

Workshops

The call for papers for the XVI Nordic Political Science Congress is closed.

- ▶ Participatory democracy
- ▶ Kommunalt selvstyre i Norden
- ▶ Mellem demokratisk konsolidering og hybridregimer
- ▶ Mångfald och integration i Norden
- ▶ Parlamentar og regeringer
- ▶ Perspektiv på politisk kultur
- ▶ Politikens projektivering – temporära organisationer i offentlig politikutforming
- ▶ Postkommunistisk politikk 20 år etter murens fall: teoretiske perspektiv og empiriske analysar
- ▶ Religion and nationalism: meeting points, conflicts and challenges
- ▶ Urban politik i ett nordiskt sammanhang
- ▶ Utvärdering i offentlig sektor
- ▶ Discourse and ideology: story-telling, images, and the space of conflicts
- ▶ Electoral behavior and turnout
- ▶ Models of democracy: what are they and do they travel?
- ▶ Nordic migration states
- ▶ Nordic populism revisited: towards a new party family?
- ▶ Parliamentarism today: concepts, history and rhetoric
- ▶ Political communication: antecedents, contents and effects of political information
- ▶ Politics & expertise
- ▶ Politics of history
- ▶ Sovereignty in the making: emerging forms of state formation and political authority
- ▶ The dynamics of the policies of care: institutions, interests and tensions
- ▶ The politics of party leadership change: criteria for party leadership challenges and impacts on political outcomes

Participatory democracy

The workshop welcomes papers which focus on such forms of political participation where citizens themselves are engaged in the democratic process. More concretely the interest lies in different channels and forms through which people can affect political decision-making and policies in other ways than through voting at elections. The papers can cover participation that has been initiated either top-down, i.e. by the political system or bottom-up, i.e. by the citizens themselves. Papers where experiments with different kinds of mini-publics, participatory budgeting or other forms of direct citizen involvement are most welcome. New forms of participation, e.g. with the help of social media on the Internet are of interest, and the papers can also cover more traditional forms of direct democracy through referendums. Theoretically oriented papers regarding participatory or deliberative democracy are welcomed as well.

Kimmo Grönlund

Social Science Research Institute
Åbo Akademi
Finland
kimmo.gronlund@abo.fi

Peter Esaiasson

Department of Political Science
Göteborgs universitet
Sweden
peter.esaiasson@pol.gu.se

Kommunalt selvstyre i Norden

Kommunalt selvstyre er en central værdi i alle de nordiske lande. Traditionelt har både det lokale og det regionale niveau været præget af stærkt demokrati og ansvaret for centrale velfærdsopgaver.

Men selvstyret har været under pres i de senere år. I Danmark blev der gennemført en omfattende kommunalreform i 2007, som førte til færre og større kommuner, afskaffede det amtskommunale selvstyre, og ændrede markant på opgavefordelingen i den offentlige sektor. I Finland iværksatte regeringen en kommunal strukturreform i 2005, som gradvis konsoliderer kommunestyret via kommunesammenlægninger eller øget mellemkommunalt samarbejde. Indtil videre har reformen ført til en reduktion i antallet af finske kommuner med næsten 100. Sverige har de seneste 10-15 år gennemført en gradvis konsolidering af det regionale niveau med sammenlægninger af landsting til egentlige regioner. Norge har oplevet det modsatte med statsliggørelsen af sundhedsvæsenet i 2002, som efterlod fylkeskommunerne med meget få selvstændige opgaver. Alle fire lande har dermed de senere år oplevet fundamentale strukturelle ændringer på det lokale og regionale niveau. Nogle af ændringerne har været styret top-down af regeringen, mens andre har været igangsat bottom-up af kommuner og regioner selv. Ændringerne peger i delvis forskellig retning, idet nogle svækker selvstyret, mens andre styrker det. Men i alle landene indebærer udviklingen, at hidtidige strukturer udfordres og sættes under pres.

Formålet med workshoppen er at gøre status. Hvor står det lokale og regionale selvstyre i Norden i dag? Sigtet er at belyse dette spørgsmål både i et vertikalt og horisontalt perspektiv. Det vertikale perspektiv retter blikket med samspillet mellem staten, regionerne og kommunerne. Hvor meget autonomi har kommuner og regioner? Hvilke styringsinstrumenter benyttes til styring på tværs af niveauerne? Det horisontale perspektiv fokuserer på de enkelte kommuner og regioner og analyserer deres politisk-administrative organisation, lokal og regional politik og økonomi samt varetagelsen af de forskellige lokale og regionale opgaver.

Metodisk er ambitionen at få en flerhed af forskningsdesigns repræsenteret i workshoppen. Det betyder, at papers med både komparative caseanalyser på tværs af lande eller inden for enkelte lande, kvantitative studier og singlecasestudier vil være velkomne. Teoretisk vil workshoppen være liberal og trække på hele politologien, men empirisk vil workshoppen være afgrænset til at fokusere på de Nordiske lande.

Jens Blom-Hansen

Institut for Statskundskab
Bartholins Alle 7
Aarhus Universitet
DK-8000 Aarhus C
Danmark
jbh@ps.au.dk

Søren Serritzlew

Institut for Statskundskab
Bartholins Alle 7
Aarhus Universitet
DK-8000 Aarhus C
Danmark
Soren@ps.au.dk

Anne Lise Fimreite

Institutt for administrasjon og
organisasjonsvitenskap
Christiesgt 17
Universitetet i Bergen
NO-5007 Bergen
Norge
Anne.Fimreite@aorg.uib.no

Mellem demokratisk konsolidering og hybridregimer

Den tredje demokratiseringsbølge, som begyndte i midten af 1970'erne og nåede et højdepunkt ved den kolde krigs ophør, er nu stagneret. Flere har tilmed proklameret, at vi netop er gået ind i en tilbagegangsperiode, hvor de nye demokratiers overlevelseschancer er blevet mindre. Men det er endnu uklart, om der er tale om en decideret 'modbølge', som fører til flere autokratier. I forlængelse heraf findes der allerede en lang række hybridregimer, hvor demokratiske træk eksisterer sammen med autokratiske tendenser. Det har givet anledning til en diskussion af, om hybridregimer er et nyt fænomen, hvorvidt der er tale om en stabil regimetype, hvor mange der er – og hvorfor.

