



**Maastricht University**

*Leading  
in Learning!*



NKWP

VERENIGING VOOR POLITIEKE WETENSCHAPPEN



## **Call voor Papers voor het 13<sup>de</sup> Politicologenetmaal Universiteit Maastricht 12 Juni – 13 Juni 2014**

Op donderdag 12 Juni en vrijdag 13 juni 2014 organiseren de Nederlandse Kring voor Wetenschap der Politiek (NKWP) en de Vereniging voor Politieke Wetenschappen (VPW) voor de 13<sup>de</sup> maal gezamenlijk het Politicologenetmaal. Het Etmaal wordt dit jaar georganiseerd door de afdeling Politieke Wetenschap van de Faculteit der Cultuur- en Maatschappijwetenschappen van de Universiteit Maastricht.

Het Etmaal op donderdagmiddag met een lunch en eindigt het op vrijdagmiddag na de lunch. Het Etmaal kent een plenaire bijeenkomst, met onder meer de uitreiking van de bekende prijzen, maar de klemtoon ligt op het werk in de vier parallele sessies.

Indien u een papervoorstel van maximaal één pagina wilt indienen wordt u verzocht vóór **1 maart 2014** contact op te nemen met de sessievoorzitters. Hun e-mailadressen staan vermeld in het onderstaand overzicht van de workshops. Voor **15 maart 2014** verneemt u of uw paper geselecteerd is voor de workshop. Het is ook mogelijk om aan het Etmaal deel te nemen zonder een paper te presenteren. In dat geval wordt u verzocht uw interesse in de workshop kenbaar te maken aan de workshop voorzitters.

U kunt zich registreren voor het politicologenetmaal via de website van het Etmaal <http://politicologenetmaal.nl/>. Op deze website vindt u ook meer informatie over hotels, rooster en conferentie. Gereduceerde tarieven zijn beschikbaar tot **1 Mei 2014**. U wordt geadviseerd pas te registreren nadat de workshop voorzitters u hebben geïnformeerd over de status van uw paper voorstel.

Indien u vragen heeft over het Etmaal kunt u deze sturen naar het email adres van de lokaal organiserend comite: [etmaal2014@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:etmaal2014@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

*Namens het organiserend comité van Universiteit Maastricht,*  
Christine Arnold, Arjan H. Schakel en Maarten Vink

*Namens de VPW en de NKWP,*  
Karen Celis (Vrije Universiteit Brussel) en Sarah de Lange (Universiteit van Amsterdam)



**Maastricht University**

*Leading  
in Learning!*



NKWP

VERENIGING VOOR POLITIEKE WETENSCHAPPEN



## **Call voor Papers for the 13<sup>th</sup> Politicologenetmaal Maastricht University 12 June – 13 June 2014**

On Thursday 12 June and Friday 13 June 2014, the 13<sup>th</sup> 'Politicologenetmaal' ('24-hour Political Science Conference') is jointly organized by the Political Science Associations of the Netherlands (NKWP) and Belgium (VPW) and the Department of Political Science at Maastricht University.

The conference starts on Thursday (noon) with a lunch and ends on Friday (noon) after lunch. There will be four parallel sessions, two on Thursday afternoon and two on Friday morning.

If you would like to submit a paper proposal to one of the workshops please submit a maximum of one page to the chairs of the workshop you are interested in before the **1<sup>th</sup> of March 2014**. The email addresses of the chairs of workshops are included below in the list of workshops. By the **15<sup>th</sup> of March 2014**, the workshop chairs will inform everyone who has submitted a paper proposal. It is also possible to participate in the Etmaal without presenting a paper. One of the goals of the NKWP and the VPW is to bring together scholars and practitioners. If you are interested in one of the workshops, but do not wish to submit a paper proposal, please contact the workshop chairs and inform them about your interest in the workshop.

Please make sure to register for the conference at the website <http://politicologenetmaal.nl/>. On this website you may also find information on hotels, schedule and conference venue. 'Early bird' conference rates are available until **1 May 2014**. Please register for the conference as soon as the workshop chairs have informed you about the status of your paper proposal.

If you have any questions regarding the Etmaal, you can reach the members of the local organizing committee with the following email address: [etmaal2014@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:etmaal2014@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

*On behalf of the organising committee at Universiteit Maastricht,  
Christine Arnold, Arjan H. Schakel and Maarten Vink*

*On behalf of the VPW and the NKWP,  
Karen Celis (Vrije Universiteit Brussel) and Sarah de Lange (Universiteit van Amsterdam)*

## WORKSHOPS | **ETMAAL 2014** | WORKSHOPS

### **Nederlandstalige workshops**

1. Politieke theorie (met speciale aandacht voor Nozick)
2. Uitdagingen voor het lokale bestuur in tijden van crisis
3. Tot ieders tevredenheid? Mogelijkheden en beperkingen van tevredenheidsmetingen en big data in de politiek-bestuurlijke context

### **Workshops in English**

4. Dealigned Electorates – Short-term Vote Choice Determinants
5. Nuclear Governance
6. Quality of Democracy in Europe and Beyond: Theories, Methods and Applications
7. Innovations in Parties and Beyond Parties
8. Populism and Foreign Policy
9. Power, Privilege and Disadvantage: Intersecting Gender and Diversity Studies in the Politics of (in)Equality
10. Advances in Political Psychology: Intergroup Relations and Political Behavior
11. Officials in Parliaments in the European Union: Legislative Backbone or Paper-Pushers?
12. The Quality of Elections
13. The Multilevel Governance of Migration and Integration Policies
14. Political Communication
15. What, How and Why do Parties and Politicians Decide? Innovative and Established Approaches in Political Decision-Making
16. Connecting European citizens: Ways to Strengthen the Democratic Legitimacy of the European Union
17. Protecting Labor Rights in the Global Economy
18. The (in)Tangible Influence of International Organizations



