T01P12 / Social Identities in Public Policy and Public Administration

Topic : T01 / POLICY PROCESS THEORIES

Chair : Nils Bandelow (Technische Universität Carolo-Wilhelmina Braunschweig)

Second Chair : Kun Huang (University of New Mexico)

Third Chair : Johanna Hornung (University of Lausanne)

Fourth Chair : Jeongyoon Lee (University of Kentucky)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

Research on explanations of policy actors' preferences and behavior in the policy process has drawn on diverse models of the individual and (social) psychological theories. One recently gaining more prominence is the perspective on Social Identities in the Policy Process (SIPP) (Hornung, Bandelow & Vogeler, 2018). Drawing on the Social Identity Approach (SIA) developed by Tajfel (1982) as a theory of intergroup relations, this perspective puts policy actors' memberships in social groups center-stage and assumes that actors are highly driven in their thinking and behavior by the identification with diverse social groups (Diamond, 2022; Vogeler, Hornung & Bandelow, 2020).

This panel invites theoretical, conceptual, and empirical papers that address the role of social groups and identities in policy processes, from agenda setting to policy formulation and decision-making up to implementation. This includes foci at the intersection with network governance research in public management (Lee & Huang, 2022). Potential research questions could include:

1) Researching social identities worldwide in different policy contexts is vital to understand social groups in different settings. How does the relevance of social groups change across borders? What are the research methods to measure social identities, their respective strengths and weaknesses? How could social identities be used as dependent variables, independent variables, or factors in configurations in public policy and management?

2) The focus on social groups allows for cross-fertilization with other theoretical perspectives or disciplines, e.g., advocacy coalition framework (ACF), social capital, sub-group culture, political partisanship, and dark networks. What does the focus on social identities contribute to the explanation of coalition building, within and cross-coalition interaction, faultlines, power constellations, resilience, or gridlock in policy processes? To what extent does the relevance of identities explain differences in policymaking and implementation, e.g., which social groups form, collaborate, and compete? What determines the outcomes of their relations?

3) The group-focused insights from social psychology provide fruitful connecting points to policy process research, including questions of polarization (Baldassarri & Page, 2021; Laebens & Öztürk, 2020) and tipping points (Macy et al., 2021). When would polarized social identities reach tipping points, and how to pull polarized communities or policy networks from tipping points?

References

Baldassarri & Page (2021). The emergence and perils of polarization. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118(50), 1-7.

Diamond (2022). Conservative Conservationists: Reconciling Conflicting Identities on Climate Change. Politics, Groups, and Identities, 1-18.

Hornung, Bandelow & Vogeler (2018). Social Identities in the Policy Process. Policy Sciences, 52(2), 211-231.

Laebens & Öztürk (2020). Partisanship and Autocratization: Polarization, Power Asymmetry, and Partisan Social Identities in Turkey. Comparative Political Studies, 54(2), 245-279.

Lee & Huang (2022). Identity-based Subgroups and Information Exchange in Adversarial Policy Networks. Journal of Public Policy, 1-27.

Macy et al. (2021). Polarization and tipping points. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118(50), 1-9.

Tajfel (1982). Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Annual Review of Psychology, 33(1), 1-39.

Vogeler, Hornung & Bandelow (2020). Farm Animal Welfare Policymaking in the European Parliament – A Social Identity Perspective on Voting Behaviour. Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning, 22(4), 518-530.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Research on explanations of policy actors' preferences and behavior in the policy process has drawn on diverse models of the individual and (social) psychological theories. One recently gaining more prominence is the perspective on Social Identities in the Policy Process (SIPP) (Hornung, Bandelow & Vogeler, 2018). Drawing on the Social Identity Approach (SIA) developed by Tajfel (1982) as a theory of intergroup relations, this perspective puts policy actors' memberships in social groups center-stage and assumes that actors are highly driven in their thinking and behavior by the identification with diverse social groups (Diamond, 2022; Vogeler, Hornung & Bandelow, 2020).

This panel invites theoretical, conceptual, and empirical papers that address the role of social groups and identities in policy processes, from agenda setting to policy formulation and decision-making up to implementation. This includes foci at the intersection with network governance research in public management (Lee & Huang, 2022). Potential research questions could include:

1) Researching social identities worldwide in different policy contexts is vital to understand social groups in different settings. How does the relevance of social groups change across borders? What are the research methods to measure social identities, their respective strengths and weaknesses? How could social identities be used as dependent variables, independent variables, or factors in configurations in public policy and management?