Sideløbende med denne debat er der en bred diskussion om demokratisk kvalitet. Her har en række forskere påpeget, at selvom mantraet om frie valg i dag respekteres i de fleste lande i verden, har den positive udvikling sjældent afspejlet sig i rodfæstede partisystemer eller bedre vilkår på områder som retssikkerhed, effektiv administration og velfærdsgoder. Det er med andre ord kun et fåtal af verdens lande, der ikke blot opfylder kravene til elektorale demokratier, men også klart har bevæget sig retning af at blive mere liberale og/eller sociale demokratier. Der findes dog interessante variationer i præstationsniveau, hvilket da heller ikke er overraskende, idet konteksten for den politiske udvikling i landene har været forskellig. Denne konstatering er dog ikke tilfredsstillende i sig selv, men illustrerer relevansen af workshopens overordnede tema.

Det er arbejdsgruppens formål at belyse disse udviklingstendenser og deres årsager i de regioner og lande, der har været berørt af den tredje demokratiseringsbølge og udviklingen siden da. De omtalte problemstillinger har allerede været behandlet i flere studier, men der er stadig rig mulighed for at bidrage til en mere fyldestgørende forståelse af relaterede emner. Arbejdsgruppen er generelt åben for relaterede begrebs- og teoriudviklende diskussioner såvel som empiriske studier af ét eller flere lande/år.

Lise Rakner

Institutt for Sammenliknende Politikk
Universitetet i Bergen
Postboks 7802
NO-5020 Bergen
Norge
lise.rakner@isp.uib.no

Svend-Erik Skaaning

Institut for Statskundskab
Aarhus Universitet
Bartholins Allé 7
DK-8000 Århus C
Danmark
skaaning@ps.au.dk

Mångfald och integration i Norden

I ljuset av ökad global migration har västvärldens demokratier – inklusive de nordiska välfärdsstaterna – en rad utmaningar att hantera. Den samtida etniska mångfalden i de nordiska länderna aktualiserar grundläggande statsvetenskapliga frågor. Det handlar om medborgarskapet i bred bemärkelse – dess innebörd i form av rättigheter och skyldigheter – men också om demokratisk delaktighet och förutsättningar för samhörighet. Syftet med denna arbetsgrupp är att samla statsvetare i Norden vars forskning på ett eller annat sätt faller inom ramen för det så kallade IMER-fältet (forskning om internationell migration och etniska relationer). Arbetsgruppen utgör nu något av en tradition, då motsvarande grupper har varit verksamma under de två senaste NOPSA-konferenserna.

Vi välkomnar bidrag som behandlar frågor kopplade till den etniska mångfalden i de nordiska länderna. Det kan handla om formulering och genomförande av offentlig politik, på statlig och kommunal nivå men också på organisationsnivå. Vilken politik har utvecklats och vilka styrningsstrategier har tillämpats i mötet mellan det mångkulturella samhällets aktörer? På vilket sätt förhåller sig migrations- och integrationspolitiken till andra politikområden, och till välfärdspolitiken i stort? Vad händer när frågor rörande integration, social välfärd och diskriminering behandlas inom ramen för det politiska systemet? I vilken utsträckning har inkludering kunnat främjas? Kan politiska åtgärder i vissa fall riskera att leda till minskat förtroende, intolerans och exkludering av vissa grupper i samhället? Hur påverkar de invandringskritiska politiska partiernas närvaro i parlamenten integrationspolitiken och den offentliga diskursen kring den?

Bidragen kan också handla om politiskt deltagande och mobilisering. Vad förklarar skillnader i förutsättningarna att nå politiskt inflytande mellan den infödda och invandrade befolkningen? Och hur påverkar olika institutionella förutsättningar villkoren för politiskt engagemang och mobilisering? Vilken roll spelar exempelvis statlig styrning, valsysteem, civilsamhälle respektive framväxten av nätverk, partnerskap och andra nya samverkansformer för minoriteters möjligheter till delaktighet och inflytande?

Vi välkomnar särskilt bidrag som behandlar dessa frågeställningar utifrån en jämförande nordisk ansats. Vilka likheter och skillnader kan man se mellan de olika nordiska länderna, och hur kan dessa förklaras? Hur går man metodologiskt till väga för att göra komparativa studier i Norden inom detta fält? Vi hoppas att arbetsgruppen blir ett spännande forum för att utforska sådana frågor, och att detta i förlängningen stimulerar intresset för nordisk forskning om mångfald och integration.

Arbetspråk i gruppen är huvudsakligen något av de skandinaviska språken. Men uppsatser författade på engelska välkomnas naturligtvis också.

Ann-Helen Bay

Institut for
samfunnsforskning, Oslo
Norge
[ann.h.bay@
samfunnsforskning.no](mailto:ann.h.bay@samfunnsforskning.no)

Maritta Soininen

Stockholms universitet
Sverige
[maritta.soininen@
statsvet.su.se](mailto:maritta.soininen@statsvet.su.se)

Per Strömblad

Institutet för Framtidsstudier
Stockholm och Linnéuniversitetet
SE-391 82 Kalmar
Sverige
per.stromblad@framtidstudier.se

Parlamente og regeringer

Parlamente og regeringer står over for nye udfordringer og krav. Workshoppen fokuserer på de nye krav, som stilles både eksternt og internt. Hvilke krav og udfordringer kan identificeres? Hvilke konsekvenser har disse krav? Hvordan kommer de til at påvirke relationerne mellem parlament og regering? Hvem rettes de mod? Hvordan manifesteres de? Vil parlamenternes magt øges eller mindskes? Hvilke reaktioner kan man forvente fra dels de etablerede dels de uformelle politiske aktører?

Gruppen er åben over for forskellige metodiske og teoretiske tilgange og perspektiver. Her mødes Nordens parlamentsforskere for at diskutere den nyeste parlamentsforskning. Historiske, ideanalytiske, begrebslige og retoriske studier dækkes dog af en anden arbejdsgruppe. Komparative bidrag er særlig velkomne. Det er en vigtig forskningsopgave i sig selv at kortlægge og sammenligne de nye krav som stilles til de europæiske parlamente og regeringer.