## **Workshop 2**

### **Uitdagingen voor het lokale bestuur in tijden van crisis**

#### **Voorzitters**

Herwig Reynaert    Universiteit Gent                    herwig.reynaert@ugent.be  
Peter Castenmiller    Senior-consultant PBLQ ZENC            p.castenmiller@planet.nl

Er zijn optimisten die eerste signalen menen op te vangen dat de financiële en economische crisis op z'n eind loopt. Zelfs als dat het geval is, geldt voor overheden dat alle luxe en franje eerder al eerder wegbezuinigd, nu beginnen de bezuinigingen echt pijn te doen. Gemeentebesturen worden bij uitstek met de gevolgen geconfronteerd. Gemeenten zijn immers overwegend dienstverlenende overheden die geacht worden dicht bij de mensen te staan.

Opmerkelijk is dat, met name in Nederland, de ambities met en voor het lokale bestuur fors zijn opgeschroefd. Binnen afzienbare tijd, al weet niemand precies wanneer en hoe, wordt het takenpakket van het lokale bestuur, vanwege grote decentralisaties van rijkstaken, uitgebreid. In de voorbereiding op de decentralisaties wordt gemorrelt aan de structuur en de schaal van het lokale bestuur. Als de workshop over lokale politiek zal plaatsvinden, zullen de gemeenteraadsverkiezingen in Nederland een paar maanden achter ons liggen. Raden en Colleges zijn met frisse moed aan de slag gegaan, zonder dat ze precies weten wat hen te wachten staat. Bovendien wordt er ook van alles van hen verwacht als het gaat om de 'doe-democratie' en de participatiemaatschappij. Uitdagingen te over.

Ook in Vlaanderen staan de lokale besturen, na de gemeenteraadsverkiezingen van 14 oktober 2012, voor immense uitdagingen. Van alle gemeenten wordt tegen eind 2013 een meerjarenplan verwacht voor de komende bestuursperiode. Het is nu al duidelijk dat veel gemeenten het moeilijk zullen hebben om de eindjes financieel aan elkaar te knopen. Onder meer de stijgende kosten voor de pensioenen van hun ambtenaren en de vaak geringere belastingsinkomsten omdat het economisch net iets minder goed gaat, spelen de gemeenten parten. Gevolgen blijven dan ook niet uit. Personeel dat met pensioen gaat, wordt niet vervangen. Naakte ontslagen probeert men in de mate van het mogelijke te vermijden. Voordelen van het personeel, zoals maaltijdcheques, staan op de tocht. Belastingen worden al dan niet gevoelig verhoogd. Investerings worden gekortwiek. De vraag is dan ook in welke mate de dienstverlening al dan niet achteruit zal gaan. Zal de burger m.a.w. meer moeten betalen voor minder dienstverlening?

## Workshop 3

### Tot ieders tevredenheid? Mogelijkheden en beperkingen van tevredenheidsmetingen en big data in de politiek-bestuurlijke context

#### Voorzitters

Dries Verlet	Hogeschool Gent	Dries.Verlet@dar.vlaanderen.be
Frank Bongers	Dialogic	bongers@dialogic.nl
Carl Devos	Universiteit Gent	Carl.Devos@UGent.be

Eens te meer zijn overheden op zoek naar een cijfermatige onderbouwing van hun beleid. Zowel in de context van de beleidsvoorbereiding, -uitvoering als -evaluatie beoogt men een solide onderbouwing met (wetenschappelijk) verantwoorde kennis. Dit streven kunnen we genoegzaam thuisbrengen in het zoeken naar een "evidence based policy". Vraag hierbij is welk type "evidence" dienstig kan zijn om het beleid te ondersteunen. In deze workshop hebben we vooral aandacht voor twee types van data: subjectieve data en resultaten uit de analyse van big data.

Uit eerdere edities van onze workshop op het etmaal is al gebleken dat het voor overheden verre van evident is om het eigen functioneren en de effecten die men ressorteert in de maatschappelijke omgeving nauwgezet in kaart te brengen. Hierbij zien we dat men – bij gebrek aan beter – vaak teruggrijpt naar zogenaamde subjectieve data. Als alternatief voor de zogenaamde objectieve data, zet men massaal in op data die in essentie de perceptie in kaart brengen. Hierbij denken we aan het gebruik van de mening van experts in de context van internationaal vergelijkend onderzoek of de tevredenheidsmetingen onder gebruikers van een publieke dienst. Voor zover het de bedoeling is om de perceptie te meten, zijn dergelijke tevredenheidsmetingen een valide manier om de kwaliteit van de dienstverlening op te volgen. Of het op zich kan dienen om het eigenlijke functioneren van een overheid te beoordelen is nog een ander paar mouwen. Met onze workshop willen we onder meer nagaan wat de status is van dergelijke subjectieve data in het onderbouwen van het beleid.

