

Lisbon 2009

Joint Sessions of Workshops

ISCTE 14-19 April

FCT
Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia



CIES
CENTRO DE INVESTIGAÇÃO E ESTUDOS DE SOCIOLOGIA

CENTRO DE INVESTIGAÇÃO E ESTUDOS DE SOCIOLOGIA

ICS
INSTITUTO DE CIÊNCIAS POLITICAS

INSTITUTO DE CIÊNCIAS POLITICAS

European Consortium for Political Research

ecpr



For more information please contact ECPR Central Services

T + 44 (0) 1206 872501

E ecpr@essex.ac.uk

W www.ecprnet.org

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.

Applications: Prospective participants should contact the director/s of the workshop in which they are interested in the first instance, bearing in mind that they will be expected to present a paper and should, therefore, be conducting advanced research in that particular area. An application to participate should include a short summary of the proposed paper, with an explanation as to how this will fit into the general theme of the workshop. 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 2008

Venue: The Joint Sessions of Workshops in 2009 will be hosted by four institutions: Centre for Research and Studies in Sociology (CIES-ISCTE); University Institute for Social Sciences Business Studies and Technologies (ISCTE); Institute for Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon (ICS) and Portuguese Political Science Association (APCP). All conference facilities (registration, book exhibition, information desk) and workshops will take place at the main building of ISCTE. The address is: Edifício ISCTE, Av. Das Forças Armadas 1649-026 LISBOA PORTUGAL

Timetable: Participants should arrive and register on Tuesday, 14 April, after 14:00 hrs. Workshops will begin on Wednesday, 15 April at 0900 hrs. and will end on Sunday, 19 April at 1700 hrs.

On Wednesday and Thursday (15 and 16 April), the Joint Sessions will run for the first time a Workshop Directors' Forum, in which one Director of each workshop will be asked to make a 15 minute presentation to a wider audience (graduate students, journalists, public in general). This event is subject to confirmation.

On Saturday, 18 April, the ECPR's Council will meet to discuss general policy and planning of the ECPR. Executive Committee members and the ECPR Directors will present reports and members may raise items for discussion. An election for members of the Executive Committee will also take place.

Social Programme: The (provisional) social programme includes a dinner for workshop directors and others involved in the organisation of the Joint Sessions on Tuesday, 14 April, the official opening on Wednesday 15 April, followed by a reception to be hosted by the Mayor of Lisbon. The Stein Rokkan Lecture will be presented on Thursday, 16 April by José Manuel Barroso (to be confirmed), followed by a reception at ISCTE, University of Lisbon. On Friday, 17 April, there will be a dinner for all Council members, Executive Committee members and ECPR staff.

Accommodation & Excursions: A specialist agency will handle all hotel reservations and bookings for excursions. The Internet address will soon be advertised.

Transportation: Participants who fly should plan to arrive at Lisbon airport. The Turismo de Lisboa counter, located in the arrivals hall is very helpful. The taxi stand is right in front of the main exit. We suggest participants take a taxi, since Lisbon airport is very central. The taxi ride should not take more than 15-20 minutes (and costs around 8-10 euros). The best way to ensure that you are charged a fair rate is to get a "taxi voucher" at the Turismo de Lisboa counter. The price of the voucher depends on the distance of the trip and on the type of service required: normal or personalized (in the former, the driver is trained to speak foreign languages and acts as tourist guide). At the Turismo de Lisboa counter you can also get the "Lisboa Card" which gives you free access to all public transportation (buses, trams, lifts, underground and trains to Sintra and Cascais), free entrance in museums and monuments, and discounts of up to 50% in other places of interest (<http://www.askmelisboa.com/intro.php>). Further logistic information will be updated on the ECPR site.

Finance and Conference Fees: Where no other source of finance is available, the ECPR will contribute toward the travel and accommodation costs of participants from full (not associate) ECPR member institutions. The exact amount reimbursed varies from year to year, depending on the overall budget and the number of people making a claim. Further information on reimbursement will be available on our website early February 2009. Unfortunately, it is not possible to extend support to non-ECPR participants who are, in addition, required to pay a conference fee of £300 in advance.

Further information: A more detailed outline of each workshop will be available on the ECPR web site together with updated day-by-day programme of events at <http://www.ecprnet.org>.

WORKSHOPS

1. Moral values, cultural change, and post-materialism in Europe and north America

Directors:

Edward Ashbee (Copenhagen Business School); Email: ea.ikk@cbs.dk
Alex Waddan (University of Leicester); Email: aw148@leicester.ac.uk

Much has been said about the abandonment of traditional moral norms, “post-materialism” and the secularization process. Although there are significant variations between countries and the clusters of countries that have been constructed on the basis of data from the World Values Survey, few have challenged the conclusion that there has been “a systematic erosion of religious practices, values and beliefs” rooted in growing material security and the systematic elimination of the “physical, societal and personal risks” that formerly laid the basis for faith and adherence to strict and unyielding moral codes, (see, for example, Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart, *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004). From this perspective the United States is an outlier insofar as industrialisation and material progress seem to have done relatively little to shake religious faith or moral traditionalism. Indeed, despite the constitutional separation of church and state in the US, faith-based organizations campaign directly in the political arena so as to promote explicit value agendas.

This workshop has a threefold purpose. Firstly, it will consider the degree to which calls for moral orthodoxy and “family values” and faith-based agendas play a part in shaping the political process, mass opinion and cultural perceptions within the individual countries of Europe and north America. Secondly, the workshop will seek to draw cross-national comparisons so as to identify the relative importance of particular variables in determining the extent to which moral values play a part in structuring the political and cultural life of a country. Thirdly, the workshop will, on the basis of this, seek to throw critical light on theoretical constructs such as post-materialism and the secularization thesis as well as the assumptions that underpin them.