Asbjørn Skjæveland

Department of Political Science
Aarhus University
Bartholins Allé 7
DK-8000 Aarhus C
Danmark
skjaeveland@ps.au.dk

Thomas Persson

Department of Government
Uppsala University
P.O. Box 514
SE-751 20 Uppsala
Sverige
thomas.persson@statsvet.uu.se

Perspektiv på politisk kultur

Det är snart 50 år sedan det stilbildande arbetet *Civic Culture – Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* (1963) av Gabriel Almond och Sidney Verba publicerades. Med denna bok etablerades politisk kultur som ett centralt begrepp i studiet av politik. Utöver definitionen av politisk kultur – som mentala förhållningssätt till politik på nationell samhällsnivå – identifierade boken också de teman som sedan dess har varit centrala för forskning om politisk kultur: den politiska kulturens uppbyggnad, formation, orsaker och konsekvenser. Denna arbetsgrupp uppmärksammar dessa teman utifrån antagandet att de fortfarande har relevans för studier av politik och politisk kultur, men med tillägget att studier av politisk kultur samtidigt står inför nya utmaningar.

I fokus för arbetsgruppen står frågor om hur politisk kultur förhåller sig till pågående samhällsförändringar, såsom globalisering, internationalisering, regionalisering, statsbildningsprocesser, individualisering och det politiska livets förändrade former. För att förstå dessa komplexa förhållanden kan begrepp som politisk socialisation, politisk kommunikation och politiska subkulturer vara relevanta att uppmärksamma tillsammans med politisk kultur. Exempel på andra frågor med relevans för arbetsgruppen handlar om integration av politiska subkulturer, möten mellan politiska subkulturer, hur politisk kultur har betydelse för konflikter och konfliktlösning, konsensus och förhandlingar, samt förändring och stabilitet. Till dessa frågor kommer också frågor om hur politisk kultur kan studeras och jämföras mellan olika sammanhang.

Ambitionen med arbetsgruppen är att samla bidrag som behandlar politisk kultur utifrån olika perspektiv. Arbetsgruppen välkomnar därför uppsatser som studerar politisk kultur utifrån begreppsanalytiska, teoretiska, metodologiska och empiriska perspektiv. Uppsatserna kan tillämpa perspektiv inom traditionella områden, men också pröva betydelsen av politisk kultur i mer okonventionella sammanhang. På motsvarande sätt ryms inom arbetsgruppens tematik uppsatser som kritiskt prövar kulturteoretiska ansatser. Även uppsatser som gör syntetiska översikter över ämnesområdet eller som uppmärksammar ämnesområdets utveckling och trender är välkomna.

Thomas Denk
Åbo Akademi
Fänriksgatan 3A
FI-20500 Åbo
Finland
tdenk@abo.fi

Daniel Silander
Linnéuniversitetet
Statsvetenskap
SE-351 95 Växjö
Sverige
daniel.silander@lnu.se

Politikens projektfiering – temporära organisationer i offentlig politikutformning

Arbetsgruppen analyserar tidsdimensionens betydelse för politikens organisering och utfall. Särskilt uppmärksammas spänningen mellan å ena sidan ett ökat inslag av tillfälliga organiseringsformer i den offentliga politiken och å andra sidan en uttalad strävan efter bestående lösningar och en hållbar utveckling.

Projektet som organiseringsform är typexemplet på instrument för tidsmässigt avgränsad problemlösning och intervention. På vissa områden är projektorganiseringen själva grunden för politikutformningen. Som exempel kan nämnas den nationella implementeringen av EU:s strukturfondspolitik. Men även många andra organiseringsformer som åtgärdsprogram, partnerskap, nätverk, avtalsbaserade samarbetsformer, lokala aktionsgrupper med mera, har ofta en mer eller mindre uttalad tidsmässig avgränsning. Utifrån en hyperrationell tolkning är tillfälliga organiseringsformer medel för en flexibel, snabb och innovativ problemlösning och intervention. Samtidigt utmanar de föreställningar om politikens kontinuitet och långsiktighet. Vi vill därför fästa uppmärksamhet vid organiseringsformers inbyggda tidsdimension och dess betydelse som förklaring till politiska processers utformning och utfall. Exempel på viktiga frågor är:

- Hur utformas relationen mellan tillfälliga organisationer och permanenta politiska och administrativa strukturer i den politiska processens olika skeden?
- I vilken mån kan tillfälliga organiseringsformer bidra till beständiga lösningar; hur påverkas exempelvis kunskapsutveckling och kunskapsöverföring?
- Hur påverkas möjligheterna till demokratisk ansvarsutkrävning om politiken i allt högre grad utformas och verkställs genom tillfälliga organiseringsformer?

Vi välkomnar empiriska analyser med anknytning till de ovan nämnda frågeställningarna. Arbetsgruppen är inte avgränsad till något specifikt politikområde. Vi välkomnar även teoretiska och metodologiska bidrag som kan öka förståelsen av organisatoriska lösningars tidsdimension och tidsperspektivets betydelse för de politiska processernas utformning som ett växelspel mellan tillfälliga och permanenta strukturer.

Gruppens huvudsakliga arbetsspråk är skandinaviska. Bidragen kan även skrivas på engelska. Vi kommer att överväga en gemensam antologi utgående från de presenterade bidragen.

Stefan Sjöblom
Svenska social- och
kommunalhögskolan
Helsingfors universitet
P.O. Box 16
FI-00014 Helsingfors
Finland
stefan.sjoblom@helsinki.fi

Karl Löfgren
Institut for samfund og
globalisering
Roskilde Universitet
DK-4000 Roskilde
Danmark
klof@ruc.dk

Sebastian Godenhjelm
Svenska social- och
kommunalhögskolan
Helsingfors universitet
P.O. Box 16
FI-00014 Helsingfors
Finland
sebastian.godenhjelm@helsinki.fi

Postkommunistisk politikk 20 år etter murens fall: teoretiske perspektiv og empiriske analysar

Over 20 år etter Berlinmurens fall kan alle landa i det gamle Aust-Europa karakteriserast som postkommunistiske, men ikkje nødvendigvis som demokratiske. Utfallet av transisjonen varierer, frå konsoliderte demokrati i Sentral-Europa og Baltikum, via hybridregime til ei overvekt av autoritære regime i postsovjetisk Sentral-Asia. Sluttresultatet av dei endringsprosessane som vart sett i gang i 1989 var altså ikkje gitt på førehand, men samtidig er det fleire demokrati i dag enn det var på slutten av 1990-talet.