2) The focus on social groups allows for cross-fertilization with other theoretical perspectives or disciplines, e.g., advocacy coalition framework (ACF), social capital, sub-group culture, political partisanship, and dark networks. What does the focus on social identities contribute to the explanation of coalition building, within and cross-coalition interaction, faultlines, power constellations, resilience, or gridlock in policy processes? To what extent does the relevance of identities explain differences in policymaking and implementation, e.g., which social groups form, collaborate, and compete? What determines the outcomes of their relations?

3) The group-focused insights from social psychology provide fruitful connecting points to policy process research, including questions of polarization (Baldassarri & Page, 2021; Laebens & Öztürk, 2020) and tipping points (Macy et al., 2021). When would polarized social identities reach tipping points, and how to pull polarized communities or policy networks from tipping points?

References

Baldassarri & Page (2021). The emergence and perils of polarization. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118(50), 1-7.

Diamond (2022). Conservative Conservationists: Reconciling Conflicting Identities on Climate Change. Politics, Groups, and Identities, 1-18.

Hornung, Bandelow & Vogeler (2018). Social Identities in the Policy Process. Policy Sciences, 52(2), 211-231.

Laebens & Öztürk (2020). Partisanship and Autocratization: Polarization, Power Asymmetry, and Partisan Social Identities in Turkey. Comparative Political Studies, 54(2), 245-279.

Lee & Huang (2022). Identity-based Subgroups and Information Exchange in Adversarial Policy Networks. Journal of Public Policy, 1-27.

Macy et al. (2021). Polarization and tipping points. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118(50), 1-9.

Tajfel (1982). Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Annual Review of Psychology, 33(1), 1-39.

Vogeler, Hornung & Bandelow (2020). Farm Animal Welfare Policymaking in the European Parliament – A Social Identity Perspective on Voting Behaviour. Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning, 22(4), 518-530.

T01P12 / Social Identities in Public Policy and Public Administration

Chair : Nils Bandelow (Technische Universität Carolo-Wilhelmina Braunschweig)

Second Chair : Kun Huang (University of New Mexico)

Third Chair : Johanna Hornung (University of Lausanne)

Fourth Chair : Jeongyoon Lee (University of Kentucky)

Session 1

Thursday, June 29th 15:45 to 17:45 (KHE129)

(Virtual) German Professors in partisan times : How the political attitudes of professors shape their social identities at the nexus of scientific policy transfer

Nadin Fromm (University of Kassel/ Chair of Public Management)

Markus Seyfried (University of Potsdam)

German Professors in partisan times: How the political attitudes of professors shape their social identities at the nexus of scientific policy transfer

Professors at German universities hold a key position in scientific research, in the education and training of students and in the context of Third Mission, including knowledge transfer and scientific policy advice. As experts, they have privileged access to politics and administrations. Their expertise is central to political action and can be a prerequisite for policy processes. From a social identity perspective, professors can thus be seen as members of a positional elite (production and dissemination of knowledge) and a decision-making elite (including indirect influence on political decision-making processes).

Considering their central position, it is surprising that hardly anything is known about the political attitudes of professors in Germany. For example, German professors are not considered in the larger elite studies. There has not been a representative scientific study on this subject for Germany since 1974. This research gap is particularly striking when compared to other western democracies where the topic is well researched and analyzed (e. g. USA, Canada, Sweden, Italy). The concept of political attitude, which is central in this context, can be defined as dispositions, either positive or negative towards an object to react. An expression of political attitudes can be cognitions, affects and behavioral dispositions of a person, e. g. a general value orientation, voting intention, party sympathy and/or party membership. Main determinants of political attitudes are traditionally effects due to socio-demographic or socio-economic characteristics (age, educational background, gender, educational qualification).

The proposed paper, which we would like to present and discuss at your panel, is from empirical nature. It presents novel data from a quantitative online-survey held in September 2022 that questioned German universities from six selected disciplines (islamic studies, law, medicine, philosophy, political science, physics). Main focus of the survey is the ??tension between science, politics and society (including political attitudes).