2. Civil Society Dynamics Under Authoritarian Rule

Directors:

Francesco Cavatorta (Dublin City University/University of Southern Denmark);
Email: francesco.cavatorta@dcu.ie
Ellen Lust-Okar (Yale University); Email: ellen.lust-okar@yale.edu

The purpose of this panel is to examine the theoretical and comparative perspectives on civil society activism under authoritarian constraints and offer a better understanding of its relationship with regime change. The literature on civil society contends that civil activism and vibrancy do not only help in sustaining democracy, but are a vital factor in explaining processes of democratisation. The cases of eastern European and Latin American transitions are often cited to substantiate the latter claim. More recently however the theoretical and empirical bases of these claims have been severely questioned. In particular, it seems that civil society activism in authoritarian

states has very different dynamics from the one in established democracies. In addition, there seem to be radical temporal and regional variations in the impact that civil society has on authoritarian systems. Understanding whether and how this is the case and what kind of differences might exist between diverse authoritarian regimes will provide a clearer understanding of the concept of civil society and will also lead to better policy-making formulation in light of current international strategies of democratisation. This panel intends to examine these issues through both theoretical and empirical papers.

3. Why Electoral Reform? The Determinants, Policy and Politics of Changing Electoral Systems

Directors:

Monique Leyenaar (Nijmegen, Radboud University); Tel:, +31 24 3613067; Fax: +31 24 361 2379; Email: m.leyenaar@fm.ru.nl
Reuven Y. Hazan (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Tel: +972 2 588 1117; Fax: +972 2 588 1333; Email: mshazan@huji.ac.il

This workshop seeks to shed light on the causes and determinants of electoral reform. In other words, why does the debate on electoral reform occur at all, when does it happen and what forms does it take?

Electoral reform is a growing phenomenon that requires explanation but is still uncharted territory in political science. Outside the vast literature on electoral systems and their political consequences, little attention has been devoted to why electoral systems have recently undergone substantial change in several advanced liberal democracies, while in other countries the topic has been placed on the national agenda or is seriously being discussed beyond academic circles. Why has a change of the democratic rules of the game become acceptable after decades of treating electoral systems as fixed elements in stable democracies?

We are interested in papers dealing with empirical research into the actual reasons for the (debate on) electoral reform and the question of who took the initiative. Where does the initiative come from – parliament, government, NGOs, citizens? Is there a relation between party family and certain reforms? Do reforms expand the influence of citizens? Can we explain the current wave of having a group of randomly selected citizens come up with a plan for reform? We welcome theoretical papers linking electoral reform to different ideas on democracy, such as representative, direct, participatory or deliberative, or relating them to different views on representation. Another type of paper may focus on the discourse of E-democracy, and more specifically the role of ICT in promoting electoral reform and/or defining the alternatives.

4. Generational Politics: The Political-Sociological and Policy Consequences of Population Ageing

Directors:

Achim Goerres (Universität zu Köln); Tel: +49 (0) 221 470 2763, Fax: +49 (0) 221 470 2069;

Email: agoerres@uni-koeln.de

Pieter Vanhuyse (University of Haifa); Tel: +972 547 682 974; Fax: +972 482 40 911;

Email: pietervanhuyse@gmail.com

Most of the advanced capitalist democracies are currently experiencing accelerated population ageing. This phenomenon can be expected to have far-reaching social and political and public policy consequences. Population aging poses new challenges and opportunities for policy-makers and it may alter the basic templates of distributional politics in these societies. The key question of this workshop is, therefore: to what extent are generational politics, politics and policies with generational implications different in ageing societies than in other contexts? Papers are invited on all major conceptual and empirical aspects of the political and/or public policy implications of ageing societies. We strongly encourage papers that address the issue from an internationally comparative viewpoint and that pay careful attention to spelling out the causal mechanisms at work in the politics-policy nexus, as well as the mediating effects of institutions. We are interested especially in the following themes:

1. Policy constraints, institutions and advanced welfare states e.g. what are feasible policy reforms in ageing welfare states?
2. Comparative analysis of the political consequences of ageing in “young” and “old” societies e.g. to what extent are the consequences of ageing in relatively young societies different from those present in relatively old societies?
3. Aging and intergenerational relationships e.g. what set of policies are desirable and feasible to generate intergenerational justice?
4. Emergence and adaptation strategies of political actors: e.g. how does population aging affect the logic of political conflict and the behaviour and strategies of political actors on the supply and on the demand sides?

5. Professionalisation and Individualised Collective Action: Analysing New ‘Participatory’ Dimensions in Civil Society

Directors:

Jan Van Deth (Universität Mannheim); Tel: +49 621 181 2098; Fax: +49 621 181 2099;

Email: jvdeth@uni-mannheim.de

William Maloney (University of Newcastle); Tel: +44 191 222 5289; Fax: +44 191 222 5069;

Email: william.maloney@ncl.ac.uk

Advanced democracies are ‘plagued’ by the complex problem of basing political decisions on the active engagement of citizens and citizens’ organisations. While concurrently groups around citizens prefer to be passive spectators, or use the market and other seemingly private or non-political arenas as venues for action. The conventional activist – a regular citizen engaged in voluntary associations and collective decision-making – seems to have been replaced by ephemeral or

episodic democratic monitors. Although the benefits of an active citizenry appear great, the reality is that most citizens don’t find political involvement attractive and very willing and positively embrace a marginal role in organised politics. Instead, citizens increasingly leave the floor to professional associations and opt for individualised modes of collective action. This workshop aims to address several issues at the core of this development: the rise of cheque book participation, the growing attractiveness of individualised forms of participation, the increasing relevance of professional expertise, and the economics of interest groups activities. The workshop is open to all scholars with an interest in assessing the changing political involvements of citizens and the changing contribution of civil society organisations to democracy (i.e., those working in the fields of participation, social capital, interest groups, social movements, professionalisation, or democratic theory).

6. Political Normativity: Conceptual and Normative Issues

Directors:

Peter Niesen (Darmstadt Technische Universität); Tel: +49 6151 162 142; Fax: +49 6151 164 602; Email: Niesen@pg.tu-darmstadt.de

Rainer Forst (Frankfurt, Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität); Tel: +49 69 798 22 046; Fax: +49 69 798 22 155; Email: forst@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Traditionally, studies of political normativity have focussed on the character of political decisions as “collectively binding”. However, developments in political theory have put pressure on all features of Weber’s famous account. We propose to discuss the implications of this under the three headings of scope, type, and source of political normativity. Some recent studies have concentrated on the scope of political normativity, concentrating on what the relevant collective is to which political norms are to apply (all-affected- vs. all-subjected-principle, territoriality vs. sectorality, moral standing vs. community membership). In debating justice, both “political” and “cosmopolitical” conceptions purport to deliver norms of a politically binding character and not just moral principles. As to the type of political norms, traditional accounts have linked their binding character to the existence of credible threats. However, deliberative approaches to decision-making and studies in governance have produced understandings of political norms that are not necessarily tied to a sanctioning force. Yet this again may blur the lines between politics and ethics. Finally, an ongoing debate concerns the source of validity of political norms. Philosophical authors have argued that there is one and only one source of normativity, while political theorists have tended to the view that admitting various co-existing sources of normativity is constitutive of political normativity. The workshop invites contributions from political theory, both continental and analytic, with a focus on domestic or international/cosmopolitan issues.

