

## ACADEMIC PROGRAMME

The European Consortium for Political Research was formed in 1970 by representatives of 8 political science institutions in Europe. The membership has now grown to nearly 350 universities, research and teaching institutions in Europe and associate members elsewhere. The Joint Sessions of Workshops have been referred to as the 'jewel in the crown' of the ECPR and are recognised as one of the main highlights of the world's political science calendar. The Joint Sessions have taken place annually in the spring since 1973.

The main aim of the Joint Sessions of Workshops is the participation and equality of endeavour between advanced students, younger and newer members of the profession and well-established professors. In order to achieve this, the size of each workshop is strictly limited. Each participant is expected to be carrying out research in the field of the workshop, so that he or she can present a paper or research document for discussion, as well as take part in the discussion of the other papers presented. Participants may attend only one workshop and should stay for the duration of the Joint Sessions.

Further details about the 2012 ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops can be found on our new website. The full details of all accepted workshops are available, along with the facility to propose papers. The new website is still very much in its infancy, and under ongoing construction. It may take a little time before all areas are fully functional, so please be patient. Please access the new site via

[http://new.ecprnet.eu/Joint%20Sessions/2012\\_Antwerp/Default.aspx](http://new.ecprnet.eu/Joint%20Sessions/2012_Antwerp/Default.aspx)

it will open in a new browser at the relevant page for the 2012 Joint Sessions of Workshops. To view the details of an individual workshop, or propose a paper please hover over the 'Antwerp 2012' menu, and click on Workshops – which will take you to a list of Workshops - or Propose a Paper – this will take you to a form where you should complete ALL fields. Please make sure your institutional and personal details are correct. Should you have any queries, please contact Marcia Taylor at ECPR Central Services ([mltaylor@essex.ac.uk](mailto:mltaylor@essex.ac.uk)).

Participants are expected to contribute fully to one workshop for the whole period of the Joint Sessions. They should not, therefore, apply to more than one workshop.

Deadline for applications: 1 December 2011

**Venue:** The Joint Sessions of Workshops in 2012 will be hosted by the University of Antwerp in Belgium. All conference facilities (registration, book exhibition, information desk) and most of the Workshops will take place in the A, B C, D and E buildings on the City campus of the university. The entrance for these interconnecting buildings is on the corner of Grote Kauwenberg and Vekestraat, 2000 Antwerpen. Other Workshops will take place in the R building, which is two minutes walking from the main conference building, and the address of this is: Lange Winkelstraat 9, 2000 Antwerpen.

**Timetable:** Participants should arrive and register on Tuesday, 10 April, after 1500. Workshops will begin on Wednesday, 11 April at 0900 and will end on Sunday, 15 April at 1300.

**Social Programme:** The (provisional) social programme includes a reception during registration on Tuesday 10 April, followed by a dinner for Workshop Directors and others involved in the organisation of the Joint Sessions. The Stein Rokkan Lecture will take place on Thursday 12 April and this will be followed by the main reception hosted by the University. There will be a free afternoon for excursions on Friday 13 April. Participants can join one of the free guided walking tours through the city and have free access to all museums of Antwerp upon presentation of their conference badge. Other possible excursions will be announced at <http://www.ua.ac.be/ecpr> (-'programme' -> 'social programme')

**Accommodation & Excursions:** For more information on accommodation, please see: <http://www.ua.ac.be/ecpr> ('accommodation'). A list of hotels will be published with special rates for participants. When making your reservation, just mention the reservation code "ECPRJS2012".

**Transportation:** The airport is located at about 45 kilometres from the centre of Antwerp. The most convenient way to reach Antwerp is by taking the SN Brussels Airlines Express Bus, a direct coach service from the airport to the centre of Antwerp (De Keyserlei – Antwerp Central Station). The bus runs every hour from 5 am to 12 midnight (on Sundays from 7 am to 12 midnight) and reaches the centre of Antwerp in approximately 45 min. A ticket costs €10 and can be bought in cash on the bus. The bus station is located on the ground floor below the arrival hall in the airport terminal. You can find more information at: <http://www.airportexpress.be/>. You can also take the train to Antwerp at the underground train station at the airport. There are 4 trains an hour to Antwerp during the day. You can find the timetables at <http://www.b-rail.be/E/index.html>. The journey takes approximately 1 hour (you have to change at "Brussel-Noord" station) and costs €9,50.

Antwerp Central Station is situated in the heart of the centre, at about 10 minutes walking distance from the City campus.

For all logistic information, please visit the website ([www.ua.ac.be/ecpr](http://www.ua.ac.be/ecpr) -> 'travelling').

**Finance and Conference Fees:** Where no other source of finance is available, the ECPR has a grant which those from ECPR full member institutions can apply for, subject to meeting specified criteria. Please see the ECPR website for full details, under the heading of Funding. Unfortunately, it is not possible to extend funding to non-ECPR member participants who will be required to pay a conference fee of £300 in advance.

Further information: A more detailed outline of each workshop is available on the ECPR website together with a day-by-day programme of events at [http://www.ecprnet.eu/joint\\_sessions/antwerp](http://www.ecprnet.eu/joint_sessions/antwerp)

For other information on the conference please see: [www.ua.ac.be/ecpr](http://www.ua.ac.be/ecpr)

## WORKSHOPS

### 1. Policy Feedback, Political Behaviour, and Democratic Citizenship in European Welfare States

#### Directors:

Staffan Kumlin (University of Gothenburg) e: [staffan.kumlin@pol.gu.se](mailto:staffan.kumlin@pol.gu.se)

Isabelle Stadelmann-Steffen (University of Bern) e: [isabelle.stadelmann@ipw.unibe.ch](mailto:isabelle.stadelmann@ipw.unibe.ch)

In democracies, citizens' attitudes and behaviour should influence future public policies. But the reverse may be just as true: attitudes and behaviour are also results of previous policies. This idea of policy feedback can be traced through the history of political science. But it has been slow to reach the mainstream of empirical political behaviour research. In the last decade, however, feedback hypotheses have increasingly been tested in studies on political trust, participation, social policy attitudes, social capital, and civil society participation. Collectively they suggest that political behaviour and democratic citizenship not only function as exogenous democratic input but are (re)shaped by policies. Many studies concern the welfare and social policy domain. In Europe, this is because many countries experience difficulties in delivering on previous commitments to public services and income replacement systems. Similarly, labour market policies and incentive structures are changing. Thus, a broad ambition for the workshop is examining how the restructuring of European welfare states affect political behaviour and democratic citizenship. In doing this, we aim at general scientific progress along several lines. We invite studies conceiving of feedback effects (also) in an interactive and disaggregated manner, with different groups and individuals affected differently by the same policies, and with different individuals being exposed to different parts of the same "welfare regime." Further, we want to identify generic mechanisms of feedback relevant for a whole range of specific dependent variables. This will have an integrating function and allow a parsimonious understanding of policy feedback. Methodologically, we need studies that take seriously the reciprocal causal relationship between policy and individual behaviour/attitudes.