Paradoxaal genoeg zien we samen met de zoektocht naar data om het bestuur en beleid te ondersteunen, een explosie aan beschikbare data. In een gedigitaliseerde maatschappelijke omgeving komen we terecht in een zee van data. Deze data komen vanuit een diversiteit aan bronnen – veelal informatiesystemen die uiteenlopende processen (in verkeer, zorg, klimaat, ...) automatisch registreren, opslaan en ontsluiten – en leveren een massale hoeveelheid aan ongestructureerde data op en laten zich enkel gewillig samenvatten in het buzzword big data. Pompen of verzuipen is de boodschap. Door middel van data mining kan men de mogelijkheden van dergelijke data optimaal benutten. Vraag is hoe overheden deze uitdagingen kunnen aanpakken en aanwenden als een opportuniteit ten einde te komen tot een meer evidence based beleid.

Dit brengt ons tot een aantal uitgangsvragen voor een nieuwe editie van de workshop: Wat is de rol van perceptie-data in het opvolgen van het overheidsfunctioneren? In welke mate dienen er zich mogelijkheden en uitdagingen aan dankzij data mining van big data? In welke mate heeft dit een invloed op hoe een overheid zich dient te organiseren? We willen (praktijk)politicalogen en hun beschouwingen/ervaringen inzake tevredenheidsmetingen en big data samenbrengen om deze thema's verder uit te spitten. Bijzondere aandacht gaat er naar de methodologische aanpak en de doorwerking van de meetinstrumenten. We richten ons hiermee vooral op (praktijk)politicalogen, bestuurskundigen en beleidswetenschappers in Nederland en Vlaanderen.

## **Workshop 4**

### **Dealigned Electorates – Short-term Vote Choice Determinants**

#### **Chairs**

Ruth Dassonneville University of Leuven Ruth.Dassonneville@soc.kuleuven.be  
Joost van Spanje University of Amsterdam j.h.p.vanspanje@uva.nl

Across advanced industrial democracies, scholars have noted a decline of parties. The decay of strong linkages between parties and citizens, or dealignment, can be observed with regard to a number of aspects of political behaviour; turnout levels are in decline, party membership figures are decreasing, volatility is increasing and voters' decision what party to vote for has shifted closer to Election Day (Dalton, McAllister & Wattenberg, 2000).

These changes provide a challenge for theories explaining voting behaviour. Thinking in terms of a 'funnel of causality' towards the vote, for example, the changes observed can be considered to have strongly increased the impact of factors situated by the end of the funnel. Long-term loyalties and cleavages have been found to become less important for vote choices (Dalton, McAllister & Wattenberg, 2000; Franklin, Mackie & Valen, 2009) and « more voters now make their electoral choices based on the campaign issues and candidates » (Dalton, McAllister & Wattenberg, 2000 : 60).

Scholars have already investigated what percentage of the electorate decides late (Blais, 2004), what voters are most prone to decide late (Schmitt-Beck & Partheymuller, 2012) and what is causing a shift towards the short-term in electorates (Walczak, van der Brug & De Vries, 2012). What is still somewhat unclear, however, is what short-short term determinants are gaining weight in the vote choice process. Do we observe an increase of patterns of retrospective voting, implying that the democratic ideal of deliberative electorates is approaching ? Or are dealigned voters guided mostly by party leaders and demagogic appeals, providing more opportunities for populism in the party system?

In this panel we aim at bringing together scholars working on the issue of changes in voting behaviour and on the impact of short-term vote choice determinants. We welcome casestudies focusing on single countries or single elections as well as comparative papers. Furthermore, both papers with a strong focus on theory as well as empirical studies and research based on experiments can be submitted.

## Workshop 5

### Nuclear Governance

#### Chairs

Tom Sauer	University of Antwerp	tom.sauer@uantwerpen.be
Biejan Poor Toulabi	VU University Amsterdam	b.poortoulabi@vu.nl
Niels van Willigen	Leiden University	Willigen@FSW.leidenuniv.nl

Whether we like it or not, the world that we live in is a world with nuclear weapons. Their use, even in small quantities, would endanger the survival of the planet. After the Cold War, the likelihood that nuclear weapons are used on a massive scale diminished, but the likelihood of accidental use of the remaining 17,000 warheads went up. The spread of nuclear weapons to more countries, including states with unstable political regimes (like Pakistan) and autocracies (like North Korea), and possibly to non-governmental actors (terrorists), further enhances the risk of use. That risk is also increased by the modernization of nuclear weapons by nuclear weapons states, which lowers the threshold to actually use them.

It is generally recognised that the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)(1968), the cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament regime, has to a certain extent succeeded in preventing proliferation. But inherent weaknesses of the Treaty make that the international regime is currently under severe pressure. This pressure does not only result from non-nuclear weapon states that are thought to be cheating (like North Korea and Iran), but also from non-nuclear weapon states that strongly believe that the nuclear weapon states renege on their treaty obligations, in particular with respect to nuclear disarmament (article 6). This is further exacerbated attempts from the industrialized world to restrict access to civilian nuclear knowledge, going beyond the restrictions of the NPT. The overall result is a growing uneasiness on behalf of many non-nuclear weapon states, including emerging powers (like Brazil, South Africa, Turkey, and Egypt), with the current international nuclear regime.

Consequently, there is a growing demand to ban nuclear weapons, just like chemical and biological weapons, and landmines and cluster munitions have been outlawed. This is amongst others illustrated by the call for 'global zero' in January 2007 by four former US politicians (Henry Kissinger, William Perry, George Schulz, and Sam Nunn) and the subsequent attempt by US President Barack Obama to place this on the international agenda. Another illustration is the renewed interest in the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. The latter resulted on its turn in an upsurge of interest by (global) civil society – in the form of global NGO's like Global Zero and ICAN – to abolish nuclear weapons. The nuclear weapon states however call this new track (outside the NPT framework) a 'distraction'. Their defensive reaction further enlarges the gap between the nuclear haves and have nots.