Berlinmurens fall var eit vegskilje også for forskinga om denne regionen. Tidleg på 1990-talet stod områdespesialistar mot komparativistar i synet på kor sui generis det postkommunistiske området eigentleg er. Dei førstnemnde hadde landkunnskapane, medan dei sistnemnde ofte brukte teori basert på vestlege og vesteuropeiske erfaringar ukritisk. I dag er det ei slags semje om verdien av samanlikning, både internt i regionen og på tvers av det gamle aust-vestskiljet. Slike samanlikningar gir grunnlag for å justere teoriane våre i lys av ny empiri, og kan dermed også gje ny innsikt i politiske prosessar i vest.

Formålet med arbeidsgruppa er å samle nordiske forskarar som forskar på eitt eller fleire land i det postkommunistiske Europa. Gruppa har eit komparativt siktemål, men casestudiar er også velkomne. Sjølv om det geografiske hovudfokuset er det postkommunistiske Europa, tar vi også mot bidrag som trekkjer samanlikningar med Vest-Europa eller Sentral-Asia. Vi ser svært gjerne bidrag som kombinerer teori og empiri, men også teoretiske bidrag som kan hjelpe oss til å forstå den politiske utviklinga i det postkommunistiske Europa.

Tematisk ser vi for oss at bidrag handlar om f.eks. overgangen til demokrati, statsoppløysing og statsdanning, framvekst og stabilisering av partisystem, typar parti og partifamiliar, forholdet mellom partisystem og elitar, sivilsamfunnet - eller for den del partipolitikk på EU-nivå, så lenge hovudfokuset er postkommunistiske land.

Elisabeth Bakke

Institutt for statsvitenskap
Universitetet i Oslo
Boks 1097 Blindern
NO-0317 Oslo
Norge
elisabeth.bakke@stv.uio.no

Jonas Linde

Akademien för humaniora,
utbildning och samhällsvetenskap
Örebro universitet
SE-701 82 Örebro
Sverige
jonas.linde@oru.se

Religion and nationalism: meeting points, conflicts and challenges

Nationalism and religion are two identity features that increasingly motivate collective action in the contemporary world, and Europe is no exception. In the aftermath of 9/11 and the subsequent global “war on terror” the combination of the two has proved to be central for the creation of common notions about one’s own group as well as about the group’s Other. While the relationship between religion and nationalism has an obvious empirical relevance it currently lacks the corresponding academic and theoretically oriented attention. The workshop is therefore focused on the meeting points between religion and nationalism in today’s world, on the dynamics of reinforcement, juxtaposition or conflict between the two, as well as on the challenges brought to both by other ways to define collective identities.

Some of the central questions raised by the workshop are: How do old stereotypes or enemy images survive or even thrive at the same time as they are confronted with other forms of collective identity, stirred by e.g. migration or other processes connected to globalization? Another question has to do with the political reactions to these phenomena. Populism and xenophobia are possible responses, as is the radicalization of national or religious groups. These are challenged by new forms of collective identity, cosmopolitanism and respect for diversity. How do transnational communication and mobilization affect religion and nationalism? In the particular case of Europe, the question may also be put what the effects are of a potential European identity on more traditionally defined national and religious identities.

Both theoretical and empirical submissions are welcome to the workshop. The chairs anticipate that the majority of the texts will focus on Europe but examples from other parts of the world are also welcome. The workshop seeks to find a balance between established and junior scholars at different stages in their academic careers. Political scientists as well as scholars from related disciplines are equally encouraged to apply. Papers and discussions will be carried out in English. It is the ambition of the two chairs to collect revised workshop proceedings into an anthology or a special issue of a peer-reviewed journal.

Bo Petersson

Department of Global Political Studies
Malmö University
SE-205 06 Malmö
Sweden
bo.petersson@mah.se

Anamaria Dutceac Segesten

Centre for Languages and Literature
Lund University
P.O. Box 201
SE-221 00 Lund
Sweden
Anamaria_Dutceac.Segesten@slav.lu.se

Urban politik i ett nordiskt sammanhang

Även i Norden får städerna och stadsregionerna allt större betydelse – som plats för boende och arbete, som motor för den ekonomiska utvecklingen och som arena för politik. Att de nordiska staterna genomgående är mindre urbaniserade än i Europa i övrigt har säkert bidragit till att urban politik som forskningsområde hittills spelat en undanskymd roll inom nordisk statsvetenskap. I kontinentaleuropa och Nordamerika har dock forskningsfältet en lång tradition. Till följd av t.ex. skillnader i välfärdssystem och planeringstraditioner bör man emellertid räkna med att den urbana politiken i Norden avviker från det som är känt i den internationella litteraturen. Inom städer och stadsregioner råder ofta markanta sociala skillnader som har politiska konsekvenser vilket kontrasterar mot den nordiska välfärdsmodellens jämlikhetsideal. Denna arbetsgrupp avser att samla statsvetare med intresse för politik i städer i Norden – såväl städer i klassisk mening (urban core) som i vidare mening som stadsregioner, dvs städer med omland.

Vi välkomnar alla slags papper som syftar till att undersöka politiska företeelser i städer eller stadsregioner i ett nordiskt sammanhang och som gör detta med hänsyn till den specifika urbana kontext som råder. Det kan t.ex. gälla frågor om stadens styre, demokratiformer, partipolitiska särdrag, politik för hållbarhet, urban policy, medborgarnas politiska deltagande, m.m. Empiriska studier relateras till ett teoretiskt sammanhang. Studier kan avse specifika fall, men kan också gälla inomnordiska jämförelser eller jämförelser mellan nordiska och icke-nordiska fall. Både kvantitativa och kvalitativa analyser är välkomna.