### 2. The European Public Servant: A Shared Administrative Identity?

#### Directors:

Patrick Overeem (Leiden University) e: [overeem@fsw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:overeem@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)

Fritz Sager (University of Bern) e: [fritz.sager@kpm.unibe.ch](mailto:fritz.sager@kpm.unibe.ch)

As the economic, political, and cultural integration of Europe advances, the organization of European administration becomes more complex, and the need for a shared administrative identity becomes more apparent. From the perspectives of political theory and the history of ideas, our Workshop attempts to examine the similarities and dissimilarities of historical and contemporary ideas on the public servant as a relevant political actor in Europe. By analyzing the continuities and discontinuities as well as the intellectual roots of different understandings of the public servant the workshop aims to contribute to finding an ideational foundation for a European administrative identity. We especially welcome paper

proposals on the following topics: (1) The ideas and ideals concerning the public servant in Europe. (2) What is typically European in European administrative thought? (3) Empirical analyses of the European public servant's identity, both past and present. (4) The history of administrative thought rather than the history of administrative practice. (5) Research that aims at better understanding contemporary issues by means of analyzing continuities and discontinuities, similarities and differences of various understandings of the public servant in the history of European thought.

### 3. Methodological Advances, Bridges and Limits in the Application of Qualitative Comparative Analysis

#### Directors:

Damien Bol (LOUVAIN, Université catholique de) e: [damien.bol@uclouvain.be](mailto:damien.bol@uclouvain.be)

Alrik Thiem (ZURICH, University of) e: [thiem@sipo.gess.ethz.ch](mailto:thiem@sipo.gess.ethz.ch)

Barbara Vis (Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit) e: [b.vis@vu.nl](mailto:b.vis@vu.nl)

Applications of Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) have proliferated in the 25 years since Charles Ragin's landmark publication "The Comparative Method", testifying to the marked increase in interest among researchers in the possibilities and advantages of this method as a tool for social-scientific enquiry. However, while the basic mechanisms behind its three related variants – crisp-set QCA (csQCA), multi-value QCA (mvQCA), and fuzzy set QCA (fsQCA) – have become widely accepted, a critical juncture has now been reached. Scholars begin to not only recognize fundamental limits and limitations, but also possibilities in further developing, extending, and complementing the method to reap its full potential for advancing our understanding of social, political and economic questions. The proposed workshop thus addresses junior and senior scholars working on methodological issues relating to QCA as a technique, and applications of QCA to substantial questions, in order to improve the method and broaden its applicability.

### 4. Advancing Comparative Political Communication Research: New Frameworks, Designs and Data

#### Directors:

Frank Esser (Zurich, University of) e: [f.esser@ipmz.uzh.ch](mailto:f.esser@ipmz.uzh.ch)

Peter Van Aelst (Antwerp, University of) e: [Peter.Vanaelst@ua.ac.be](mailto:Peter.Vanaelst@ua.ac.be)

For a long time comparative studies in the subfield of political communication have been rare. This is mainly due to a lack of interest in comparative methodology on the part of communication scholars and a lack of interest in mass communication on the part of comparative political scientists. Kindled by the recent works of Esser and Pfetsch (2004) and Hallin and Mancini (2004), however, comparative political communication studies are on the rise and are even becoming fashionable. A consensus is emerging that more cross-national comparative research is needed to fully understand the role of social, cultural and institutional differences in political communication. Just as the study of comparative politics has greatly enriched our understanding of politics in general, the growing 'system

sensitivity' in political communication can enhance our understanding of communication flows in the political process. However, the growing interest in comparative political communication research has not been translated into real scientific progress as many theoretical and methodological problems have remained unresolved. This workshop plans to stimulate the scholarly debate about both theoretical and methodological aspects, and will discuss rigorous empirical research that will help advance this new subfield. Progress in newly emerging fields depends on identifying well-defined concepts that can serve as a foundation for widely-shared theoretical frameworks. As Pippa Norris (2009) said, without a theoretical map or conceptual compass comparativists remain stranded in Babel. Although various studies have proposed middle range concepts for the comparative study of political communication, few others have taken them up, developed them further, or integrated them into larger frameworks. An ambitious exception is the classification of three media/politics models by Hallin & Mancini (2004). Although immensely useful, problems remain. There is a tendency among some scholars to unreflectively "apply" their typology to any country sample and topic without questioning its applicability, whereas other scholars criticize it for being too descriptive, western-centered and nonempirical. There are also methodological uncertainties related to this need to advance the conceptual foundation of comparative political communication research. How do we analyze case studies and two-country studies adequately? Should we focus on small-N or large-N studies, on most similar or most different systems designs? Shall we continue to improve our typologies or concentrate on explanatory research? These and other methodological questions will be addressed during this workshop – by way of either conceptual papers or empirical papers presented by the participants..

#### **5. Citizens and Public Service Performance: Demands, Responses and Changing Service Delivery Mechanisms**

##### **Directors:**

Oliver James (Exeter, University of) e: o.james@exeter.ac.uk

Steven Van de Walle (Rotterdam, Erasmus University) e: vandewalle@fsw.eur.nl

The workshop analyses the interaction between citizens, users and public services that entail public funding, ownership or regulation in the context of contemporary service delivery mechanisms. These mechanisms include quasi-market and choice based mechanisms, non-state actors providing services and structures for coproduced services that operate alongside, or as an alternative to, more state-centric, bureaucratic or professionalised modes of delivery. The workshop organisers welcome papers on these topics that evaluate the empirical implications of theory using evidence. The workshop will discuss a set of core themes: How do structures for choice, exit, coproduction, consultation and broader voice affect citizens and users' interaction with public services? How does transparency, including published information about the performance of services, and communications technology affect citizens and users' interaction with services? Are interactions now consumer rather than citizen oriented? Do market and related methods interact with, and even crowd-out, citizens' political voice activities? What are the effect of service delivery structures on citizen cooperation with services and coproduction of

services? What are the effects of citizen and user feedback on political and managerial service providers, service performance and the continued use of particular mechanisms? Are different groups of citizens and users differently able to use delivery mechanisms to advance their interests? What is the current state of policy-makers' knowledge about these issues and how can social science inform the future institutional design of mechanisms for citizens and users' interaction with public services?