This section aims to describe, understand, and explain past and current trends in nuclear governance in the broadest sense: nuclear weapons policies, nuclear arms control and disarmament, nuclear (non)proliferation, and nuclear safety and security. These themes may be addressed from a variety of perspectives, including a nation state, a regional (NATO, EU) or global perspective. Moreover, papers may focus either on the policies themselves or on the politics behind the policies (such as decision-making). Also, papers are invited which address specific case studies, such as the cases of North-Korea and Iran, or historical cases such as the Cuban missile crisis and the nuclear weaponization of India and Pakistan. There is space for policy-oriented papers and concept and/or theory driven papers, using a variety of research designs and methodologies (quantitative and qualitative). The language used in this section will be English.

## Workshop 6

### Quality of Democracy in Europe and Beyond: Theories, Methods and Applications

#### Chairs

Eliyahu V. Sapir	Maastricht University	e.sapir@maastrichtuniversity.nl
Niels Matheve	University of Leuven	niels.matheve@soc.kuleuven.be
Gert-Jan Put	University of Leuven	gertjan.put@soc.kuleuven.be

Since the surge of the third wave of democracy, and especially since the collapse of the USSR in the 1990s, democracy has spread and taken root in the majority of the world's countries. Notwithstanding that the processes of democratization has made more people worldwide governed by elected representatives than ever before, there are striking differences in the practices of democracies. Consequently, many observers were made disillusioned with democracy and have shifted their scholarly attention from explaining why transitions to democracy happen, to evaluating and explaining what makes for the differences in the characters of different democratic regimes. Many scholars nowadays are considering democracy both as an end in itself, as well as an important means to represent the interests of individuals and collectives in society. Furthermore, high-quality democracy is expected to facilitate other ends, such as economic development, greater protection of human rights, poverty reduction, and more.

Naturally, there is much room for debate when it comes to assessing the quality of democracy. Some of the controversy is around our ability to provide theoretically unequivocal criteria to assess democracy's quality. Based on which criteria can we say just what makes a democratic regime one of "high-quality"? Moreover, some key methodological questions arise when discussing the quality of democracy. First and foremost, is it even possible to develop a universal conception of democratic quality, and are there available reliable comparative methods to allow us to implement and enhance citizens' audit of democracy, and their representation in it?

Many scholars have focused on studying the quality of democracy by understanding how well are citizens' voices, opinions and perspectives represented in the public policy making processes. This line of investigation addresses the representation of individuals and social groups in the local level, and geographical representation in the local, national and trans-national levels. Notably, the debate about the representation of citizens' interests is, in many cases, not confined to academic debate, but also has substantive impact on party activity and the formation of party lists.

In this session, we aim at disentangling the concepts of quality of democracy and political representation, by evaluating substantive and procedural concepts developed with the aim of measuring the "quality" of consolidated democracies, and assessing the quality of political representation in Europe and beyond. To achieve

that, we will address salient regime characteristics discussed in the literature as useful meters to understand democracy's quality. Amongst these, will be included the rule of law, participation, competition, vertical and horizontal accountability, freedom, equality, political responsiveness, as well as more practical steps taken to ensure adequate political representation. We will further investigate the usefulness of these criteria in assessing the quality of democracy comparatively.

We would welcome theoretical, empirical and methodological papers. Theoretical papers should present fresh approaches or synthesize existing literature. Empirical papers should be theory-guided and advance understanding by providing detailed evidence. Methodological papers should critically examine existing techniques or develop new ones. The workshop hopes to see a spectrum of data and research designs (qualitative / quantitative, and single case studies / large-N analyses).

## **Workshop 7**

### **Innovations in Parties and Beyond Parties**

#### **Chairs**

Bram Wauters

Ghent University

bram.wauters@ugent.be

Emilie van Haute

University of Brussels

evhaute@ulb.ac.be

Joop van Holsteyn

Leiden University

holsteyn@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

It is not for the first time in history, but representative democracy is considered to be in crisis in Western political systems. One of the actors that are held accountable for this alleged crisis are political parties. They are generally portrayed as being in decline and this impacts directly on the health of representative democracy as we know it since the beginning of the twentieth century. This decline is illustrated by, among other things, low and decreasing levels of trust in parties and decreasing numbers of party members in most if not all advanced Western democracies (e.g., van Biezen et al, 2012). As parties are (still) performing crucial functions for a representative system (e.g., linkage function, interest articulation, recruitment and selection of political elites), their decline could have potentially far-reaching consequences (Dalton, Farrell & McAllister 2013).

In order to remedy this negative trend, several political parties have made efforts to revitalize and 'reinvent' themselves by reforming their party organization: for instance, they experiment with interactive means of communication, they introduce participatory instruments in order to give party members (and even non-members!) a greater say in the internal working of the party, they open up their candidate lists to non-members, they pay more attention to the representation of diversity within the party, etc. (Hazan & Rahat 2010; Cross & Blais 2012; Cross & Katz 2013)

In parallel, governing parties seem to have increasingly taken action to provide citizens with alternative mechanisms for a more direct say in political decision-making, such as referenda, electoral system reforms, deliberative democracy experiments, and direct local citizen participation (Dryzek 2000; Smith 2009; Renwick & Pilet 2011; Caluwaerts 2012). By doing so, parties put themselves in a paradoxical situation where they adopt measures that may reduce their powerful position in the political process (Scarrow 1999).