7. The Politics of Governance Architectures: Institutions, Power, and Public Policy in the EU Lisbon Strategy

Directors:

Susana Borrás (Copenhagen Business School); Tel: +45 38 15 35 68; Fax: +45 38 15 35 55; Email: sb.cbp@cbs.dk

Claudio Radaelli (University of Exeter); Tel: +44 1392 263 176; Fax: +44 1392 263 305; Email: C.Radaelli@exeter.ac.uk

The Lisbon strategy for growth and jobs (launched by the Spring Council of March 2000) is the most important political initiative of the European Union (EU). Most of the scholarly work on the Lisbon strategy, however, is based on either the economic outcome of individual policies or on a specific mode of governance, that is, the Open Method of Coordination. Very little work has been done on explaining the emergence of the Lisbon strategy, the role of different EU institutions and Member States in the 'initial framing' and subsequent re-definition of its main aims through time, the interplay between different modes of governance in individual policies and across policies, the institutional-administrative effects brought about by Lisbon innovations and the new forms of interaction between the EU and Member States.

With this workshop, we turn to a governance perspective to analyse the politics of the Lisbon strategy. We will bring a wide range of theoretical approaches to bear on the analysis of the politics of the Lisbon strategy. The workshop will attract theoretical and empirical papers on the macro-politics of EU integration, comparative public policy and public administration, international relations, modes of governance, institutional analysis, the politics of problem definition and agenda setting, discourse analysis, the Europeanisation of national policies, and, power and distributional politics in the EU context.

8. Party Government and Parliamentary Democracy in the New Europe

Directors:

Hans Keman (Amsterdam, Vrije University); Tel: +31 20 598 6852; Fax: +31 20 598 6820; Email: je.keman@fsw.vu.nl

Ferdinand Müller-Rommel (Universität Lüneburg); Tel: +49 4131 677 2486; Fax: +49 4131 677 2474; Email: muero@uni-lueneburg.de

The study of party government is among the core themes within comparative politics. Particularly in Europe, the comparative analysis of party government has been on the research agenda for long. The workshop aims - among other things - on assessing the various extant approaches to the study of representative government. In addition, its concepts and extant data in relation to the performances of European democracies in east and west Europe are in need of further attention. Finally, the workshop provides an opportunity to explore new theoretical avenues, modes of analysis and related evidence to develop the study of party government further and across more democracies in Europe.

This workshop sets out to do this by inviting comparativists active or interested in this field. Among its aims are: taking stock of extant theoretical approaches and related comparative data

as well as the introduction of fresh approaches, new evidence, and case-based, cross-system and cross-time analyses of the structuration and behaviour of party government across the whole of Europe. In particular the relationship between parliamentary democracy and party government is an important dimension to consider. The workshop invites papers on the following topics in particular:

The formation process of coalition government and multi-party system dynamics.
Types of government and variations in ideological composition and party representation.
Consequences of government termination and patterns of democratic (in)stability.
Executive/Legislative relations and the room for manoeuvre of party government.
The role of political elites and organized interests in the functioning of party government.
Policy seeking behaviour and related performances of democratic party government.
Assessing existing data collections of party government and further developments.

The type of papers that are welcomed ought to cover one or more of the topics outlined as well as be of a comparative nature. Obviously the area of research is Europe (east and west). Finally, papers confronting theory and evidence are particularly welcome.

9. The Role of Transnational Experts in European Integration: Recharging the Debate

Directors:

Angela Wigger (Nijmegen, Radboud University); Tel: +31(0) 24 3611978, Fax: +31(0) 24 3612379; Email: a.wigger@fm.ru.nl

Hubert Buch-Hansen (Copenhagen Business School); Tel: +45 (0) 3815 3324 Fax: +45 (0) 3815 3840; Email: hbh.ikl@cbs.dk

The workshop seeks to contribute to the understanding of the politics of expertise in EU agenda setting, policy-making processes and governance, in particular with regard to transnational expert communities. It provides a platform for discussion on the various roles experts and expert knowledge play in the EU integration trajectory, cutting through diverse policy fields and political agencies. The issue of transnational private expert knowledge and the multi-faceted roles expert play in the policy process constitute a crucial point of debate for European Integration scholars. The transnational character of these expert committees or groups, most notably their interlinkages with global policy networks and their shared cognitive and value schemes, render them an important instance of political agency in the EU.

The workshop invites researchers working on topics linked to the politics of expertise in EU policy making and governance. The objective of the workshop is to go beyond generic discussions on the politics of expertise by recharging the debate between various perspectives, both from an IR as well as an EU studies perspective, on the role of expert knowledge on the basis of recent empirical studies. It seeks to engage scholars from a variety of sub-disciplines such as (but not exclusively) comparative politics, international relations, political sociology, critical political economy, political psychology, and European Union studies more generally with a focus on regulatory governance.

10. The Politics of Skill Formation: Institutions, Actors, and Change

Directors:

Marius R. Busemeyer (Köln, Max Planck Institute); Tel: +49 221 276 7166; Fax: +49 221 276 7555; Email: busemeyer@mpifg.de

Christine Trampusch (Universität Bern); Tel: +41 31 631 3750, Fax: +41 31 631 8590; Email: christine.trampusch@ipw.unibe.ch

Despite the recent upsurge of interest in skill formation expressed by policy-makers, scholars of political science have long neglected the study of the politics behind systems of skill formation. The goal of the workshop is to close this research gap. With a special focus on post-secondary education (vocational training, higher education, and lifelong learning), the workshop pursues two goals:

1. To establish and develop a typology of skill regimes that is sensitive towards institutional complementarities between skill formation, labour markets, industrial relations and the welfare state. Building on established typologies like “Varieties of Capitalism”, “worlds of welfare capitalism” and “families of nations”, we would like to enhance significantly our understanding of skill regimes and their underlying institutions and political coalitions.