#### **6. Minority Rights and Majority Rule in European Legislatures**

##### **Directors:**

Michael Koss (Potsdam, Universität) e: mkoss@uni-potsdam.de

Radoslaw Zubek (Oxford, University of) e: radoslaw.zubek@politics.ox.ac.uk

The evolution of minority party rights has so far been analyzed chiefly in presidential democracies, particularly in the United States, where scholars have mapped such rights and have explained any changes with institutional, partisan and ideological factors. In Europe, a comprehensive focus on the evolution of procedural rights of individual MPs and opposition parties has so far been largely absent. Against this background, the objective of this workshop is to bring together scholars working on legislative politics and organization to examine the conditions under which the rights of individual members and opposition parties are curbed (or expanded) in European legislatures. In particular, the workshop will address the following questions: What rights do individual MPs and opposition parties have in European legislatures? Do such rights change over time and, if so, how and why? How can cross-country variation in the evolution of such rights be explained? We define minority rights broadly to include a variety of formal and informal, constructive and obstructive, individual and partisan privileges that members and opposition parties can resort to in European legislatures to counteract majority (or government) power. Interested participants are invited to submit both theoretical and empirical papers that explain the evolution of and variation in minority rights and parliamentary organisation in European national legislatures. Theoretically informed case studies and systematic cross-temporal and cross-country comparisons are particularly welcome.

#### **7. Time, Temporality and Timescapes in Politics and Policy**

##### **Directors:**

Klaus H Goetz (Potsdam, Universität) e: khgoetz@uni-potsdam.de

Michael Howlett (Simon Fraser University) e: howlett@sfu.ca

This workshop aims to examine political time, temporality and timescapes in the study of politics and public policy. Whilst references to temporal categories, such as timing, sequence, speed, duration, time budgets, time limits or time horizons, are ubiquitous both in comparative politics and comparative public policy, there are very few systematic treatments of time in political science. The workshop seeks to advance the debate (i) by exploring different facets of time and how they affect politics, government and public policy; (ii) by paying attention to time as a institution, a resource and a contextual variable; (iii) by discussing both the temporal features of politics and government (such as, e.g.,

election timing and term limits) and public policy-making (such as policy cycles or policy horizons); (iv) by exploring time in both diachronic-historical and synchronic analyses; and (v) by debating the status of time in different theoretical traditions in political and policy analysis.

## 8. Interest Group Influence in an Era of Multi-Level Governance and Mediatization

### Directors:

Anne S. Binderkrantz (AARHUS Universitet) e: asb@ps.au.dk

Caelesta Braun-Poppelaars (ANTWERP, University of) e: caelesta.braun@ua.ac.be

Interest groups are crucial to the practice of modern politics – few policies are made without the input of groups. Nowadays, however, they face increasingly complex political environments. Traditionally the national administrative arena was the central focus of interest group influence in European countries, but in recent decades processes such as multi-level governance and rising mediatization have fundamentally altered patterns of influence seeking behaviour. Interest groups are affected by the blurring and transformation of traditional boundaries (Bartolini 2005) and the increasing fragmentation or sharing of political responsibilities across different political levels (transnational, EU, national and regional). Consequently, there is an increasing presence of groups at international or supranational venues such as the EU, the UN or the WTO (Hanegraaff, Beyers and Braun-Poppelaars 2011; Lowery and Berkhout 2008). Interest groups are also profoundly affected by the mediatization of politics which has made political decision making more visible to the general public and required policy makers to use (new social) media to their advantage. This has raised the necessity of maintaining a strong presence in the parliamentary and media arenas for interest groups as well. Few studies, however, explicitly examine the consequences of multilevelness and mediatization on group influence across different arenas and levels. This workshop aims to advance the study of interest groups by focusing on these issues.

## 9. Ethnicity, Territory, and Party Competition. Toward a Unified Approach

### Directors:

Edina Szöcsik (ZURICH, University of) e: Edina.szocsik@eup.gess.ethz.ch

Christina Zuber (COLOGNE, University of) e: zuber@uni-koeln.de

During the 1990s, the re-territorialisation of politics in Western Europe on the one hand and the break-up and democratisation of multi-national states in Central and Eastern Europe on the other hand both increased the importance of ethnicity and territory in party competition. With an additional ethnic issue dimension structuring the policy space and the fragmentation of party systems into segmental and/or regional subsystems, party competition in the multinational democracies of wider Europe takes the form of a complex multi-dimensional game played in multiple, territorially nested arenas. We argue that fresh analytical approaches bridging the fields of territorial, ethnic, and party politics are needed to deal with this complexity. So far, however, research on ethnicity has remained largely disconnected from the field of party politics. Additionally, a heterogeneous use of terms

has detached scholars working on 'ethnoregionalist' parties in Western Europe from scholars focussing on 'minority' parties in Central and Eastern Europe. The workshop seeks to overcome scholarly insulation and kickstart a debate that explores the possibility of a unified analytical approach to ethnicity and territory in party competition.

## 10. Perceptions of representation: a cross analysis of citizens' and MPs' views

### Directors:

Olivier Costa (BORDEAUX, Institut d'Etudes Politiques de)

e: o.costa@sciencespobordeaux.fr

Oscar Gabriel (STUTTGART, Universität) e: oscar.gabriel@sowi.uni-stuttgart.de

As shown by population surveys in many democracies, dissatisfaction with the responsiveness of parliaments and elected representatives has become widespread in many contemporary democracies. One possible explanation to this pattern is a felt discrepancy between the citizens' normative expectations on political representation on the one hand and the perceived practice of representation by parliaments as collective agencies and members of parliament on the other. If a large segment of the public doubts whether parliaments and parliamentarians do adequately perform their roles as representatives of the citizens, the idea of representative democracy is challenged. This holds true for normative as well as empirical reasons. A perceived discrepancy between the normative idea and the practice of representation can be interpreted as a cultural misfit, leading towards phenomena such as a lack of compliance to political decisions, distrust in political institutions and actors, withdrawal of support for the political regime, abstention from vote, and participation in (illegal) protest activities. The aim of the workshop is to analyze the attitudes towards parliamentary representation in contemporary democracies and to explore the impact of the respective attitudes on the citizens' broader relationship towards the political system. Starting from the classical theoretical debates on the concept of representation, the papers should focus on a comparative or single case study of the citizens' and/or elite's attitudes towards the normative idea and practice of parliamentary representation at the various levels of the political system.