In this workshop we invite papers dealing with one or more of these topics. Analyses of democratic innovations both in parties and beyond parties are welcome. The analyses could deal with the occurrence (both formal and in practice), the causes and/or the consequences of these innovations. Papers can be written in English or Dutch. Presentations and discussions will be held in English when non-Dutch speaking researchers attend the workshop.

## **Workshop 8**

### **Populism and Foreign Policy**

#### **Chairs**

Andrej Zaslove	Radboud University Nijmegen	a.zaslove@fmr.u.nl
Bertjan Verbeek	Radboud University Nijmegen	b.verbeek@fm.ru.nl

Political scientists argue that Europe is currently in the midst of a populist Zeitgeist (e.g., Mudde 2004). These observations are relevant, however, beyond Europe and could be expanded to a host of countries within the industrialized and industrializing world. However, the study of populism, to date, has been mainly confined to comparative politics, in particular populist parties, and its impact on domestic politics. International Relations (IR) scholars, even in the subfield of Foreign Policy Analysis, paid only scant attention to the role of populism in explaining state behavior in world politics.

This relative disregard for the role of contemporary populism in foreign policy is remarkable because in the past the IR discipline offered ample inroads into the subject (through notions like jingoism, irredentism, and nationalism) which have not been taken up by populism scholars. It thus seems timely to connect IR scholarship with the current scholarship on populism from Comparative Politics. At the same time, it is important to trace the intellectual roots of populist foreign policy in political theory. This political-theoretical basis has so far been absent in most debates on foreign policy. This panel seeks to address this lacuna by (1) tracing the intellectual roots of populism in foreign policy; (2) examining the link between populism, populist parties, and movements and foreign policy; (3) discussing the permanent battle for defining the 'correct notion of one's past foreign policy as resembling the true nature of one's nation'; and (4) acknowledging the blurred distinction between left wing and right politics and its impact on the possibilities for populism.

We welcome contributions on different actors (such as movements, parties, and individual leaders) and different countries and encourage papers from different disciplines, including history, sociology, comparative politics, political theory and international relations.

## Workshop 9

### **Power, Privilege and Disadvantage: Intersecting Gender and Diversity Studies in the Politics of (in)Equality**

#### **Chairs**

Severs, Eline	University of Brussels	eline.severs@vub.ac.be
van der Haar, Marleen	Radboud University Nijmegen	m.vanderhaar@fm.ru.nl

The intersectionality paradigm has been crucial in bringing together research on 'gender' and 'diversity'. The understanding that social world privileges and disadvantages – such as those based on gender, ethnicity/'race' and class – do not exist independently of each other but are intertwined and mutually reinforcing has indicated the shortcomings of studying single markers of inequality (cf. Crenshaw 1989; Collins 1990). The notion of 'complex inequality' (cf. Jordan-Zachery 2007) has resulted in a variety of studies based on multiple research traditions: While large N studies have mainly set out to research how intersectional systems of power – such as, for instance, patriarchy, racism, heteronormativity, and 'able-ism' – affect the lives of sets of people differently (cf. McCall 2005; Choo and Ferree 2010), case studies have researched individuals' intersectional self-identifications and complex resistance-building strategies (cf. Prins 2005; Severs et al. 2013).

Building from these studies, this panel aims to further critical exchanges between 'gender' and 'diversity' scholars. By investigating the complexities of social relations of power, privilege, and subordination, we aim to further our understanding of social inequalities, and the processes and institutions through which these are maintained, challenged or otherwise affected. We welcome studies that investigate processes of differentiation (such as, 'gendering'), systems of domination (such as patriarchy, heteronormativity, racism), or individuals' reactions against such processes and systems (such as, 'resistance-building' strategies). We equally welcome papers that research the politics of (in)equality, for example via investigating its framing in policies and politics. In addition, we aim to stimulate methodological reflections (e.g.: 'how can intersectional inequalities be studied?'; 'how to generalise on the basis of individuals' experiences?'; etc.), and innovative theorising (e.g., on the relation between systems of domination).

This panel welcomes paper contributions that 1) present empirical findings on inequality, 2) theorise on inequalities and their relation to power and politics at large, or 3) address analytic concerns related to studying social positionings and their implications for in- and exclusion. The working language of the panel is English. Papers may be written in Dutch or English.

## **Workshop 10**

### **Advances in Political Psychology: Intergroup Relations and Political Behavior**

#### **Chairs**

Cecil Meeusen	University of Leuven	Cecil.Meeusen@soc.kuleuven.be
Jolanda van der Noll	University of Leuven	Jolanda.vandernoll@uclouvain.be
Michael F. Meffert	Leiden University	m.f.meffert@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

Political psychology is an intriguing field that draws on the interrelationship between psychological and political processes to analyze the attitudes, norms, values, identities and behavior of individuals within a specific political and social system. Political psychology provides sharp insights into contemporary political and social problems, by analyzing, for example, how political grievances are transformed into collective action (e.g. Arab Spring), how individuals and state actors react to terrorism, why right-wing extremist parties attract a large share of (mainly low educated) voters, how political messages affect the decision making and behavior of citizens, and how parents influence the political thinking of their children.