2. To understand and assess the degree of change that systems of skill formation are going through in the wake of de-industrialisation, liberalisation and internationalisation of economies. In particular, we are interested in finding out whether processes of change in skill regimes are driven by endogenous (domestic politics) or exogenous (globalisation, EU) forces and whether we can observe convergence or continued divergence across the OECD world.

The workshop would like to contribute to the establishment of a particular political science perspective on education and skill formation. We welcome papers from different theoretical and empirical perspectives (qualitative case studies, historical analyses, quantitative micro and macro level studies).

11. The EU in the World Economy

Directors:

Andreas Dür (Dublin, University College); Tel: +353 1 716 8387; Fax: +353 1 716 1171; Email: Andreas.Duer@ucd.ie

Manfred Elsig (Universität Bern, World Trade Institute); Tel: +41 31 631 5495; Fax: +41 31 631 3660; Email: manfred.elsig@wti.org

The EU is an influential player in the global economy due to its economic weight and the internal coordination of foreign economic policies. However, research on the EU's foreign economic relations is fragmented across different sub-fields of political economy. Only little attention has been paid to the interactions between the various aspects of the EU's foreign economic relations (for example, trade policy, monetary policy, competition policy, global taxation issues, financial markets and financial stability, and development policy). The workshop attempts to capture the nature of the EU as a key actor in the world economy by overcoming this shortcoming in the literature. Across the various policy fields, the workshop aims to cover the following major topics:

1.) Preference formation: what is the relative weight of geopolitical interests, interest group pressures, and norms and ideas in shaping EU preferences on foreign economic policies?

2.) Bargaining strategies and tactics in international economic negotiations: what strategies and tactics does the EU use to achieve its objectives in international economic negotiations? How does the EU's negotiating behaviour compare to the one of other entities in the global economy?

3.) Bargaining power: how much power does the EU have in international economic relations? Does the EU's bargaining power vary across policy areas?

4.) The EU in international economic organisations: what role does the EU play in international economic organisations, such as the World Trade Organisation? How does it interact with other international economic organisations (such as the IMF and the World Bank), standard setting organisations (such as the Codex Alimentarius and the Basle Committee), and plurilateral clubs (such as the G7/G8)?

We are interested in papers that approach these questions and the field of EU foreign economic relations in general from different theoretical angles and using different methodologies.

12. Governing Religious Differences at the Intersection of Gender and Ethnicity

Directors:

Sieglinde Rosenberger/Birgit Sauer (University of Vienna);

Email: sieglinde.rosenberger@univie.ac.at; birgit.sauer@univie.ac.at

Petra Rostock (Berlin, Freie Universität); Tel: +49 (0)30 838 57 030;

Email: prostock@zedat.fu-berlin.de

In the last decade religious, ethnic and cultural differences have become highly contested issues in many European countries. Particularly, the presence of Islam as a “migrating” religion has been on the political and academic agenda for some time now. Conflicts have evolved around issues such as wearing Muslim headscarves in public institutions, and so called traditional violence against women, as for example female circumcision and arranged or forced marriage. Some of these conflicting issues did not only trigger heated debates but also have been leading to a wide range of policy action across European countries as for instance bans of headscarves in public institutions, changes of laws for marriage abroad, and amendments of penal laws to punish genital cutting.

The contested issues reveal that public discussions and political responses to religious and ethnic differences and to the “crisis of multiculturalism” are deeply entangled with gender relations. Moreover, gender equality is often used as an argument against “other” cultures and ethnicities in order to show their lack of modernity.

The workshop wants to shift existing debates on multiculturalism, feminism and gender equality and give them a new spin by focusing on the governing of religious difference at the intersection of gender and ethnicity. Research questions will be: How is intersectionality constructed in policy debates? Which are the main factors that might explain differences and similarities in governing religious differences in European countries? Which democratic procedures have been developed to address the above mentioned issues?

13. Political Parties and Civil Society

Directors:

Elin H. Allern (Universitetet i Oslo); Tel: +47 23 08 61 55 (until August), +47 95 21 61 10 (mobile phone); Fax: +47 23 08 61 01, from August: +47 22 85 44 11; Email: elin.h.allern@socialresearch.no, from August: e.h.allern@stv.uio.no

Tim Bale (University of Sussex); Tel: +44 1273 87 3974; Fax: +44 1273 67 3563; Email: t.p.bale@sussex.ac.uk

The prime aim of this workshop is to explore the character of political parties' relationships with civil society and its organisations in liberal democracies, both across time and space. By civil society, we refer to the public sphere and a wide range of organisation types – from registered charities to business associations. We want to test the common wisdom that such relationships have atrophied and are withering away in established democracies. With the general development of political parties in the late 20th century towards more open and professionally driven structures, it is widely agreed that long-established links – like those between social democratic parties and trade unions – have declined in many cases. However, few have systematically studied the general party–interest group dyad empirically, either within or across countries. Moreover, we want to explore the conditions under which parties and interest groups choose to establish links, or opt for distance or separation, in liberal democracies.

Primarily, we aim to attract empirical papers, whether single case (country) studies or comparative cross-national treatments, including both old and new democracies. We anticipate that the workshop will bring together scholars working in the areas of party organisations, on the one hand, and those specialising in various types of civil society groups and organisations on the other.

14. Institutionalising Intersectionality: Comparative Analyses

Directors:

Hege Skjeie (Universitetet i Oslo); Tel: +47 228 55 191; Fax: +47 228 54 411; Email: hege.skjeie@stv.uio.no

Judith Squires (University of Bristol); Tel: +44 117 928 8239; Fax: +44 117 331 7500; Email: judith.squires@bris.ac.uk

The growing pressures on EU member states to address multiple inequalities have generated equality reviews in countries across Europe, with significant numbers of states changing their institutional arrangements for promoting equality. This workshop will document and evaluate the institutional and legal reforms underway in Europe in response to both the international human rights regime's prohibition on discrimination and Article 13 EC, which identifies six key strands as requiring measure to combat discrimination: sex, racial and ethnic origin, disability, age, religion and sexual orientation. It aims to deploy comparative analyses of current state-level reforms in the institutions designed to implement equality policies, within both EU member states and non member states, in order to evaluate the potential for 'institutionalising intersectionality'.