## 11. Political Animals and Animal Politics

### Directors:

David Schlosberg (SYDNEY, University of) e: david.schlosberg@sydney.edu.au

Marcel Wissenberg (NIJMEGEN, Radboud Universiteit) e: m.wissenberg@fm.ru.nl

Despite 20 years of environmental politics scholarship, the place of animals and the non-human realm in environmental politics has remained unclear. It has been addressed only in the margin of 'environmental' (=resource management) research questions, or by authors who were usually more interested in the ethical than the political status of the nonhuman. This workshop should begin to fill this void with contributions ranging from theoretical arguments about non-human nature to policy initiatives regarding animal welfare and rights. It aims at a systematic, interdisciplinary understanding of the politics of animals and their environments, by addressing a series of research questions consistently from three

perspectives: normative political theory; the qualitative analysis of the discourses and ideology of policy makers, political parties and social movements; and more classic political analysis of public policy and party politics. The workshop will deal with the following, intrinsically related questions: 1. What do some of the recent normative approaches to animal/nonhuman politics add to our political approach to nature? 2. How have environmental and animal rights groups and parties framed their recent arguments for the protection of non-humans? What discourses have been most popular and appealing to movements and groups? 3. Which normative approaches and/or movement discourses have been successful, and which not, as frames for public policy initiatives? How can we analyze the policy processes that have led to successes and failures of animal politics initiatives? Contributors can address a variety of animal politics campaigns from single-state, regional, and comparative perspective.

## **12. The Institutions of International Society Revisited: theory, practices, and performativity**

### **Directors:**

Tanja Aalberts ((LEIDEN, Universiteit) e: taalberts@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

Jorg Kustermans (ANTWERP, University of) e: jorg.kustermans@ua.ac.be

The purpose of this workshop is to re-assess the institutions of international society, as defined by Hedley Bull in the 1970's, in light of recent theoretical advances in International Relations scholarship, viz. the focus on practice and performance. It will focus on two main issues: (1) which are the institutions of (contemporary) international or world society and how have these institutions evolved? (2) what does the deployment of analytical concepts such as practice and performativity add to our understanding of the institutions of international society, and thus of international society as such? Answers to these questions should yield a theoretical and empirical update of the concept of international society. To this end, we invite papers that analyse a particular institution of international society (e.g. war, diplomacy, law, or less common entries like colonialism and multilateralism), or that analyse an emerging institution of world society, through the lens of practice and/or performance theory. Papers can be either theory-heavy, empirics-heavy, or evenly balanced, but all should preferably include both components.

## **13. Private Military and Security Companies: Transforming Security Governance?**

### **Directors:**

Elke Krahman (BRISTOL, University of) e: e.krahmann@bris.ac.uk

Anna Leander (COPENHAGEN BUSINESS SCHOOL) e: al.dbp@cbs.dk

The proliferation of Private Military and Security Companies (PMSCs) since the early 1990s has spawned a new field of research. However, despite or perhaps because of the small but growing number of academics and students involved in this research, the field has remained theoretically and empirically disjointed. Unlike research on international organizations or non-governmental organizations, which can draw on common conceptual languages and theoretical traditions, the investigation of PMSCs is usually subsumed under

other fields such as the study of private policing in criminology, their impact on military interventions in security studies and the question of state control over the legitimate use of force in international relations and international law. The objective of this workshop is to bring these different communities and strands of research together to facilitate an exchange of ideas and to investigate the possibilities of a joint research programme around the central idea of a transformation of security governance. Specifically, the workshop addresses four key questions: (1) What theoretical approaches have been used to analyse and understand the transformations of security policy making related to the proliferation of PMSCs and what synergies exist with the concept of security governance? (2) How do particular conceptualizations and definitions of PMSCs hide or illustrate new modes of security governance? (3) What do we know empirically about the role of PMSCs in local, national and global security governance? (4) What are the primary issues of concern with regards to PMSCs and security governance and what questions have been under-researched?

## **14. Comparing National Experiences of European Integration**

### **Directors:**

Daniel Gaxie (PARIS I (PANTHÉON-SORBONNE), Université de) e: gaxie@univ-paris1.fr

Alfio Mastropaolo (TORINO, Università degli studi di) e: alfio.mastropaolo@unito.it

There are important differences in citizen's levels of support for European integration across EU member States. One among many explanations emphasizes the key role of national belongings. It is said that perceptions of the process of European unification vary according to national culture and identities. The hypothesis is that different national experiences of European integration could lead to different national perceptions, evaluations, and attitudes. A first aim of this workshop is to provide analyzes of various national experiences of European integration. We need more research on western cases that have already been analyzed, and comparisons with so-called "smaller", and also Eastern, member States of the EU. A second aim is methodological. How scholars may observe these national experiences? What are the best sources and methodologies? The communications to the workshop should not only characterize, but also try to explain, the various national perceptions of European integration. The literature provides several research hypotheses that need to be discussed. Also, to what extent the whole public or only parts of it share national perceptions of European integration? Beyond the Antwerp meeting, the ambition of the workshop is to set up a research group, whose members would share similar research questions and methodologies and would engage in a collective comparative program. Therefore, all communications on methodological, empirical, or/and theoretical aspects of research projects, completed research or work in progress, including discussions of the best relevant sources and data (qualitative, quantitative, qualitative-quantitative), are welcome, even from scholars who are not planning to join a future collective program.