One of the most important challenges for contemporary Western societies is by no doubt the increasing ethnic, cultural and religious diversity and the socio-political conflicts on issues such as the integration of minorities and the formation and demarcation of group identities. The social environment can have both integrative and destructive effects on the quality of diversity-induced intergroup relations. On the one hand, diversity enhances economic and cultural competition between groups and can lead to stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination. On the other hand, diversity can stimulate contact and interaction opportunities between ethnically, culturally and religiously different groups, which have generally been found to improve intergroup relations.

The study of intergroup relations remains one of the most important tasks for political psychologists as they address fundamental issues such as discrimination, group-based political behavior, voting behavior, prejudiced political socialization, societal well-being, and specific types of political communication.

In this session, we invite papers that study the causes (e.g. segregation, political socialization, civic education, personality traits, political messages and campaigns...) and consequences (both attitudinal and behavioral; e.g., stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination) of diversity and intergroup relations in contemporary Western societies. We also welcome papers that take a comparative quantitative or qualitative approach on this topic (widely defined). The language of the session is English, but papers may also be written in Dutch.

## **Workshop 11**

### **Officials in Parliaments in the European Union: Legislative Backbone or Paper-Pushers?**

#### **Chairs**

Peter Bursens	University of Antwerp	peter.bursens@uantwerpen.be
Anna-Lena Hoegenauer	Maastricht University	al.hoegenauer@maastrichtuniversity.nl
Christine Neuhold	Maastricht University	c.neuhold@maastrichtuniversity.nl
Inger Baller	University of Antwerp	inger.baller@uantwerpen.be

Bureaucratic politics have increasingly moved to the fore in the literature on the European institutions, with a number of academics analyzing the Commission bureaucracy and the role of comitology. However, the focus on executive politics has so far largely eclipsed the role of bureaucracy in parliaments. The narrow literature on the European Parliament is rarely linked to the wider question of bureaucratic politics in the EU. At the same time, the literature on the Europeanization of domestic institutions has focused mostly on ministerial bureaucracies, rather than the administrations of national parliaments.

As the US literature on parliamentary administrations and the emergent literature on European parliaments shows that administrators are also not just mere “paper-pushers”, this session aims to provide the link between the literatures on EU bureaucracy and the nascent literature on European parliamentary bureaucracies. For this purpose, the session is taking a comprehensive approach that brings together theoretical conceptualization with strong empirical research on executive and parliamentary bureaucratic actors at different levels of EU policy-making.

## Workshop 12

### The Quality of Elections

#### Chairs

Hans Schmeets

Maastricht University

h.schmeets@cbs.nl

Max Bader

Leiden University

m.bader@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Carolien van Ham

Twente University

c.t.vanham@utwente.nl

There has been growing interest in the issue of election quality in recent years. Election quality can be seen as encompassing two distinct dimensions. First, electoral integrity refers to the whether there is open, genuine competition, and to the absence of both pre-election and election-day manipulation of the vote. Second, administrative quality refers to whether the electoral process is conducted in line with a certain set of widely agreed upon (international) standards. The issue of election quality is pertinent both to democracies and non-democracies. While there is generally little doubt about the integrity of the electoral process in liberal democracies, the administrative quality of elections in those countries often leaves much to be desired. In elections in non-democracies, by contrast, the lack of electoral integrity is a matter of concern.

There are different ways of assessing the quality of elections. Election quality can be viewed in terms of the extent of compliance with domestic legislation and/or international standards for elections. Second, the perceptions of specific domestic groups or the population at large can be seen as indicative of the quality of an election. Third, a measure of election quality can be established through a survey of impartial experts. And finally, electoral returns can be studied quantitatively to check for patterns that diverge from what would be expected in a manipulation-free election ('election forensics').

This session is interested in the issue of election quality with regard to both its dimensions (electoral integrity and administrative quality) and with regard to both democracies and non-democracies. Questions that the session intends to address include, but are not limited to:

- 1) How can we measure election quality? How valid and reliable are existing measures of election integrity based on election observation reports, expert and citizen surveys, and fraud forensics? How can existing data be leveraged to enhance our understanding of election quality?
- 2) What explains variation in election integrity? What are the causal mechanisms explaining changes over time in election integrity and differences between countries? Are explanations different in democracies and non-democracies?
- 3) What is the role of (domestic and international) election observation in assessing, and improving the quality of elections? What is the role of domestic and international actors in promoting electoral reform? How can new voting technologies help to improve election quality?

## **Workshop 13**

### **The Multilevel Governance of Migration and Integration Policies**

#### **Chairs**

Ilke Adam	University of Brussels	ilke.adam@vub.ac.be
Peter Scholten	Erasmus University Rotterdam	p.scholten@fsw.eur.nl

One out of several governance challenges to migration and integration policies is the fragmentation of these policies over various levels of government. Competencies that were originally located primarily at the national level have increasingly shifted upwards (EU) as well as downwards toward local and regional authorities. This makes these domains into exemplary cases for a broader development of multi-level governance, which has been drawing a growing interest in political sciences and policy studies. This involves studies of Europeanization of policies (top-down) as well as other forms of vertical interaction such as 'vertical venue-shopping' (bottom-up). These studies show the relevance of multi-level governance processes in this area in particular, but also show the governance dilemmas and consequences of failure to establish such multi-level governance processes.