The various modifications to equality institutions underway are frequently accompanied by an

expectation that these changes will facilitate engagement with issues of intersectionality. This workshop considers whether this potential is likely to be realised. It will bring together legal, public policy, comparative political science and political theory scholars working through the analytical categories of gender, ethnicity, disability, religious belief, age, sexuality and their intersections, in order to: document the nature of the changes underway via detailed case studies; map the type and range of equality mechanisms being introduced via comparative analysis; develop initial typologies of equality institutions in relation to different political systems and citizenship models; and critically evaluate the potential of these various types of equality institutions to both deal with tensions between equality strands and address issues of intersectionality.

15. Voice and choice in health politics

Directors:

Patrick Hassenteufel (Institut d'Études Politiques de Rennes); Email: patrick.hassenteufel@free.fr
Hans Vollaard (Universiteit Leiden); Tel: +31 (0) 71 527 4673; Fax: +31(0)71 527 3 815; Email: vollaard@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

Over recent decades, citizens-patients in many Western countries have acquired (at least formally) more choice in health services and insurance due to more competition, privatisation or EU legislation. They have also been offered more opportunities to express their desires, grievances and concerns on health matters through patient empowerment policies. This workshop explores how changing choice and voice options in Western healthcare systems interacts as well as impacts on the emancipation, political loyalties and preferences of citizens-patients, on their power relationship with other health actors such as doctors and on the legitimacy of welfare states. Healthcare is the pre-eminent policy-area to explore the combined impact of market-oriented reforms and participatory policy-making, considering the number of possible combinations of choice and voice in one of the largest social-economic sectors and the political sensitivity in a diversity of systems. The empirical focus of the workshop is on the interaction and impact of voice and choice, and on the justification of 'voice and choice reforms' in Western health politics. Theoretically, the workshop seeks to advance a comparative and comprehensive framework to explain how the various reforms and developments in Western healthcare systems are interlinked and impact on power relationships in and legitimacy of healthcare systems. The workshop, therefore, welcomes empirical, historical and theoretical papers from scholars specialised in health issues, as well as in more general issues in political science such as citizenship, democratisation, legitimacy and market-state relations.

16. Political Information, Public Knowledge and Perceptions of Reality

Directors:

Toril Aalberg (Norwegian University of Science and Technology); Tel: +47 735 98359;
Fax: +47 735 95310; Email: toril.aalberg@svt.ntnu.no
Shanto Iyengar (Stanford University); Tel: +(1) 650 723 5509 Fax: +(1) 650 723 1808;
Email: siyengar@stanford.edu

Informed citizens are better citizens judged by the standards of democratic theory. They are more likely to participate in politics, to have meaningful, stable attitudes on issues, to link their interest with their attitudes and to choose political representatives who are consistent with their own attitudes. In order to express attitudes and act according to their self-interest, citizens need relevant and up to date information about current affairs. However, several scholars have questioned the quality and the form of information provided by the news media. Market mechanisms and news criteria are said to provide a poor information environment. The claim is that there is a rise of tabloid, soft news in television and a tendency for many newspapers to compete with television by shifting to shorter more entertaining and less fact-orienting stories. This workshop will focus on the political information given by the news media to the public, and how this information influences the public's knowledge and perception of political reality. The aim of the workshop is to contribute to the research agenda in two areas: (i) Does the information given by the news media vary across different media systems and types of media within these systems? (ii) Do variations between and/or within systems in news content influence political knowledge and public perception of political reality? The workshop will offer an arena for sharing and discussing the results of diverse empirical research on these topics. Contributions are invited from comparativists and country specialists and we particularly welcome papers which combine theoretical and empirical approaches.

17. European domestic societies in the face of European integration and globalisation

Directors:

Ben Rosamond (University of Warwick); Tel: +44 247 652 4461; Fax: +44 247 652 4221;
Email: b.j.rosamond@warwick.ac.uk
Kennet Lynggaard (Roskilde University); Tel: +45 4674 3206; Fax: +45 4674 3080;
Email: kennetl@ruc.dk

A recent, if rather disparate, turn in political economy scholarship has sought to link three broad themes: globalisation, European integration and change in European domestic societies. Diverse changes in European domestic societies commonly attributed to processes of globalisation and/or European integration include, for instance, the appearance of new modes of governance, the restructuring of political conflict and patterns of interest intermediation, the re-calibration of domestic identities, the infusion of neo-liberal ideas within domestic public administration and sectoral policies plus, in a reactive sense, the move towards a new politics of economic patriotism.

This workshop will be devoted to the analytical challenge of how these three processes can be examined in concert. What types of analytical strategy are appropriate for understanding the relationship between global market pressures, supranational governance and domestic socio-econom-

ic transformation? Do 'globalisation' and 'Europeanisation' constitute rival variables (perhaps mediated by institutions) that might explain domestic change? Is the growth of EU governance a local (European) embodiment of globalisation or a means to deliver globalisation within European space? What is the role of EU-level institutions, discourses and policies in mediating the domestic effects of processes of globalisation?

With the intention of drawing upon work from various theoretical starting points and empirical domains, the workshop has two overarching objectives:

1. to consider how European domestic societies respond to European integration and globalisation respectively and,
2. to examine how EU-level institutions, discourses and policies either facilitate or act as an 'antidote' to globalisation.

Papers are invited which approach the workshop themes from a range of theoretical perspectives including the study of 'varieties of capitalism', discourse analysis and institutional theory. Particularly welcome are case studies, cross-national comparisons and cross-sectoral comparative studies.

18. European Leaders and Democratic Elections

Directors:

Marina Costa Lobo (Lisboa, Instituto Ciências Sociais); Tel: +351 21 780 4774; Fax: +351 21 794 0274; Email: marina.costalobo@ics.ul.pt

John Curtice (University of Strathclyde); Tel: +44 141 548 4223; Fax: +44 141 552 5677;
Email: j.curtice@strath.ac.uk

It has been argued that evaluations of party leaders have become more important in determining both how individual people vote and the overall outcome of elections. This process can be regarded as part of a wider process of the presidentialisation of European democracies and to be the product of the declining influence of social structure and partisanship on voting behaviour.

However, the claim has been widely contested, is subject to considerable methodological dispute, and has been little tested beyond the confines of the consolidated democracies. Equally, whether leadership evaluations matter more for some kinds of voters than others has been little explored.