## **15. The partisan effect of electoral systems: studying complex electoral rules**

**Directors:**

Julian Bernauer (KONSTANZ, Universität) e: Julian.Bernauer@uni-konstanz.de

Daniel Bochsler (ZURICH, University of) e: dbochsler@gmail.com

Comparative studies establishing the link between electoral systems and representation often look at the difference between proportional representation (PR) and plurality/majority rule, or district magnitude as main explanatory variable, leaving more complex electoral systems apart. We are interested in these less studied electoral systems. For instance, mixed electoral systems are expected to provide for a happy medium between proportional representation and simple plurality or majority-vote systems, but the complexities of the interaction of two different electoral rules leave many questions open. Other types of electoral systems, such as the Single (Non-)Transferable Vote, Limited Voting, or features of electoral systems, such as list appointments under PR, territorial vote distribution requirements or bi-proportional seat allocation rules, are even less studied. This panel gathers contributions about the effect of these electoral systems on party strategies, on the formation of party systems and on party representation. This might include papers that explore to what degree the degree of proportionality of complex electoral systems is comparable to the one of PR or of the plurality vote (first-past-the-post) or the majority vote, or which study further aspects related to party representation: polarisation of political parties, descriptive representation, policy congruence, inter-party coalitions, etc. We expect papers to apply innovative methodological approaches and new data sources, allowing the study of complex electoral rules, which are rarely used, so that they can hardly be explored using large datasets on national parliamentary elections.

**16. Conservatism, Conservative Parties and Women's Political Representation****Directors:**

Karen Celis (Vrije Universiteit Brussel) e: karen.celis@hogent.be

Sarah Childs (BRISTOL, University of) e: s.childs@bristol.ac.uk

It appears that we may be entering a 'conservative moment'. Across many western democracies there are concerns that governments, of both left and right, are responding to the global economic crisis with neo-liberal policies that further reduce the size and role of the state. Such policies are considered not only to disproportionately impact on women but also to negatively affect women's rights and equality. In so doing they may herald a return to more traditionally bifurcated gender roles, with a reassertion of a strong public/private divide. Women's Policy Agencies, if not already abolished, are also seemingly under threat. Concerns over multi-culturalism and security compound these developments, as populist responses to the 'war on terror' and immigration are frequently played out on and over women's bodies, not least over veiling. At the same time, conservative women looked to have increased their presence in politics, whether as elected representatives, political leaders, or as organized participants in civil society. These conservative women frequently make claims to represent women. Feminists might recoil from the idea of conservative women like, Margaret Thatcher, Jenny Shipley, Kim Campbell, Angela Merkel and Sarah Palin, as representatives of women. But, pre-emptively dismissing conservative representatives, on the grounds that they are either falsely conscious, or are

but 'a wolf in sheep's clothing' - where claims and acts that unintentionally or intentionally harm women's interests are disguised as claims in favour of women - cannot lead to good research. Rather, gender and politics scholars should take conservatism and conservative representatives more seriously. This requires a reconsideration of our conceptual, analytic and empirical frameworks. A smattering of individual research outputs on conservatism and conservative parties and policies and women's representation has been published in the last few years, but, hitherto, there has been no systematic consideration of the meaning and challenge of conservatism and conservative representatives to extant understandings of gender and political representation. To do all this demands, moreover, that our analytic frameworks and research designs are capable of including conservative women and their representative claims.

**17. "Political Representation: Congruence of Interests in New Democracies"****Directors:**

Manuel Alcántara (SALAMANCA, Universidad de) e: malcanta@usal.es

Margarita Corral (VANDERBILT University) e: margarita.corral@vanderbilt.edu

Modern democracies are based on the idea of party government through which political parties appear as the linkage mechanism that connects the voters' preferences to the government outputs (Blondel and Cotta 2000). This system is built on the premise that governments enact policies that are congruent with the preferences of the citizenry. Therefore, the study of the way public officials represent the policy preferences of the electorate is key for the understanding of modern democratic processes. The analysis of political representation has been addressed from many different perspectives and has considered different dimensions (Manin 1997, Ryden 1996). The traditional classification proposed by Pitkin (1961), who considers that citizens are represented descriptively, symbolically and substantively, stands out. Since then, there has been a clear agreement on the importance of mandate representation which occurs "when politicians' and voters' interests coincide and/or when voters can reasonably expect that parties will do what they propose" (Manin, Przeworski, and Stokes 1999, 30). And as Achen (1978) points out, if the views of representatives and citizens are similar, then representation is improved. Therefore, modern ideas of political representation are linked to the model of party government according to which parties compete in elections offering distinct policy platforms for which they will be accountable (Schattschneider 1942, APSA 1950). Nonetheless, recent studies on new democracies point out a crisis of representation which is undermining the quality of democracy in several regions of the world (Hagopian 2005; Mainwaring et al 2006). Political systems seem to have failed to fulfill citizens' expectations, which is producing a high and growing dissatisfaction with the main political institutions of representation. On the other hand, studies on politicians' preferences have also pointed out the close relationship between quality of politicians and the quality of democracy (Alcántara 2008). A workshop addressing the extent to which public officials and political parties represent citizens' policy preferences in new democracies will help us know if indeed representation is based on programmatic linkages between voters and parties, which leads to democratic accountability and responsiveness (Kitschelt 2000), or

on personalism and individual candidate's qualities which might lead to systems characterized by fragile party-society bonds, and non institutionalized forms of representation (Roberts 2002). This workshop seeks to attract scholars who are interested in the study of different dimensions regarding political representation, especially political congruence between citizens and public officials in New Democracies.

#### 18. **Process Tracing – philosophy, theory and practice**

##### **Directors:**

Derek Beach (AARHUS Universitet) e: derek@ps.au.dk

Ingo Rohlfing (COLOGNE, University of) e: rohlfig@wiso.uni-koeln.de

The aim of the workshop is to contribute to the expanding methodological literature on qualitative case study methods. Our focus is on process tracing and in-depth case study methods more generally, as well as the role that they can play in multi-method research designs. Witnessing an increasing use of process tracing in empirical research and an increasing body of methodological literature on process tracing and causal mechanisms, we see the need to draw the literature together. At the same time, we need to develop further our knowledge on key aspects of process tracing such as how Bayesian updating can be used as an inferential logic, and when and how process tracing studies can be nested in multi-method research designs. We invite papers that explore the ontological and epistemological foundations of process tracing. Extending the perspective beyond designs that exclusively rely on process tracing, we expect that some papers will deal with the combination of process tracing with other methods in multi-methods designs. Finally, we want to attract empirical case studies that demonstrate process tracing in action and that shed new light on how the promise of this technique can be brought to fruition in the analysis of social phenomena.