Anders Lidström

Statsvetenskapliga institutionen
Umeå universitet
SE-901 87 Umeå
Sverige
anders.lidstrom@pol.umu.se

Jacob Aars

Rokkansenteret
Nygårdsgaten 5
NO-5015 Bergen
Norge
jacob.aars@uni.no

Utvärdering i offentlig sektor

Utvärdering (no. da. evaluering, fi. arviointi, eng. evaluation), som systematiskt kartlägger och bedömer offentliga interventioners resultat och vägarna dit, har utvecklats till en central styrteknik i de nordiska länderna. Även inom EU och i globala organisationer som Världsbanken och Valutafonden har utvärdering blivit ett stående inslag. Men samtidigt som evaluering praktiskt vunnit terräng så har den blivit kraftigt kritiserad och omdiskuterad. Arbetsgruppen välkomnar promemorier om policymässiga, demokratiska, organisatoriska och metodologiska problem av viss generalitet i utvärdering. Särskilt välkomnar gruppen promemorier som diskuterar programteorier (interventionsteorier) och deras användning i utvärdering, styrning genom samverkan (nätverk), brukare och intressentmodeller samt användning av utvärderingars resultat. Gruppen står öppen för såväl forskare som praktiker. Språk: svenska, danska, norska och engelska.

Evert Vedung

Institutet för bostads- och
urbanforskning (IBF)
Uppsala universitet
Box 785
SE-801 29 Gävle
Sverige
evert.vedung@ibf.uu.se

Pekka Kettunen

Institutionen för
samhällsvetenskap och filosofi
Jyväskylä Universitet
Box 35
FI-40014 Jyväskylä Universitet
Finland
pekka.t.kettunen@ju.fi

Morten Balle Hansen

Institut for statskundskab
Syddansk universitet, Odense
Campus
Campusvej 55
DK-5230 Odense M
Danmark
mbh@sam.sdu.dk

Discourse and ideology: story-telling, images, and the space of conflicts

This section invites papers from the poststructuralist and anti/post-foundationalist approach to politics. Submissions may include case studies or theoretical work, or a combination of both. We particularly invite papers dealing with contingency and conflict, and meaning-making as a form of politics. The papers may wish to focus on concepts, discourse, logics, narratives, rhetoric or specific tropes, and may draw from a range of theoretical perspectives associated with the linguistic turn and poststructuralism (Derrida, Foucault, Lacan, Laclau, Mouffe, Rancière, Skinner, etc.).

The section hopes to focus on the political, and would like to devote some time in making clear the contributions of this kind of approaches to the study of politics - rather than cultural studies, linguistics or sociology, just to name a few neighbouring fields where the focus may differ.

The empirical case studies may range from an area specific focus (e.g. Latin America, European politics), to theoretico-empirical topics such as feminism, ethnicity or populism, or urban politics, politics of the past, and politics and art. Politics under investigation may take place on the global, national, transnational, regional or local level. The study of language, metaphors and visual images or sounds – or indeed the classics, time and space – is encouraged but not expected.

Dealing with poststructuralist and anti/post-foundationalist approach to politics, this section proposes to interrogate those precise moments and ideas of ground and grounding, rupture and contingency – besides discussing the issues presented in the panels. How and what to study, when studying the political or politics in its various dimensions?

A large part of the section will be held only in English to meet the demand for such panels by international researchers working in the Nordic countries, who are expected to join Nordic colleagues at the NOPSA Conference 2011.

Emilia Palonen

Department of Political and
Economic Studies,
University of Helsinki
Finland
emilia.palonen@helsinki.fi

Charlotte Fridolfsson

Center for Urban and Regional Studies
Örebro university
SE-701 82 Örebro
Sweden
charlotte.fridolfsson@oru.se

Electoral behavior and turnout

The workshop examines two classical issues in the study of electoral behaviour, i.e. factors accounting for turnout and party choice. We especially invite papers analysing the social logic of voting such as the impact of social network and habit formation on electoral participation and party choice. We also encourage papers with generational elements and papers discussing the role of contextual factors (e.g. degree of electoral competition). In relation to current economic and political phenomena, such as global financial crises and increasing number of floating voters, papers discussing on economic voting and the effect of election campaigns and the role of party leaders versus policy are warmly welcome. We specifically encourage papers using comparative approach based on for instance Nordic election studies or other comparative datasets.

Workshop language is English.

Kasper M. Hansen

Department of Political Science
University of Copenhagen
Øster Farimagsgade 5
DK-1353 Copenhagen K
Denmark
kmh@ifs.ku.dk

Hanna Wass

Department of Political and Economic Studies
University of Helsinki
P.O. Box 54
FI-00014 University of Helsinki
Finland
hanna.wass@helsinki.fi

Models of democracy: what are they and do they travel?

This workshop has two main objectives. First, it seeks to develop our knowledge and understanding of different forms of democracy. These could be procedural forms - liberal, illiberal, direct, representative, partycentred, candidate-centred, deliberative and the like. Equally, they could be regionally or culturally specific, such as the European or Nordic "models" of democracy. What, if anything, is really distinctive about such models? What is to be gained analytically by constructing them? How closely do real-world cases conform to their precepts?

The second objective concerns the possible transmission of these precepts from one place to another. Policy diffusion is a well-established sub-field within political science. Somewhat less studied, however, though certainly not entirely neglected, has been the notion of institutional diffusion: the idea that political institutions can spread from one place to another, perhaps inducing a break with local practice. Under what conditions might this happen? Clearly, modern institutional theory is likely to be central to many of the workshops' contributions, though that leaves wide scope for various ways of defining and understanding political institutions. Post-communist democratisation in Europe is one area in which the application of an institutional-diffusion framework might be especially helpful.

The core of the panel would comprise participants in an ongoing international research project, the Nordic Model of Democracy (nmd-project.net), which investigates the relationships between democracy in the Nordic and Baltic states. The panel chairs are both members of the project team. However, we welcome papers that contribute to either or both of the two main objectives outlined above. A variety of methodological approaches is also encouraged.

In order to make our workshop as inclusive as possible, and especially with an eye to participation by scholars from the Baltic states, we would like its working language to be English, and we would expect most papers to be written in English. Our workshop would, however, remain open to papers that are written in Danish, Norwegian or Swedish.

Nicholas Aylott
School of Social Sciences
Södertörn University
Sweden
nicholas.aylott@sh.se

Kadri Simm
Institute of Philosophy and Semiotics University
of Tartu
Estonia
kadri@eenet.ee

Nordic migration states

The concept of the migration state refers to the paradox of open liberal states and economies: 'in order to maintain a competitive advantage, governments must keep their economies and societies open to trade, investment and immigration. But unlike goods, capital, and services, the movement of people involves greater political risks' (J. H. Hollifield 2004 'The Emerging Migration State,' *IMR* 38(3): 885). Arguably, this paradox or dilemma cannot be – by the nature of things – finally solved, but has to be managed. The question is hence how, and how successfully states manage this problem.