The communitarisation of EU migration and anti-discrimination policies by the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) and the introduction of Community law and policies since the early 2000s represent a major turning point in the politics of migration and integration in Europe. The consequences of this communitarization are only gradually becoming apparent, primarily in the field of migration and anti-discrimination but to some extent also migrant integration policies. Beyond Europeanization, scholarly attention is increasingly drawn to the local and regional dimension of migration and integration and the interaction between these sub-state levels with the state and Europe. Cities throughout Europe have developed their own migrant integration policies and their own pan-european networks of policy learning. Regional authorities have developed immigrant integration and anti-discrimination policies that clearly differ from the state discourse. This is also reflected in a growing academic interest for the urban dimension of migrant integration policies in particular; some even speak of a local turn in migration studies.

This panel starts from the proposition that migration and integration policies are shaped in interactions between policy actors at the local, regional, national and European level. Contributions are invited that focus on the interaction between the local, regional, national, European and international levels (the vertical dimension). We welcome papers that explore these vertical interactions from a theoretical or empirical perspective, as well as comparative studies of whether there is a specifically European, national, regional or local dimension of migration and immigrant integration policymaking (the horizontal dimension).

## Workshop 14

### Political Communication

#### Chairs

Rens Vliegenthart

University of Amsterdam

r.vliegenthart@uva.nl

Kristof Jacobs

Radboud University Nijmegen

k.jacobs@fm.ru.nl

The field of political communication research is rapidly expanding. Driven by technological innovations new methods are being developed and used, new topics emerge and conventional wisdom regarding old ones is re-evaluated. It is therefore time to take stock of the latest developments in the Flemish and Dutch research on

Political Communication. Topics that may be included are for instance: The influence of media on politics. Agenda-setting and agenda-building are topics that have long been part of the political communication research agenda. Rather than focussing on the influence of the media on politics in general, scholars have recently stressed the contingent impact of media on elements of politics (Walgrave and Van Aelst, 2006; Vliegenthart and Walgrave, 2011). Papers on this contingent impact of media on politics are highly welcomed.

Campaigning. 2014 will be a year of multiple elections both in Belgium and the Netherlands. We welcome papers on the electoral campaigns at the local, provincial, national or European level. Topics that can be thought of are the effects of negative campaigning in multiparty settings such as Belgium and the Netherlands or the impact of the digitalization of campaigning (Spierings and Jacobs, Forthcoming). Both topics provide fruitful research venues.

The personalization of politics. Another classic in the study of political communication is the personalization of politics. Recent research has distinguished between individualization, which can be general or concentrated on party leaders, and privatization, which can focus on personal characteristics of politicians or their personal life (cf. Van Aelst, Shaefer and Stanyer, 2012). Such distinctions could change the verdict by e.g. Karvonen (2012) who found that the evidence of the existence of personalization was at best mixed.

Mediatization. The omnipresence of media in everyday politics is a central concern to many political communication scholars (Strömbäck, 2008). Mediatization refers to four related processes: (1) news media have become the most important source of information and channel of communication between citizens and political actors; (2) the large degree of independence of the media vis-à-vis political institutions; (3) the extent to which media content is determined independently by the media's own news values and by their need to attract a large audience; (4) the extent to which political actors adjust their perceptions and behavior to the news media logic rather than political logic. Recent work has called for more rigid empirical work on those topics (Esser and Strömbäck, forthcoming).

## Workshop 15

### **What, How and Why do Parties and Politicians Decide? Innovative and Established Approaches in Political Decision-Making**

#### **Chairs**

Jona Linde	VU University Amsterdam	j.linde@vu.nl
Yves Dejaeghere	University of Antwerp	Yves.Dejaeghere@uantwerpen.be
Barbara Vis	VU University Amsterdam	b.vis@vu.nl

The way in which politicians, including party leaders, take decisions on specific issues and make strategic choices has received increasing attention in recent years. This growing literature has provided many illuminating results. For example, it has established that a party's policy position is often changed in response to changes in public opinion. Nevertheless, open puzzles remain. For instance, due to inconclusive findings we do not know whether, and if so when, party leaders respond to changes in the strategies of rival parties. A more thorough theoretical and empirical understanding of when party decision makers are willing to take the electorally risky decision to change their party's position, or to introduce a new issue will likely help to resolve this and related puzzles. In a similar way, thirty years after Kingdon's ground-breaking study on decision-making by congressmen in the US, there is still much to be learned about the decision making process that guides elected politicians in proposing and supporting specific policy measures and not others.

This workshop offers a venue to discuss new approaches to studying political decision-making, as well as novel applications of old approaches, to advance theory building and testing. We see at least three research directions on which contributions to the workshop could focus, but contributions are not limited to these alone. First, to open the black box that is the party to understand the behavior of decision makers within the party and their interactions, for example by looking at intra-party decision-making. A second, related, direction would be to examine the behavior of individual politicians more closely. Do politicians behave in line with the rational choice, expected utility models typically applied in this field? Or do we need to turn to other models of decision-making, such as prospect theory, to understand their decision-making behavior? A third direction for improved theorizing we see is to (further) connect the literature on agenda-setting and that on political decision-making.

The workshop is open to all methodological approaches. However, we especially welcome papers that (also) apply original methodologies, for instance using an approach that is uncommon in the field (such as an experimental design, or a Qualitative Comparative Analysis).