#### 19. **Party primaries in Europe. Consequences and challenges**

##### **Directors:**

Giulia Sandri (BRUXELLES, Université Libre de) e: gsandri@ulb.ac.be

Fulvio Venturino (GENOVA, Università degli studi di) e: fventurino@unica.it

We propose a workshop on the impact of primary elections on political parties, both in terms of internal party functioning and of inter-party competition. The main aim of this workshop is to clarify the consequences of primaries on the internal and external functioning of political parties. We are interested in developing the empirical and theoretical exploration of the consequences of the adoption of party primaries. The scope of the workshop will be focused on two level of analysis, i.e. on the internal level of party organization and on the external level of interparty competition. We are interested in establishing whether primaries can strengthen the link between party elites and members, or, instead, they produce a deterioration of the degree of loyalty and sense of belonging to the party organization. The second aspect concerns the distribution of power within the organizational structures of the party. The third one concerns the evolution of leadership-party relations, assessing whether there are changes in the role played by leaders and in the

features of their legitimacy towards party voters and supporters. Looking at the external aspects of the consequences produced by primaries, we are interested in interparty competition and the reactions of the competitors in the electoral arena. The second question that arises here concerns the electoral gain in promoting primaries. The third question is whether primaries with their promises of internal democracy and their transparent and inclusive procedures can compensate the lack of legitimacy perceived by the electorate and described by recent literature on party decline and disengagement. Empirical papers may be focused on case studies or on one specific aspect of the two abovementioned different dimensions of analysis suggested for examining the consequences caused by primaries on political parties. We will welcome papers from a comparative perspective or conceptually based that consider the implications of primaries on parties and party competition on the internal and/or the external side.

#### 20. **'Parties and Campaigning in the Digital Era'**

##### **Directors:**

Rachel Gibson (MANCHESTER, University of) e: rachel.gibson@manchester.ac.uk

Andrea Römmele (HERTIE School of Governance) e: roemmele@hertie-school.org

Elections worldwide have all seen parties launch social media initiatives to communicate with voters, many copying directly from 2008 efforts of Barack Obama and his mobilization and activist oriented 'MyBO.com' site. Beyond the surface-level similarities, however, to what extent are these developments and use of web 2.0 by political actors taking hold and promoting a new more devolved style of citizen-led forms of activism – modes that challenges the top-down model of the professionally managed campaign that has emerged in a wide range of national election contexts over the past three decades? Alternatively, are the new internet tools actually allowing central elites to more closely monitor, direct and coordinate local voluntary efforts? Perhaps they make little difference and simply reinforce existing practices? The question of the impact of digital tools for political organizations in terms of their internal organizational structures, relationships to members / supporters, and overall contents and style of their communication with voters are one's that this workshop will address. More generally through drawing on comparative examples we will seek to provoke debate on whether we are witnessing a second wave of the 'Americanization' of campaign style? Or whether there is a more diverse and pluralized approach to social media campaigns worldwide?

#### 21. **Thinking Big about 'Gender Equality' Policy in the comparative Politics of Gender**

##### **Directors:**

Amy G Mazur (FONDATION NATIONALE DES SCIENCES POLITIQUES)

e: mazur@wsu.edu

Mieke Verloo (NIJMEGEN, Radboud Universiteit) e: m.verloo@fm.ru.nl

This workshop calls on the growing group of scholars involved in large scale comparative

analyses of (gender) equality policy issues in Europe and globally. Its major ambition is to shed light on the dynamics, determinants and impacts of policies that specifically promote gender equality. Why do we find gender equality policies? Why do they have a particular content and form in certain places and times? What are the theories that can explain their positive or negative impact? And which explanatory models actually work? Since the 1990s, “gender equality” or “feminist” policy has become an established policy field. In parallel, there has been a number of international research teams that have looked at different aspects of the policy puzzle related to gender equality (e.g. RINGS, MAGEEQ, QUING, FIIN, and FEMCIT). These projects have delivered a wide range of publications and insights within a specific approach and theoretical background. This workshop intends to use these large cross-national projects as a launching pad to push the scholarship on gender and policy forward to take on board new questions. We are interested in empirical cross-national papers on the complex puzzle of gender equality policy. They can focus on making new typologies, on cross-national similarities in dynamics and drivers both in terms of process and impact as well as on policies that have the potential to affect gender equality. These papers should relate to a broad range of social and political theory and ideally reflect upon how established cross-national projects inform their studies.

## 22. The Transformation of International Trade Governance

### Directors:

Leonardo Baccini (IMT (Institutions Markets Technologies)) e: l.baccini@imtlucca.it  
Manfred Elsig (BERN, Universitaet) e: Manfred.elsig@wti.org

Our era experiences a deep transformation of the global trading system. On the one hand, the fate of the Doha Round of trade negotiations under the WTO remains uncertain, if not bleak. In the past years trade talks collapsed at multiple occasions and since summer 2008 no tangible progress has been made. On the other hand, during the past 20 years, preferential trade agreements (henceforth, PTAs) that liberalize commerce between members have proliferated dramatically. We also can observe that many PTAs are no longer exclusively an instrument of trade policy, but more generally are a tool to manage globalization and to redistribute the benefits and the costs of economic cooperation. For instance, the US and the EU have been important drivers of conditional agreements. They open their domestic markets for goods from developing countries (allowing for traditional gains from trade), in return for developing countries’ liberalization of services markets, the acceptance of investment provisions, more stringent intellectual property rights and cooperation in non-economic areas. In sum, the critical importance of multilateral negotiations in the global trading system has been receding, whereas bilateralism is rocketing the sky. This workshop explores the consequences for international relations and domestic politics of this profound transformation of the global trade governance. This workshop invites theoretical and empirical contributions that address this new surge in going preferential in regulating trade and the multilateral-bilateral nexus. In particular, we encourage contributions both inspired by the international political economy (IPE) literature as well as the international institutions/cooperation literature (e.g., legalization, rational design, diffusion). Special attention is devoted to the conditions that affect the

design, focusing on depth, scope, flexibility or rigidity of international trade institutions. From a dynamic perspective, we are interested in the interplay between various trade institutions (the WTO, multilateral-bilateral, across PTAs) and shifting priorities over time. And finally, we welcome contributions that assist in better grasping the effects of trade institutions in economic or political terms. We invite papers from different research traditions and research methods (qualitative and quantitative) to address some of above questions related to new regionalism via the use of trade institutions.