The workshop will investigate in a comparative perspective the development of different types of immigration, integration and citizenship/residency policies in the Nordic countries. Are there distinct Nordic - or diverse national - ways to govern who gets in, to organize social, economic and political incorporation, and to structure the acquisition of full membership in society?

What are the internal or external, economic, political or cultural causes of differences and similarities? Do Nordic states encounter similar problems and challenges in terms of the nexus between welfare states, labor markets and national economies and on the other hand their emerging immigration and integration policy regimes? How, in particular, does Nordic state-modernism and social interventionism translate to immigrant integration policy, given visible national identity differences and political landscapes (e.g. 'soft' Swedish multiculturalism versus 'tough' Danish civic integrationism)?

What, finally, are the effects of Nordic policy approaches to immigrant incorporation, e.g., in terms of distribution of economic cost and benefits of immigration, political claims-making, societal tolerance cohesion or racism, and identity formation within immigrant and majority populations? How do policies affect immigration and how do they align with the needs and demands of the national economy, the immigrants and the majority population?

The workshop will address these problems to understand the similarities and differences in the way that Nordic countries manage migration, how successfully they do so, and how they each conceptualise 'success'. This will also allow us to get an idea of whether there is a specific type of Nordic Migration State or not.

The workshop encourages the submission of papers which compare two or more Nordic countries with regard their policies and policy histories in this field. Single country studies are also welcome to the extent that they can be paired with similar studies of other countries.

Grethe Brochman

Department of Sociology and Human
Geography
University of Oslo
P.O. Box 1096 Blindern
NO-0317 Oslo
Norway

Tore Vincents Olsen

Department of Political Science
University of Aarhus
Steen Blichersvej 22
DK-2000 Frederiksberg
Denmark
torevincentsolsen@gmail.com

Nordic populism revisited: towards a new party family?

After The Sweden Democrats' electoral success in the 2010 parliamentary elections, all Nordic countries populist party representation in the national parliaments. Political parties such as the Danish and the Norwegian Progress parties, The Danish People's Party, New Democracy, the Sweden Democrats, the Finnish Rural party and the True Finns have either been or still are significant parties within their own party systems and in the public debates. The stability of these parties put into question the common idea of populist parties as *flash parties*. On the contrary it looks like populist parties have come to stay in the Scandinavian party systems and constitute a type of new party family.

These surprising developments in Scandinavia and in large parts of Europe have resulted in many interesting studies. Yet there are still a number of questions to be answered. For example, there is obviously a lack of thorough studies of these parties over time. Many parties have existed for about 20 years, while the Norwegian Progress Party is approaching 40 years. The assumed various Nordic populism types – nationalist, neo-liberal and agrarian – and the different socio-economic electoral bases offer many interesting research questions. Do populist parties in the Nordic countries face a process of normalization (and/or institutionalization) with parliamentary experience? If so, how do these experiences impact upon their policies and organizations? Moreover, how do the ideological changes affect the composition of the party's electorate? Another unexplored topic is whether or not voter support has changed from a protest to the political establishment to an active support to these party's policies. Or differently put: Is there consistency between voters' policy preferences and party ideology? And do Nordic populist parties have loyal voters? Without doubt the Nordic countries represent an ideal political laboratory for interesting designs in the further study of the populist parties.

The focus of the workshop is on empirical approaches and studies since the existence of theoretical frameworks and concepts are already voluminous. Consequently, this workshop calls for papers that analyze the Nordic populism in a genuine comparative perspective, that is, across both time and space. Based on different data sources – party manifestos, public debates, media coverage, voter surveys, party voting behavior in local and national parliaments, organizational data, etc. – the goal is to study if there have been any convergence or divergence among Nordic populist parties. In short, has the conceptual vagueness and lack of organization within Nordic populism been replaced by a more coherent policy and professionalized organizations across the political party systems?

Ann-Cathrine Jungar
CBEEES Centre for Baltic and East
European Studies
Södertörn University
SE-141 89 Huddinge
Sverige
ann-cathrine.jungar@sh.se

Anders Ravik Jupskås
Department of Political Science
University of Oslo
Boks 1097 Blindern
NO-0317 Oslo
Norge
a.r.jupskas@stv.uio.no

Parliamentarism today: concepts, history and rhetoric

European states have varied histories of parliamentarism. Basically, however, these histories tell similar stories of the familiarization, embracement and development of the manifold practical manifestations of the idea. Moreover, these histories are “one-state stories”, only secondarily taking into account the developments in other (nation) states. In these histories, the states are thought as sovereign masters of their own development. Parliamentary procedures and modes of government are means to this end. Today, however, governance in Europe is often conceptualized in various different ways; as manifested e.g. by the Lisbon Treaty, European integration comprises of multiple sites of politics, and the member states as well as the EU aspire to realize common goals often by non-parliamentary means.

Against this background, it is reasonable to reconsider past and present parliamentarism. What does parliamentarism mean in today’s Europe characterized e.g. by long parliamentary traditions on the one hand, and deep levels of integration and the central role of judicial institutions and procedures on the other hand? How are the distinct parliamentary procedures and institutions perceived and activated in academic and political debates today? What are the focal points in national and international (EU, IPU) discussions on parliamentarism? What differences and developments are there in this regard?

Moreover, what challenges does e.g. the multi-layered EU system of governance pose to parliamentarism? Do these challenges signify a turning-point in the history of parliamentarism, or perhaps but old practices concealed in partly new vocabularies? What insights would novel approaches and perspectives offer into past and present parliamentarism? The workshop endeavors to discuss these kinds of questions in various historical contexts from the perspective of conceptual history and rhetoric. The importance of historical analyses will be emphasized. For the workshop we expect different types of papers, such as:

- historical studies on parliaments and parliamentarism in single countries or in a comparative perspective
- rhetorical studies on the history of parliamentary debates in both diachronic and synchronic perspectives
- studies on conceptual disputes on the meaning, range and value of parliamentarism in parliamentary and scholarly debates
- studies on the political relevance of parliaments to modern democracies.

To allow participation of interested non-Nordic colleagues, the language of the workshop will be English.