We welcome papers that examine whether the impact of leadership evaluations has become greater over time; the degree to which leaders control party strategies/ appeals; how far the impact of leader evaluations varies across the whole range of social and political contexts that exist in Europe; whether leader evaluations matter more for some kinds of voters than others; and the methodological difficulties involved in assessing this impact.

19. Studying the Political through Frame Analysis

Directors:

Merlijn Van Hulst (University of Tilburg); Tel: +31 (0)13 466 8198; Fax: +31 (0)13 466 8149
Email: M.J.vanHulst@uvt.nl

Dvora Yanow (Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit); Tel: +31 (0)20 598 6740; Fax: +31 (0)20 598 6765
Email: D.Yanow@fsw.vu.nl

Frame analysis has a long history in the political sciences. It looks at the way framing processes enable meaning-making by highlighting particular views of political and other social realities, while simultaneously occluding or downplaying other views. Frame analysis means looking for patterns in the way political actors collectively put forward particular views of the specific issues they are dealing with and the way(s) that contending frames can impede communication between or among policy-relevant groups.

This workshop intends to bring together a group of scholars working on policy frames and framing from various perspectives (including public policy, IR, and social movement studies) to elucidate their entailments from a theoretical perspective grounded in empirical research. The workshop will be a platform for discussion and debate concerning the strengths and weaknesses of current approaches and will help advance the methodology of frame analysis.

Papers can theorise a range of topics, from the understanding of frames and framing processes themselves, to “re-framing,” to the similarities and differences among frames, stories, narratives, metaphors, and the like. For example, frame analysis often involves a study of the uses of political language, specifically, and political symbolism, more widely. Moreover, frame analysis overlaps in important ways with work on metaphor analysis, narrative research, and discourse analysis. As the literature suggests, framing holds great promise as an analytic concept and approach or method, and the workshop potentially draws together political scientists from a wide range of fields and subject areas.

20. Parliaments, Parties and Politicians in Cyberspace

Directors:

Karina Kosiara-Pedersen (University of Copenhagen); Tel: +45 35 32 34 16; Fax: +45 35 32 33 99; Email: kp@ifs.ku.dk
Cristina Leston-Bandeira (University of Hull); Tel: +44 1482 466 618; Fax: +44 1482 466 208;
Email: c.c.leston-bandeira@hull.ac.uk

New information and communication technologies are increasingly applied within European representative democracies, affecting central institutions such as parties, parliaments and politicians. This workshop aims to focus on whether the application of these new technologies has had an impact on how representative democracy works. The purpose of the workshop is to assess not only how party organisations, parliaments and politicians in a wide range of European democracies apply the new technology when conducting their primary assignments but also, and primarily, to assess the reasons for and impact of this application. When assessing the reasons for

applying the new technology, we focus in particular on the relationship between institutional characteristics and online presence. When assessing the impact, we distinguish between internal and external consequences: We want to assess how the technology may have an impact on the kind and level of activity, the assignments taken on and fulfilled, and the organisational characteristics within these political institutions. Furthermore, we want to analyse how the application of the new technology changes the relationship between parties, parliaments and politicians on the one hand, and the electorate on the other. We welcome participants from political communication, legislative studies and party research and other researchers working within this field. We invite, in particular, participants analysing European countries so far not covered within this research field, as well as innovative contributions. We invite a mixture of papers, both comparative analyses and case studies, qualitative and quantitative studies as well as a combination thereof.

21. Promoting Internal Party Democracy: A Selling Point, A Serious Danger, Or A Redundant Exercise?

Directors:

Ruud Koole (Universiteit Leiden); Tel: +31 71 527 3936; Fax: +31 71 527 3815;
Email: koole@fsw.leidenuniv.nl
Pat Lyons (Czech Academy of Sciences); Tel: +420 221 183 563; Fax: +420 222 220 143;
Email: pat.lyons@soc.cas.cz

Political parties have been in decline for at least four decades and it seems reasonable to conclude that the ‘golden age’ of mass parties is now part of history. An importance consequence of the decline in party membership has been the loss of representativeness. Moreover, such changes have come with falling rates of partisanship and electoral participation. In short, the decline in the strength and status of political parties has coincided with what some have defined as a ‘democratic malady’ that affects both ‘old’ and ‘new’ liberal democratic states. However, political parties have not simply accepted their fate. They have tried to enhance their reputation among citizens by increasing the role and power of the grass-roots members within parties. The nature and extent of such programmes of renewal have varied considerably across country and over time. A central goal of this workshop is to evaluate whether such policies have been advantageous to parties in terms of increasing their membership and competitiveness in elections. At present, there is no consensus on what has been the impact of promoting internal party democracy.

22. The Political Economy of Labour Market Reforms in Advanced Capitalist Democracies

Directors:

Nikos Koutsiaras (University of Athens); Tel: +302 103 688 935; Fax: +302 103 688 935;

Email: nikkouts@hol.gr; nkoutsiar@pspa.uoa.gr

Sotiria Theodoropoulou (Dublin, Trinity College); Tel: +353 1896 2773; Fax: +353 1896 3939;

Email: theodors@tcd.ie (for queries); sotiriati@gmail.com (for abstracts)

Labour market reforms have been at the top of the policy agenda in advanced capitalist democracies since the 1980s. These countries have faced a number of structural pressures since the 1970s, including the slowdown in productivity growth, technological change, increased economic integration, particularly within the EU, de-industrialisation and tertiarisation. These pressures have called into question the effectiveness of economic and especially labour market policies and institutions, such as systems of collective wage bargaining and non-employment benefits, employment protection legislation and activation policies that were established during the 'Golden Era' in supporting good labour market performance. In spite of the largely common pressures, reform patterns have varied widely.

The purpose of this workshop is to bring together researchers in political economy with a special interest in labour market reforms in order to discuss theoretical and empirical contributions on how domestic and international political, social and economic institutions, norms and discourse have been shaping the patterns of labour market reforms in the light of the above pressures since the 1980s, especially those relating to the rise of the service sector and economic integration (including EMU and growing trade flows in services). The existing literature on the political economy of reforms has been abundant with hypotheses on these questions and one of the main interests of this workshop is to take stock of what empirical evidence can teach us about the validity of these hypotheses and any useful extensions that may be drawn thereof.