## 23. Economic Ideas and the Political Construction of Financial Crisis and Reform

### Directors:

Andrew Baker (BELFAST, QUEEN’S University of) e: a.baker@qub.ac.uk  
Geoffrey Underhill (AMSTERDAM, University of) e: g.r.d.underhill@uva.nl

The purpose of this workshop is to map and evaluate the recent financial crisis and its continuing fallout from a political economy of ideas perspective. The objective is to account for and explain the variety of persuasive struggles that are being played out across policy areas and countries. The ongoing financial crisis provides an excellent laboratory for exploring how economic ideas interact with political coalitions acting as devices for the empowerment of certain actors, the disempowerment of others and the restructuring or preservation of existing social and political relations. The paradox of the recent financial crisis is that while it opened a window of opportunity for change agents and norm entrepreneurs to push new ideas, these forces for change have had to interact with a pattern of ‘path dependency,’ where prior knowledge informs institutional responses, meaning that there is often a durable quality to pre-existing ideas. Papers at the workshop will assess and evaluate the dynamic interactions between agents promoting change and the pattern of ideational path dependency. Such analysis will not only help us to better understand how ideas relate to interests and vice versa in the current epoch, but also how the dynamics of change and continuity are interacting in relation to the current crisis and therefore its potential political and historical significance as a transformational moment or sequence of events.

## 24. The Transformation of Foreign Policy and Diplomacy

### Directors:

Costas M. Constantinou (University of Cyprus) e: m.costas@ucy.ac.cy  
Gunther Hellmann (FRANKFURT, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität)  
e: g.hellmann@soz.uni-frankfurt.de

In the face of a globalized world characterized by practices of de-territorialisation, shifting spaces of political authority and increasing uncertainty about what is foreign and what is domestic, foreign policy appears to be an anachronistic concept. A similar problem exists with diplomacy, if viewed exclusively as an intergovernmental affair. Used almost interchangeably in some scholarly quarters, the terms foreign policy and diplomacy are problematized in more critical and sociological approaches, mostly viewed as distinct or co-constitutive, and sometimes even as antithetical concepts. This makes it even more

necessary to examine current shifts in the theory and practice of foreign policy and diplomacy together. The proposed workshop seeks to link the study and practice of foreign policy and diplomacy with changes and transformations taking place in global politics. To do so, firstly, the diachronic or conceptual history dimension will be addressed, specifically by examining a set of issues relating to the evolution of “foreign policy“ and “diplomacy” as distinct and historically contingent practices that had to respond to and were shaped by major political transformations. Secondly, going beyond a systemic understanding of foreign policy and a merely interpersonal understanding of diplomacy, contributions will emphasize a broader conceptualization of practices in the way they affect the constitution and transformation of notions of political subjectivity, sovereignty, national identity, mediation and international order. Thirdly, the workshop will examine the extent to which the combination of new technologies, actors and networks impacts on both the objectives, methods and practices of foreign policy and diplomacy, and indeed how new forms of interrelatedness and interconnection reconfigure regional and global power relationships.

#### 25. **The Politics of Double-Standard? Revisiting the EU’s Engagement with Authoritarian Regimes**

##### **Directors:**

Elena Baracani (Istituto Italiano di Scienze Umane) e: elenabaracani@gmail.com  
Giselle Bosse (Maastricht Universiteit) e: g.bosse@maastrichtuniversity.nl  
Tom Casier (Kent, University of) e: t.casier@kent.ac.uk

The proposed workshop aims to critically analyse the EU’s multilateral foreign policy towards authoritarian regimes on its Southern and Eastern rim. The popular uprisings in Egypt, Tunisia and Yemen in early 2011 have not only shaken the ruling political elites but also international diplomacy, notably that of the EU, which, over decades, did not hesitate to consider the regimes in the Mediterranean as strategic allies. The recent events in Egypt and elsewhere in the region are exemplary for an EU policy that is fearful that democratic transformation of the countries could endanger stability. Likewise, the EU’s pragmatic engagement with Belarus under the Eastern Partnership was severely called into question following the brutal crackdown of demonstrations held in central Minsk following the presidential elections in late December 2010. The workshop analyses what paradigms and strategies have guided EU policies towards authoritarian regimes over the past decades, to what extent the EU has applied double standards and the factors which explain the recent failures of EU policies vis-à-vis authoritarian regimes such as Egypt, Tunisia or Belarus. Most studies to date focus on the effectiveness of EU policy towards countries which aspire integration with the EU (‘most likely’ cases). Very few attempts have been made to provide a comprehensive study contrasting EU engagement with countries which have explicitly ruled out integration with the EU (‘least likely’ cases). The current literature on EU foreign policy clearly lacks a coherent comparative study of EU relations with authoritarian regimes across geographical space.

#### 26. **The Politics of Labour Market Policy in Times of Austerity**

##### **Directors:**

Kenneth Dubin (CARLOS III de Madrid, Universidad) e: ken.dubib@uc3m.es  
Susan Milner (BATH, University of) e: S.E.Milner@bath.ac.uk

The Holy Grail of labour market policy analysis is that felicitous institutional arrangement which is both socially equitable and economically efficient. For many analysts, flexicurity, whatever that is, is just such an arrangement. Unfortunately, proposals for reform based on these kinds of analyses obviate the centrality of politics in labour markets: labour market institutions shape—and are shaped by—collective action in politics and at work. Moments of economic turmoil often generate efforts to reform these institutions, thus offering a privileged window for the study of interest group politics and their implications for the strategies of political entrepreneurs, firms and the distribution of economic opportunities and market risks. This panel invites theoretically informed, empirically-grounded papers that can deepen our understanding of the organizational logics underlying and the consequences (political, economic, social, but above all, organizational) of battles over labour market reform in the context of the current crisis.