Tapani Turkka
University of Jyväskylä
P.O. Box 35 (MaB)
FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä
Finland
tapani.turkka@uta.fi

Jussi Kurunmäki
Stockholm University
SE-10691 Stockholm
Sweden
jussi.kurunmaki@statsvet.su.se

Political communication: antecedents, contents and effects of political information

Today's societies have been labeled mediatized and the relationship between journalism, politics and citizens is allegedly driven by media-logic. It is evident that many citizens do not have extensive first-hand experiences or engagement with the political arena. For them, and also for those that are engaged in political discussions, the media play a crucial role as channel of communication, source of information, and in crystallizing opinions and changing attitudes and behavior.

In very general terms, political science has tended to downplay the role of the media and information for the development of attitudes and behavior, despite evidence showing that the media can have significant effects. Communication science and media studies have tended to focus in particular on the media themselves and less on the political context and implications of the media. In the recent years there is a renewed interest in issues of political communication, triggered by developments in political campaigning, with an increasing level of professionalization and importance of news management, by developments in the media, with increasing market competition and new technologies, and by developments in the electorate showing signs of increasing political dissatisfaction and electoral volatility.

In the Nordic countries research agendas have emerged in both communication science and political science departments. It is the explicit goal of this workshop to bring together social scientists working on issues of political communication. We will welcome paper proposals that deal with the *antecedents* and conditions of political news and actor-controlled political information, papers dealing with *contents* and systematic features of news and political information, and papers dealing with the *effects* of the media and mediated political information on attitudes, opinions and behavior.

The workshop takes a starting point in the Nordic countries – focusing on new research agendas and changes in political communication – but is explicitly open for international scholars.

Claes de Vreese

Syddansk Universitet and
University of Amsterdam
Netherlands
c.h.devreese@uva.nl

Jesper Stromback

Mid Sweden University
Sweden
jesper.stromback@miun.se

Rune Slothuus

Aarhus University
Denmark
slothuus@ps.au.dk

Politics & expertise

In the last decade, there has been an increasing demand for “evidence-based” policymaking. Good science is regarded as essential for addressing complex problems and for managing rapid technological change. At the same time, the authority of scientists and science appears to have become more contested. Professional monopolies over scientific discourse have weakened, sometimes being challenged by the rise of a new “citizen science.” Are we witnessing the “scientization” of politics or the “politicization” of science or both? This workshop proposes to explore this changing and sometimes troubled relationship between politics and expertise. The workshop will focus on four broad and interrelated questions:

- 1) What factors and trends are driving the relationship between politics and expertise? These drivers might include such factors as globalization, rapid technological change, increasingly complex interdependence, pluralization, the knowledge society, the risk society, the rise of the internet, etc.
- 2) How is expert knowledge being used to make and implement public policy? Science may be used to legitimize political decisions based primarily on values and interests. Or experts may actually be shaping political agendas. The relationship between politics and expertise will surely vary by policy area and by country, but some general findings may be possible.
- 3) What are the implications of expert knowledge for democratic theory? For some scholars, the increasing importance of expert knowledge may raise the specter of “technocracy,” where scientists become unelected and often unaccountable policymakers. Other scholars argue that it is reasonable to ask from decision-makers that they do not ignore relevant information, thereby focusing on how expert knowledge can be fruitfully integrated into deliberative democracy. Still others will ask how citizens use and understand expert knowledge.
- 4) What kind of expert knowledge is useful to policy-makers? In the social sciences, in particular, there is often a large gap between expert knowledge and policy-relevant knowledge. Why is this the case? Is this because social scientific knowledge is especially contested and because social scientists have weak scientific authority? Or is it because policy-relevant knowledge is so contextual? Different models have been proposed for how social scientists should engage with policy-makers. How do these different models work in practice? Increasingly, these concerns may be as relevant for the natural sciences as they are for social sciences.

The workshop organizers invite participation from scholars working across a range of policy areas and utilizing diverse methods and perspectives.

Shirin Ahlbäck Öberg
Uppsala University
Sweden
shirin.ahlback@statsvet.uu.se

Christopher Ansell
UC Berkeley
USA
cansell@berkeley.edu

Politics of history

While it has been suggested that Western democracies have entered a post-historical age the fall of the Berlin wall being the defining event, others consider the post Berlin wall period as a particularly historical period characterised by new interpretations of the key events in European history. In both viewpoints, however, the presence of the past in contemporary societies is a recognised feature in politics and political research.

In relation to the extensive projects studying the historical consciousness on the level of national populations carried out in the U.S., Australia, Canada and Finland during the past ten years, the workshop aims to discuss the relationship between history and politics from various angles such as memory laws of various countries, the political uses of history in the public sphere, the role of history teaching and history writing in political socialisation, and societal generations, understood in Mannheimian sense to refer to a group of people who have faced certain 'key experiences' during their formative years. One of the key concepts is historical consciousness which is regarded as the linkage between the past, present and future. The interest is not so much on what people know about history but on what they think has happened in the past and how the understanding concerning the past is related to the views and attitudes on present and future when considering such issues as immigration, globalisation and economy.

The workshop invites papers discussing for instance the role of history and historical consciousness in politics. Papers related to uses of the past in contemporary societies as well as methodological contributions and papers presenting the results of the various national projects are warmly welcomed.

Klas-Göran Karlsson

Department of History

Lund University

Box 2074

SE-220 02 Lund

Sweden

klas-goran.karlsson@hist.lu.se

Pilvi Torsti

Department of Political and Economic Studies

University of Helsinki

PB 54

FI-00014 University of Helsinki

Finland

pilvi.torsti@helsinki.fi

Sovereignty in the making: emerging forms of state formation and political authority

While the issue of ‘failed’ and ‘fragile’ states has received considerable attention during the last decade, the existence of territorial polities without juridical sovereignty has not attracted equally sustained focus. However, throughout the world, there are several specific sites and processes of contested or attempted sovereignty – what we call ‘sovereignty in the making’. Sovereignty in the making refers to the sets of practices of statecraft that cumulatively comprise attempts to achieve juridical sovereignty. Sites of contested sovereignty fall into four basic categories: existing polities that are making new or pressing old territorial claims, but lack international recognition (e.g. Somaliland); old states that are in a state of prolonged collapse but still are considered sovereign entities (e.g. Somalia); unitary states that are (re)configured into federal arrangements that ‘split’ sovereignty between two or more entities, often as a response to civil war (e.g. Sudan/South Sudan) or to civic claims for self-determination (e.g. Tanzania/Zanzibar); and seemingly chronic civil war situations related, at least in part, to unrealised sovereignty claims (e.g. Eastern Congo; Northern Mali).

