often reverts to arguments that they need to defend the political order and citizens from extremist influences and have various ways on how to react to extremists, e.g. by including them (i.e. collaboration, ruling with them) or by excluding them (i.e. via a 'cordon sanitaire' or excluding them from the government). The country elite can even initiate judicial measures to contain extremist parties (e.g., prosecution, bans) or revert to patterns of stigmatization (both by political actors, but also by the media).  Finally, it is unclear how responses of established actors to extremist parties impact citizens' attitudes and voting behavior. For instance, does the cordon sanitaire affect political trust and/or voting behavior? What are the effects of initiating legal actions against extremist parties for public opinion?  In sum, this workshop invites papers that investigate causes of the success of extremist parties (e.g. challenger and anti-establishment parties) and rising extremism, how established elites respond to the emergence of these new parties and divides, and/or effects of the success of these parties, and the responses of the elites to this success, for public opinion, democratic attitudes, political behavior and electoral support.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 13. NGOs in crisis mode: Making tough choices n times of pressure

<b>Chairs</b>	Dr Jutta Joachim (Radboud University, the Netherlands) Dr Sandra Resodihardjo (Radboud University, the Netherlands)
<b>Contact person</b>	Dr Sandra Resodihardjo (s.resodihardjo@fm.ru.nl)
<b>Short description (max. 50 words)</b> NGOs increasingly face tough decisions, e.g. whether to remain in conflict zones, who to align themselves with, how to achieve their aims under dire circumstances and whether to compromise on their mandate. Focusing on a range of different issue-areas, this panel will assess what decision-making related to such dilemmas looks like inside NGOs.	
<b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b> NGOs are increasingly faced with difficult decisions. Should humanitarian NGOs remain in conflict zones and risk endangering the lives of their staff? Is it wise for environmental NGOs to align themselves with corporate actors and compromise their independence and neutrality? Should they provide information to their donors about less successful projects and pay the price of losing their financial support? These and other dilemmas/questions will be addressed by a group of scholars from different disciplinary backgrounds (e.g., public administration, political science, philosophy, and communication studies). . Informed by a broad range of different theoretical perspectives and based on a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods, the papers presented examine the organizational interests at stake, the trade-offs involved, and the normative or ethical dilemmas these situations pose for NGOs. The panel adds to the firmly established NGO literature which until this point has been preoccupied with the external dimensions of NGOs, the relations they maintain with stakeholders, the role they play in transnational social movements, or the strategies they use to mobilize citizen support and to bring about societal change. While these are not irrelevant in the papers presented, the panel places, however, greater emphasis on the inner life of NGOs and the dynamics which unfold in the organizations in response to changes and developments in their immediate environment.	
<b>Language papers</b>	Preference for English, Dutch is possible
<b>Language discussion</b>	English

## 14. Political Communication

<b>Chair(s)</b> Ine Goovaerts (KU Leuven) Emma Turkenburg (KU Leuven)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Ine Goovaerts (ine.goovaerts@kuleuven.be) Emma Turkenburg (emma.turkenburg@kuleuven.be)	
<b>Short description (max. 50 words)</b> This workshop welcomes papers that address topics broadly related to political communication, such as political journalism, internal and external party communication and the influence and use of social media in politics. Both qualitative and quantitative, empirical and theoretical works can be submitted.	
<b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b> <i>“Who (says) What (to) Whom (in) Which Channel (with) What Effect?”</i> , the well-known statement summarizing Harold Lasswell’s model of communication (1948), covers broadly the different key aspects in political communication research this workshop warmly invites and aims to discuss. What intentional and what unconscious choices are made both during the sending and the receiving of political communication? How does political information and communication influence politics and policy makers, the news media, and citizens? This session aims to convene scholars with varying angles of incidence to discuss the broad field of political communication research  The wide array of communication channels available to both politicians and citizens today, makes for a multitude of potential topics to be assessed during this workshop: from discourse quality to fact-checking, from election campaigns to political journalism, and from populist communication to official institutional statements.  We invite researchers from different disciplines and with different areas of focus: large scale, cross-country research, investigations on the local level and everything in-between. Ideally, this workshop would accommodate a diverse selection of methods, such as survey research, experiments, (automated) content analysis, and other methods.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 15. Political Socialization in Everyday Life