#### 27. **The (re)configuration of political representation in the EU**

##### **Directors:**

Richard Bellamy (LONDON, University College) e: r.bellamy@ucl.ac.uk  
Sandra Kröger (BREMEN, Universität) e: [skroeger@uni-bremen.de](mailto:skroeger@uni-bremen.de)

After the normative, participative and deliberative turns in political theory and empirical EU studies, we are currently witnessing the beginning of a “representative turn”, not least due to the much debated alleged democratic deficit in and of the EU. The proposed workshop understands itself as a stock-taking exercise of this “representative turn” and, at the same time, as a venue to charting new research needs on political and democratic representation in the European Union. We assume that representation is a sine qua non for the legitimacy of any democratic political system, the EU included. The workshop therefore focuses on the question: what is the relation between representation and democracy in the EU? Although the EU conceives of itself as a representative democracy in the Lisbon Treaty, the meaning of this concept for a supranational polity in both theoretical and practical terms is far from clear. On the contrary, the contemporary, historically contingent link between representation and democracy is severely challenged by various processes of diversification at all levels of political action (national, regional, global). Additional actors beyond parliaments claim representative functions and interact in new spaces of politics across different geographical levels, addressing formerly purely national issues and acquire new competences to act in additional spaces (internet, local juries, etc.). Consequently, it becomes increasingly unclear who is represented by whom in which forum. These processes challenge our understanding of representative democracy as electoral democracy within clearly delineated nation-states, provoking a situation in which “new frontiers” of representation develop.

## 28. **International Institutions and Policy Diffusion: Sources – Mechanisms – Impact**

### **Directors:**

Anja Jakobi (PEACE RESEARCH INSTITUTE FRANKFURT) e: Jakobi@hsfk.de

Thomas Sommerer (STOCKHOLM University) e: Thomas.sommerer@statsvet.su.se

This session analyses the impact of international institutions on policy diffusion. Policy diffusion is the subsequent adoption of policies by different actors, governments or organizations, supported by different voluntary or coercive mechanisms. Despite a growing literature on diffusion, little is known about the role international institutions play in this process and how they can trigger diffusion process across countries and regions. Starting from this account, the workshop explores this link, applying a broad notion of international institutions that encompass international organizations, international regimes, and networks. Diffusion effects will be examined on the global, regional, national and subnational level, taking into account the many linkages that international institutions have among themselves and other actors. The workshop is conceptualized as a forum for exchange on the link between international institutions and policy diffusion. We welcome scholar from international relations, comparative politics and other research fields who carry out empirical research in this area. Papers should fall in one of the three categories: sources of diffusion, mechanisms of diffusion, and impact of diffusion. In any of these fields, we are open to a variety of research methods, both qualitative and quantitative. However, given the aim to present empirical research results, a basic restriction is that conceptual papers and papers without empirical work are less likely to be accepted.

## 29. **Between Retribution and Restoration – explaining the Politics of Transitional Justice**

### **Directors:**

Klaus Bachmann (WARSAW School of Social Psychology) e: k.bachmann@feps.pl

Adam Czarnota (New South Wales, University of) e: a.czarnota@unsw.edu.au

Transitional Justice has become an increasing field of research and academic discussion during the decades after World War II. What originally was a subject mainly for historians and lawyers, has now become a field for sociologists and political scientists, too. That is why we see a need to include Transitional Justice into the activities of ECPR and intend to integrate researchers who concentrate on issues of legal transition and institutions and mechanisms of “dealing with the past”. We expect the workshop to be of great interest to at least some of the ECPR standing groups, like the ones dealing with International Relations, Central and East European Politics, Comparative Political Institutions, Latin American Politics, Security Politics, Southern European Politics and with the European Union. We invite empirical oriented papers which embrace comparative, cross-national approaches, which allow identifying and analyzing patterns of Transitional Justice in more than only one country and can contribute to a better theoretical understanding of Transitional Justice mechanisms. Even when only one country is dealt with, the analysis should attempt to make wider claims about the mechanisms of Transitional Justice. The overarching

perspective for all papers should be an attempt to explain the choices made in particular countries between restorative and retributive justice and different combinations of both. Why do some transitional societies apply harsh and punitive measures against former dictators, perpetrators and their followers, whereas others grant de facto or de jure amnesties? How can we explain the difference in the scope of punitive measures and cross – national differences of the number of people excluded from society? How do transitional societies construe notions of guilt and criminal responsibility and apply exclusive measures during and after transition? What are the driving forces behind the institutional design for transitional justice? We warmly welcome and encourage papers dealing with the politics and policies of the EU in that field: How can we explain the preferences within the EU with respect to retributive and restorative justice in a transitional context? Why does the EU strongly support retributive measures in some cases (like the former Yugoslavia, the ICC), whereas it supports restorative institutions in others (South Africa, Northern Ireland)? Why did the EU require compliance with the ICTY in the former Yugoslavia as a precondition for accession, but refrain from any demands for vetting with respect to Central and Eastern post-communist Europe? Contributions to the workshop could also try to address some of the already existing theoretical claims made by authors like Huntington, Stan, Welsh, Kitschelt et al, Nedelsky, Nalepa, Teitel and Elster.

## 30. **Re-Defining the Public**

### **Directors:**

Marta Reuter (STOCKHOLM University) e: marta.reuter@statsvet.su.se

Annette Zimmer (MÜNSTER, Westfälische Wilhlems-Universität) e: zimmean@uni-muenster.de

The development of “the public” in Western European societies has been closely affiliated with the emergence of modern statehood, democratic government and citizenship rights. From the very beginning the public has been related to both serving the needs of people best (“public sector”, “public goods” and “public utilities”) and giving people a voice (“public opinion”). Doubtlessly during classical modernity, the public translated into being at the frontiers of societal and political innovation. But in the golden years of the welfare state, the service-provision dimension of the public shifted toward bureaucracy, while its voice-dimension was increasingly professionalized through mass media. Since the 1970s, political opinion leadership started to favor the private in terms of both service provision and in-put with respect to political decision-making. Since then, the public sector has been heavily deregulated. Public governance has developed into a synonym for public-private partnerships with commercial and third sector /civil society organizations included. Private policy experts, consultants and advisory committees have become ubiquitous in western democracies. Simultaneously, the “voice” dimension of the public has changed remarkably. There is a significant decline of citizens’ engagement in classical arenas of political and social activities (parties, trade unions, churches, voluntary associations). The media as a central venue of the public has passed through an amazing process of concentration. But concurrently, there is a shift towards new forms of political and social activities, such as social networks, virtual communities, as well as a decisive increase in civic engagement,

particularly at the local level and on behalf of national, international and community issues. Against this background, the purpose of the workshop is to investigate the current re-defining of the public with special attention to three particular topic and themes: 1) the output-dimension and hence the provision of public services, specifically the increasing hybridity which characterizes the field of public service delivery; 2) the discourse and therefore the legitimacy-dimension of the public, in particular with respect to changes of the welfare mix of service provision; 3) the actor-dimension and thus the changed role and scope of public constituencies in the age of globalization and post-democracy.