The existence of political and territorial entities without recognised international sovereignty poses a challenge to the management of international relations. Yet no less important is the question of what sovereignty – or its absence – does to the lives of people inhabiting environments of such uncertainty. However, there have been few efforts to understand the complex and multifarious ways in which people living in sites of contested sovereignty attempt to govern themselves. This working group session aims to start filling this gap by bringing together papers and presenters that fills this gap by studying how sovereignty is crafted in various contexts. The papers will develop new theoretical insights to further the understanding of the complex and overlapping linkages between juridical and empirical sovereignty, as well as shedding on how people’s lives and social relations are affected by attempts to construct sovereignty.

Morten Bøås

Fafo
P.O. Box 2947 Tøyen
NO-0608 Oslo
Norway
morten.boas@fafo.no

Karin Dokken

Department of Political Science
University of Oslo
P.O. Box 1097
NO-0317 Oslo
Norway
karin.dokken@stv.uio.no

The dynamics of the policies of care: institutions, interests and tensions

The care of children, the elderly and the disabled is a well established part of the Nordic welfare state, particularly when compared to other European countries. The policies of care are also high on the political agenda not least because of demographic changes.

From the perspective of political science, the policies of care are an interesting field of research: it is characterised by a specific set of institutions and type of actors, which in turn produces a range of tensions.

1. The policies of care to a large extent take place at the local level, while policies are also embedded in a national welfare state. This leads to tensions between local and national levels and between the specific and the universalistic.
2. The policies of care encompass both the formal, for example the regulation of care services, and the informal, for example the support of care in the family. As such, the policies of care are about tensions between the responsibilities of the state and society and also concern the societal division of labour between women and men.
3. The policies of care are subject to a specific type of interest politics, as the interests of citizens often are not very well organized. Instead, interests are represented by 'proxy actors' such as professions and service providers and this leads to tensions between direct and indirect representations of interests.

The workshop is inviting contributions, which analyse specific aspects of the policies of care and their dynamics, and thereby help to explore this emerging field of research from both empirical and theoretical perspectives.

Viola Burau

Department of Political Science
University of Aarhus
Bartholins Alle
DK-8000 Aarhus
Denmark
viola@ps.au.dk

Signy Irene Vabo

Department of Social Science
University College Oslo
P.O. Box 4, St Olavs Plass
NO-0130 Oslo
Norway
signy.vabo@sam.hio.no

The Nordic gender and welfare models in transition

Numerous studies including the books *Unfinished Democracy* and *Equal Democracies* have concluded that the gender equality and welfare policies of the Nordic countries share common characteristics. They have given women a political voice, and they have adopted policies that facilitate the reconciliation of work and family. The role of men and the rights of fathers have also become part of the political agenda. These developments have been stimulated by policy learning and contacts between feminist organizations and civil servants that has become institutionalized in Nordic cooperation.

During the past decades, critical voices have challenged the notion of Nordic gender equality models. This has been done in several ways.

- The gender equality models have been criticized for benefiting white middle class women ignoring differences between women (and between men)
- Some scholars have argued that the countries fare better in terms of policies of redistribution than in policies of recognition of cultural differences or rights to bodily integrity (including violence against women)
- Many studies have demonstrated that the Nordic labour markets are strongly gender segregated and the pay gaps between women and men have persisted
- It has been demonstrated that there are distinct differences between the countries in terms of their discourses on gender and diversity, as well as their policy logics concerning gender equality.

We invite papers that approach these issues and challenges that the Nordic gender equality models are facing. Is it still possible to talk about a Nordic model of gender equality or are they characterized by different trajectories? What challenges does the transnational framework including the EU and the UN pose for notions of gender equality and policies in the countries? What policy solutions have the countries put forward to tackle the new challenges, such as intersectionality, and how do these diverge or converge? Have there been internal challenges, such as the men's rights movement, that have questioned Nordic gender equality policies? How have the Nordic women's movements responded to these developments?

We welcome, in particular, comparative papers focussing at differences and similarities within the Nordic countries.

Anette Borchorst
Aalborg University
Department of Economics, Politics
and Public Administration
Fibigerstræde 2
DK-9220 Aalborg Ø
Denmark
ab@epa.aau.dk

Johanna Kantola
University of Helsinki
Department of Political and Economic
Studies
P.O.Box 54
FI-000014 University of Helsinki
Finland
johanna.kantola@helsinki.fi

The politics of party leadership change: criteria for party leadership challenges and impacts on political outcomes

Scholarly searching for criteria for new challengers of party leadership have drawn extremely limited attention. A.O. Hirsman's terminology of exit, voice and loyalty of party members as effective means of actions has been used as a tool for challengers' possible options. Previous studies touched upon either criteria of party leadership challenge or causes to leadership challenge as a form of "voice" of dissident leaders within parties. Findings from studies of the British and Danish left parties indicate that party members who successfully make use of the opportunity for voice in party conference run as main source of challenging forces with their parties. Case study from New Zealand points out that main criteria of party challengers comprise of elective, policy or unity dimensions. This workshop aims at touching upon extended views of party leadership changes including patterns of party leadership changes, causes to party leadership challenge, criteria of challengers, as well as effects of leadership changes in terms of both internal and external party relationship. The workshop aims at drawing scholarly attention in theoretical and methodological approaches in terms of 1) party leadership formation, 2) conditions and needs of power shift within political parties, 3) criteria for successful party leadership change, 4) electoral outcome of leadership change and 5) theory-building in party leadership change and power formation in representative democracy. Equal priority will be given both to comparative studies of the Nordic countries and to case study of Western democracies. In this workshop papers with theoretical and empirical ambitions are evenly welcome.

Yonhyok Choe

Department of Political Science
School of Social Sciences
Södertörn University
SE-141 89 Huddinge
Sweden
yonhyok.choe@sh.se

Jenny Madestam

Department of Political Science
Stockholm University
SE-106 91 Stockholm
Sweden
jenny.madestam@statsvet.su.se