23. Empires of Norms and Law

Directors:

Michael Baurmann (Universität Düsseldorf); Email: baurmann@phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de

Nicholas Southwood (Australian National University); Email: nicholas.southwood@anu.edu.au

Politics involves the study of systematic power and authority in human affairs. One important context in which such power and authority are manifest is in the formal institutions of coercive law. But there is a second highly significant context in which power and authority are also manifest, namely, in the structures we call social norms. The first has received considerable attention from political theorists. Indeed, there is even a branch of political theory – jurisprudence – that is charged specifically with the task of investigating the kind of power and authority that law possesses (descriptive jurisprudence), and considering how and to what extent it helps realise, or might be made to help realise, things we have reason to want (normative jurisprudence). Norms, by contrast, have not received anything like the same kind of sustained attention, an omission that would seem to have the consequence of excluding a crucial part of the proper subject of political inquiry.

The aim of this workshop will be to bring together individuals from diverse perspectives in order to try to develop a better understanding of the kinds of power and authority manifest in social norms, and in what ways, and to what extent, they might they be made to help realise things that we have reason to want. We are particularly interested in papers that can help us develop a better understanding of the relation between norms and law: the different kinds of power and authority at issue; their respective strengths and weaknesses as regulatory tools; and how they do and ought to work alongside one another.

24. Theorising NATO

Directors:

Mark Webber (University of Loughborough); Tel: +44 1509 222996, +44 116 2214367; Fax: +44 1509 223917; Email: m.a.webber@lboro.ac.uk

Adrian Hyde-Price (University of Bath); Tel: +44 1225 383 50; Email: a.g.v.hyde-price@bath.ac.uk

NATO is commonly held to be a central institution of European security governance and the principal institution connecting Europe and North America. Despite this status, NATO has, within Europe, been subject to scholarly neglect and remains under-theorised in European scholarship. New approaches to security such as Critical Security Studies and the 'Copenhagen School' have not considered the Alliance in any depth, and while some work has occurred in a Social Constructivist vein, it has tended to focus on a single aspect of NATO, namely enlargement. The majority of NATO studies tend to be empirical, policy-oriented, and do not make a major theoretical claim. Those that are theoretically-inclined are often influenced by mainstream American liberal institutionalist and neo-realist interpretations with attendant limitations: a rationalist, positivist methodology and a 'problem-solving' approach to theory. These deficiencies leave untouched by theoretical investigation important aspects of NATO – inter-governmental bargaining, leadership, networks, two-level games and the power of bureaucracy to name but a few. Further, there tends to be a focus on practical issues – 'what is NATO for' rather than conceptual ones 'What is NATO?'

The workshop has two purposes: to push forward the theoretically-informed scholarship on the Alliance and to encourage the development of a European network of NATO scholars. It is open to papers which: attempt to conceptualise NATO, apply theoretical propositions to case-study examples of NATO activity and/or specific NATO institutions, explore the relevance of theoretical frameworks (such as Critical Security Studies, historical institutionalism etc.) presently underdeveloped in analysis of the Alliance, and subject NATO to comparative theoretical enquiry (for instance, by reference to scholarship on the EU).

25. Practices of Citizenship and the Politics of (in)Security

Directors:

Xavier Guillaume (Université de Genève); Email: xavier.guillaume@politic.unige.ch

Jef Huysmans (Open University); Email: j.p.a.huysmans@open.ac.uk

Citizenship and security are not only two words that are pervading contemporary discussions around the globe but two central concepts in political science. Both citizenship and security are key concepts in comprehending how political communities perform as well as in analysing what are the ways by which such communities are delineated, whether through discourses or political practices and institutions.

The workshop's principal aim is to analyse the interplays at work between practices of citizenship and politics of (in)security, both of which are at the heart of the constitution of contemporary political communities. Such a project requires bringing together scholars from the widest possible range of political science sub-disciplines. Both citizenship and security are central issues of empirical, theoretical and normative work in political science, but security analysts are mostly not talking to citizenship scholars and vice versa.

The need for reflection on the interplay between security and citizenship is much needed, as it goes beyond its academic value; daily and institutional practices, whether related to demands for recognition of specific groups, practices of ascription upon specific groups, or definition of (potentially) threatening or subversive groups – have concrete effects upon the everyday of citizens and non-citizens alike throughout the globe. To provide for a discussion and an analysis of these interplays and their potential or concrete effects in modern polities is thus to address important and contemporary empirical, theoretical and normative issues – such as immigration, cultural and ethnic minorities rights, civil rights and liberties, terrorism and counter-terrorism, global mobility – that are now driving concrete policies whether touching questions of security, citizenship or governance.

26. Institutional Design of Parliamentary Rules and Party Politics

Directors:

Zdenka Mansfeldova (Czech Academy of Sciences); Tel: +420 221 183 563; Fax: +420 222 220 143; Email: zdenka.mansfeldova@soc.cas.cz

Wolfgang Müller (Universität Mannheim); Tel: +49 181 2082 / 2081; Fax: +49 181 2080;

Email: wolfgang.c.mueller@uni-mannheim.de

Parliament is the central political institution in modern democracies in the sense that major political decisions require parliamentary approval, or at least the toleration by a majority of the assembly. As parliamentary rules of procedure are not protected by the constitution in most European countries, there is considerable potential for manipulation by parliamentary majorities. Unlike reforms of the United States Congress that have motivated a substantial body of research, changes of European parliamentary institutions have received scant attention. This workshop will seek to bring together current research on how parliamentary institutions work and evolve over time. Specifically, it will discuss how parliamentary institutions affect parties' abilities to achieve

their goals and to what extent institutional reform was motivated by partisan goals.

Five kinds of papers are welcome in particular. First, the workshop seeks theoretical papers that explore the issues of institutional design in a parliamentary context. Second, the workshop will allow for papers that deal with one particular parliamentary institution (e.g., a specific voting rule, a specific instrument of parliamentary control) and its change over time. Third, more general reviews of changes in parliamentary rules in single countries are welcome. Fourth, the workshop is interested in papers that research the relationship between change in parliamentary rules and the parties' capacities to discipline their MPs. Finally, the workshop welcomes comparative empirical papers on parliamentary institutions, the conditions under which they are designed, and their implications for party performance and democratic governance.