<b>Chairs</b> Prof. Dr. Agnes Akkerman (Radboud University) Bram Geurkink, MSc. (Radboud University) Dr. Katerina Manevska (Radboud University)	
<b>Contact person and email address</b> Bram Geurkink, <a href="mailto:b.geurkink@fm.ru.nl">b.geurkink@fm.ru.nl</a>	
<b>Short description</b> This workshop addresses how experiences in non-political spheres of life affect political attitudes and behavior. We welcome papers with a focus on the development of political values, behavior, and attitudes (e.g., trust, protest behavior, or populist attitudes) and/or the (relative) influence of different socializing agents (e.g., parents, schools, workplaces, or voluntary associations).	
<b>Long Abstract</b> Increasing support for populist parties, eroding political participation, and erosion of support for liberal democratic values have all been subject of concern regarding the future of democracy. While such developments are often attributed to relatively stable factors, such as level of education, less attention is paid to dynamic factors, most notably everyday life experiences that function as a form of political socialization.  Political socialization theory, how and under which circumstances individuals learn political attitudes and behavior, has offered a range of relevant socializing actors that can contribute to or counter such developments. Parents, for instance, can foster party identification and political awareness and interest, which in turn affect political preferences and participation. Schools are expected to foster political knowledge and trust. Political socialization in the workplace can either foster or hamper political participation, as well as affect worker’s political attitudes. Yet, many questions are still unanswered with regard to the role of political socialization in the development of political values, behavior, and attitudes.  We welcome papers that contribute to the understanding of how experiences in non-political spheres of live affect political values, behavior, and attitudes. Contributions can be theoretical or empirical and can be based on qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods. We are especially interested in papers that advance insight in one of the following aspects of political socialization: 1) Papers with a focus on the development of political values, behavior, and attitudes (e.g., trust, protest behavior, or populist attitudes), 2) Papers on the (relative) influence of different socializing agents (e.g., parents, schools, workplaces, or voluntary associations), 3) papers addressing the potential of political socialization mechanisms to counter, or accommodate, recent developments in contemporary societies around the world.  Next to political scientists, we encourage scholars from different academic backgrounds (e.g., sociology, psychology, economics) to provide insights that are relevant for the study of political socialization.	
<b>Language papers</b>	English
<b>Language discussions</b>	English

## 16. Technology and Politics: Agency, Effects and the International

<p><b>Chair(s)</b>          Malcolm Campbell-Verduyn (Department of International Relations and International Organization, University of Groningen)          Raluca Csernatonu (Institute for European Studies, VUB)          Marijn Hoijtink (Department of Politics and Public Administration, VU Amsterdam)</p>
<p><b>Contact person and email address</b>          Marijn Hoijtink (<a href="mailto:M.Hoijtink@vu.nl">M.Hoijtink@vu.nl</a>)</p>
<p><b>Short description (max. 50 words)</b>          This workshop extends on growing efforts to take seriously the ways in which technology is embedded in politics and constitutive of political effects. The world-making capacities of technologies and agency in socio-technical assemblages, as well as interdisciplinary dialogues between International Relations and Science and Technology Studies are considered.</p>

<p><b>Long abstract (max. 400 words)</b>          Technology, in its multiple forms, influences the shape of global politics. From ‘older’ technologies, such as railroads, to emerging ones, such as cryptocurrencies in global finance or machine-learning algorithms for lethal targeting decisions in contemporary warfare, technology has profound repercussions for how relations between states are structured, for how wars are conducted and peace is made, and for how wealth is produced and distributed.</p> <p>The study of technology and its ramifications for global politics is increasingly foregrounded in International Relations (IR), yet a serious engagement with how technology is embedded in politics and/or has political effects by means of its interaction with humans and international publics is still lacking. This is due to two broader tendencies within IR literature (Hoijtink &amp; Leese, 2019). The first is a tendency to conceptualize technology as an <i>external</i> tool that amplifies power, accelerates globalization or plays a role in the production and circulation of norms, but that is itself largely a-political. A second tendency that has prevented an analytical appreciation of technology within IR concerns the way in which agency has traditionally been conceptualized – that is, as <i>human</i> action, which is, then, more or less constrained by the social structures in which it is embedded.</p> <p>To enable a focus that takes seriously how technology is embedded in politics and constitutive of political effects, this workshop argues for further integration of Science and Technology Studies (STS) approaches into the existing theories and concepts of IR. Over the last decades, STS has done much to question the depoliticizing effects of technology, e.g. by examining the enactment of technoscientific and expert-driven knowledge, or by analyzing new forms of technological participation, contestation and resistance (e.g. Verbeek 2013). This workshop builds on these insights, as well on recent efforts by scholars in IPE (e.g. Bernards &amp; Campbell-Verduyn, 2019) and critical security studies (e.g. Bourne, Johnson, &amp; Lisle, 2015) to unpack emerging technologies and their distributed relations and political effects. We invite empirical and conceptual contributions (especially from Dutch/Flemish scholars) from across IR and STS, focusing on one or more of the following themes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Technologies and their implications as they emerge and are integrated into global politics and governance;</li> <li>(2) The world-making capacities of technologies and agency in socio-technical assemblages;</li> <li>(3) What it means – theoretically, methodologically and empirically – to foster an interdisciplinary dialogue between STS and IR and how this affects our study of politics and the international.</li> </ol> <p><b>References</b></p>
--

Bernards, N., & Campbell-Verduyn, M. (2019). Understanding technological change in global finance through infrastructures. *Review of International Political Economy*, 26(5), 773-789.

Bourne, M., Johnson, H., & Lisle, D. (2015). Laboratizing the border: The production, translation and anticipation of security technologies. *Security Dialogue*, 46(4), 307-325.

Hojtink, M., & Leese, M. (Eds.). (2019). *Technology and agency in international relations*. London: Routledge.

Verbeek, P-P. (2013) Resistance is Futile: Toward a Non-Modern Democratization of Technology. *Techné: Research in Philosophy and Technology* 17(1), 72–92.

Language papers	English
Language discussions	English