## **Workshop 16**

### **Connecting European Citizens: Ways to Strengthen the Democratic Legitimacy of the European Union**

#### **Chairs**

Soetkin Verhaegen University of Leuven soetkin.verhaegen@soc.kuleuven.be  
Kris Grimonprez University of Luxembourg

During the past few decades, a growing amount of attention has been paid to the disconnectedness of the European citizen. Citizens tend to feel alienated from the institutions of the European Union and from the European community of citizens. This problem is often referred to as the limited democratic legitimacy of the EU. The disconnection is reflected in the behavior and attitudes of citizens, such as low voter turnout during EP elections, increasing distrust in the EU institutions, expressions of Euroscepticism and reluctance to measures of solidarity within the EU.

To address these concerns about the democratic legitimacy of the EU, the concept of European citizenship has been studied in different ways. One approach is to refer to EU citizenship as a fundamental status when borders are crossed, and triggering rights referred to in the Treaties. Although the importance of EU citizenship is growing, foundations appear to be weak. Scholars ask for research beyond the rights based approach. Consequently, a shift has been made in EU studies turning from the institutions to the citizens. The affective dimension of European citizenship has come to the front and has been mainly studied by research on European identity. It has been noted that citizens need to feel attached to the political community they are part of in order to perceive its policy output as legitimate.

To come to a better understanding of this relatively weak connection between European citizens and the European political community, we invite reflections and/or empirical tests on the following issues: First, conceptually, we should think about how to define citizenship in the EU from a multi-level perspective, embracing national and European dimensions. How do its political, social and legal dimensions interact? Second, we should address which factors influence the connection of the European citizen to the European political community and which actors are at play. For instance, how can a feeling of belonging to the EU be developed? What is the role of citizenship education? Which role do media play? How to see the role of the European Court of Justice in the framing of the concept of European citizenship? Should we expect that the development of a European public sphere will lead to political accountability or do we expect that the political institutions will be better at strengthening the connection with the citizen?

As European citizenship is a co-creation of multiple actors, we invite scholars from multiple disciplines (such as political science and legal science) to get into dialogue and debate. The connection of European citizens in a European political community is crucial for the future of Europe. Linking several perspectives will enrich and deepen insight in the role of citizens in the European Union.

## **Workshop 17**

### **Labor and Environmental Governance in the Global Economy**

#### **Chairs**

Axel Marx	Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies axel.marx@ggs.kuleuven.be
Laura Beke	Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies laura.beke@ggs.kuleuven.be
Lore Van den Putte	Ghent University lore.vandenputte@ugent.be

In recent years labor rights and environmental standards have been integrated in global economic governance tools to an unprecedented extent. The topicality of climate change and the public outrage caused by the collapse of a textile factory in Bangladesh in April, resulting in more than 1,000 casualties, have only added to their increased importance. This panel therefore aims to assess recent public and private initiatives that aim to protect labor and environmental standards internationally. The panel invites papers which focus on assessing the effectiveness of transnational public and private policy initiatives.

Papers can address several dimensions of the nexus between global economic development and the protection of labor rights and/or environmental standards including (1) the inter-linkages between trade, investment, labor rights and/or environmental standards, thereby paying attention to the incentives that drive the decision-making process of the actors involved in international trade and investment; (2) the governance of labor rights and/or environmental standards integrated throughout the supply chain; (3) the role of public actors (national, regional and global) and (inter-)governmental standards in promoting and protecting labor rights and the environment; and (4) the potential and limitations of private actors and their increasingly diverse initiatives aimed at the protection of labor rights and the environment. Authors can focus either on labor rights or on environmental standards, or seek to consolidate an analysis of both cases in their research. The panel welcomes both theoretical and empirical perspectives, and will be held in English.

## **Workshop 18**

### **The (in)Tangible Influence of International Organizations**

#### **Chairs**

Dirk De Bièvre      University of Antwerp      dirk.debievre@uantwerpen.be  
Elissaveta Radulova      Maastricht University      e.radulova@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Contemporary global governance witnesses the proliferation of international organizations (IOs) and their prominent input in the processes of national, regional and global policy-making. While the emergence and the processes of decision-making in IOs are relatively well researched and theorized, the influence of IOs' decisions on the national level of policy-making is a more recent subject of academic interest. IOs influence is conceptualized differently. On the one hand, IOs are seen as an arena where national actors meet and exchange views and ideas, or bargain according to their interests. From this perspective the main role of the IO is to facilitate these interactions and assure platform for negotiation or ideational exchange. On the other hand, IOs are seen as actors, which go far beyond sheer facilitation and mediation. From this perspective, IOs can form and follow own agenda, and can actively aim to steer the processes of international exchange, and the respective domestic implications.

This workshop adopts the analytical lens of the second perspective outlined above and invites contributions that analyse conceptually, theoretically and/or empirically the (in)tangible influences of the processes of policy-making at the international level. Paper-givers are invited to discuss the internationalization of policy-making, the role of international organizations (IOs) therein, and particularly the way the latter shape the domestic policy-making processes. There are 3 main research questions that we would like to address:

- (1) How and to what degree do IOs affect the domestic policy-making processes?
- (2) What are the appropriate conceptual and analytical strategies to study the influence of IOs on the domestic policy-making processes?
- (3) What are the implications of the emerging multi-layered structure of policy-making?

We welcome participants who are working within comparative and international political economy broadly defined, including on public policy analysis, regulatory studies, and rationalist, institutionalist and constructivist perspectives. We are looking forward to case-based or medium/large-n studies of different organizations (EU, OECD, UN, WTO, NATO, etc.) and from various policy fields. Theoretical/conceptual, methodological and empirical contributions are welcome.