27. The Diffusion of Authority? Changing Patterns of International Governance

Directors:

Stefano Guzzini (Danish Institute for International Studies/Uppsala Universitet); Tel: +46 18 471 1211; ; Email: stefano.guzzini@statsvet.uu.se; sgu@diis.dk

Iver Neumann (Universitetet i Oslo/Norwegian Institute of International Affairs); Tel: +47 228 55 050; Fax: +47 229 94 000; Email: i.b.neumann@ilos.uio.no; Iver.Neumann@nupi.no

Over recent decades, there has been increasing research on the diffusion of authority in the international system, away from the military to other sources of power, from the state to other actors in the system, and from the public realm to markets. International political theory saw attempts at re-defining the concept and analysis of power and governance in international relations. International political economy focused on the shift of authority from the realm of public actors to market structures which affect fundamental institutions of international society, such as sovereignty (e.g. the de-territorialisation of authority by off-shore finance). Globalisation studies analysed the new publicly sanctioned (but private) authorities which emerged through the privatisation of fundamental governance roles, such as security (private military companies), fiduciary (private credit rating agencies); on the creation and role of an increasingly networked international public sphere (transnational advocacy groups); and on the emergence of corporate social responsibility as possibly a form of moral (and global) citizenship.

The workshop addresses this emerging picture of a diffusion of authority, as well as de-territorialisation and privatisation of governance. It invites (1) theoretical and methodological studies which further our capacity to identify instances of, and to provide frameworks for studying, international governance, and (2) empirical studies which specify or question the existence of such allegedly new instances of governance at the global, regional, or local level by either providing primary evidence or by synthesising such evidence in a wider understanding of the re-articulation of power in world affairs.

28. Institutionalising European Cooperation in the Area of Internal Security

Directors:

Thomas Christiansen (EIPA, Maastricht & Maastricht University); Tel: +31 43 3296 222;

Fax: +31 43 3296 296; Email: t.christiansen@ejpa-nl.com

Mark Rhinard (Swedish Institute of International Affairs, Stockholm); Tel: +46 8 5117 6840;

Fax: +46 8 5117 6899; Email: mark.rhinard@ui.se

In response to an increasing number of perceived threats to European security, there is a growing emphasis on transnational cooperation among national and supranational actors in Europe. Threats such as avian influenza, natural disasters, terrorism, failed states, and organised crime are seen as transnational in reach and cross-sectoral in scope, revealing the limitations of unilateral state action in a complex security environment. This explains why governments are reaching out across national borders to improve coordination in such matters.

In Europe, much of this cooperation is taking place within the institutional framework of the European Union (EU), a trend which underlines two new realities: first, that the EU's security identity is changing rapidly if we account for the full range of its old and new security initiatives; and second, that European integration is moving forward even after enlargement and the difficulties witnessed in the context of treaty reform. Cooperation may be taking place at the low politics and technical levels, but it is taking place nonetheless. It may even represent the 'new face' of European integration.

Scholars have yet to take systematic account of institutionalisation processes and emerging cooperation patterns in Europe's transnational internal security environment. Such processes and patterns take many and varied forms, some familiar to scholars of European integration, others novel and innovative in nature.

The objective of this workshop is to attract papers from junior as well as established scholars to address the following issues:

What kind of institutional mechanisms and capacities are being put in place in order to deal with today's "all hazards" internal security concerns?

How can the nature of new forms of cooperation in today's European security environment be explained?

In which areas and under what conditions can governance arrangements for security cooperation be found, and how effective, efficient and accountable are such solutions?

We look forward to receiving paper proposals that promise to examine cooperation in different empirical areas of European internal security and we welcome contributions from a diverse range of theoretical perspectives.

29. Civil Society, Democracy and Global Governance

Directors:

Jean Grugel (University of Sheffield); Tel: +44 114 222 1662; Fax: +44 114 222 1717;

Email: J.B.Grugel@sheffield.ac.uk

Anders Uhlin (Lund Universitet); Tel: +46 (0)46 222 8953; Fax: +46 (0)46 222 4006;

Email: anders.uhlin@svet.lu.se

The role of civil society actors in global politics has received much scholarly attention during recent years. However, empirical studies of democratic aspects of the interaction between civil society actors and global governance institutions are rare. The proposed workshop aims at taking research on civil society and global governance a step forward through a focus on the democratic qualities and contributions of civil society actors and their interactions with a range of governance institutions above the state. More specifically, we aim at gathering researchers analysing different kinds of civil society activism related to various forms of global and regional governance, with the aim of analysing and discussing the extent to which such interventions are democratic, seek to build or contribute to democracy (whether at the global, regional, national or sub-national levels), or understand their mandate to be in any way driven by democratic imperatives. We therefore invite cutting edge, empirically grounded research on various non-governmental organizations, social movements and other forms of non-state interventions, interacting with different regional or global governance institutions, or seeking to influence the direction of global governance regimes. The focus might be, for example, on problems of representation and accountability, as well as the tension between coercive and non-coercive forms of activism. This is a topic that opens up potentially very fruitful exchange between scholars working within the fields of comparative politics, international relations, international political economy and political theory and we explicitly welcome interdisciplinary approaches.

30. The Politics of Policy Appraisal

Directors:

John Turnpenny (University of East Anglia); Tel: +44 1603 593908; Email: j.turnpenny@uea.ac.uk

Klaus Jacob (Freie Universität Berlin); Tel: +49 30 8385 4492; Email: Jacob@zedat.fu-berlin.de

Policy appraisal systems have emerged in recent decades to fulfil a variety of purposes, including, at the very broadest scale, attempting to deliver cross-cutting goals like more sustainable development, and address emerging large-scale global change challenges such as climate change. But, policy appraisal systems have encountered some well-known difficulties in these aims, such as how well they truly offer representative stakeholder consultation, and how far they increase the influence of 'evidence' within the policy process. There are clear higher-level political considerations in play than there being simply too few resources available for appraisals. This workshop particularly examines sustainable development as a major cross-cutting issue, and hence takes an interdisciplinary approach to better understanding policy appraisal's role in delivering cross-cutting goals. The aims are 1) to better define appraisal, including different aims, concepts and terminology; 2) to better explain appraisal: how the political, institutional, cultural and organisational context shapes appraisal's goals and design; 3) to better evaluate appraisal: what counts as 'successful' and why - and are appraisals successful?; 4) to better engage with non-academic audiences: what processes and contexts promote usable knowledge?.