In the paper, we are aiming to analyze the social identities of German professors as policy-concerned group. Due to the existing research gap, we examine the quantitative data to answer the research question what political attitudes the German professors have and, secondly, how these can be classified in light of their social identity. In the following, the data and its interpretation is discussed from a more conceptionally viewpoint to evaluate the relevance of professors' social identities in the decision-making processes.

Integrating the Social Identity Approach (SIA) into Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) Research

Nils Bandelow (Technische Universität Carolo-Wilhelmina Braunschweig)

The Social Identity Approach (SIA) is an established perspective in social psychology that provides

comprehensive theoretical and empirical foundations for understanding the formation and change of preferences, group processes, and intergroup relations (Trepte & Loy 2017). SIA is also a fruitful application in public policy research (Hornung et al. 2019; Vogeler et al. 2020; Rychlik et al. 2021; Hornung et al. 2022; Lee & Huang 2022; Bell & Lui 2023). The perspective seems particularly promising for the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), which has recently developed initial references to identities and, increasingly, to emotions as an important element of SIA (Henry et al. 2022). Can SIA be integrated as a tool in the ACF? What challenges and opportunities arise from such an integration? The paper discusses the relationship between SIA and ACF with reference to the current research areas of ACF: coalitions, policy learning and policy change. It is shown that SIA can contribute to a better theoretical foundation of existing ACF hypotheses and the development of further and modified ACF hypotheses.

Bell, Elizabeth, & Lui, Edith (2023). Integrating Identity in Policy Design Theory. Policy & Politics, 1-26. DOI: 10.1332/030557321x16587888968118

Henry, Adam D., Ingold, Karin, Weible, Christopher M., & Nohrstedt, Daniel (2022). Advocacy Coalition Framework: Advice on Applications and Methods. In Christopher M. Weible & Samuel Workman (Eds.), Methods of the Policy Process. New York: Routledge.

Hornung, Johanna, Bandelow, Nils C., & Vogeler, Colette S. (2019). Social Identities in the Policy Process. Policy Sciences, 52(2), 211-231. DOI: 10.1007/s11077-018-9340-6

Hornung, Johanna, Schröder, Ilana, & Bandelow, Nils C. (2022). Social Identities in the Policy Process of Defective Democracies Politische Vierteljahresschrift, 63(2), 225-247. DOI: 10.1007/s11615-022-00391-w

Lee, Jeongyoon, & Huang, Kun (2022). Identity-based Subgroups and Information Exchange in Adversarial Policy Networks. Journal of Public Policy, early view, 1-27. DOI: 10.1017/s0143814x22000228

Rychlik, Jasmin, Hornung, Johanna, & Bandelow, Nils C. (2021). Come Together, Right Now: Storylines and Social Identities in Coalition Building in a Local Policy Subsystem. Politics & Policy, 49(5), 1216-1247. DOI: 10.1111/polp.12431

Trepte, Sabine, & Loy, Laura S. (2017). Social Identity Theory and Self?Categorization Theory. In Patrick Rössler, Cynthia A. Hoffner, & Liesbet van Zoonen (Eds.), The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects (pp. 1-13). Hoboken: Wiley. DOI: 10.1002/9781118783764.wbieme0088

Vogeler, Colette S., Hornung, Johanna, & Bandelow, Nils C (2020). Farm Animal Welfare Policymaking in the European Parliament – A Social Identity Perspective on Voting Behaviour. Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning, 22(4), 518-530.

To what extent do resource flows to Canadian charities from governments reflect shared social identities?

Christopher Dougherty (University of St. Andrews)

The Canadian charitable sector is a good site for examining identities and their relationships to policy because the sector is heterogeneous, reflecting diverse causes and identities, and it includes formalized elements of interest groups and social movements. Emerging research (for example Chapman (2019) and Mehta (2016), is pointing in the direction of a relationship- or identity-first model for how resources flow into charitable sector organizations and, by extension, how charitable sectors grow, the ways they interact with other institutions, and the roles they play in communities. Individual and organizational identities, the alignment of identity between charities and political actors, and the ability of networks of organizations to form and express a common identity, may have something to do with how resources are allocated in charitable sectors. Hornung, Bandelow, and Vogeler's (2019) concept of Social Identities in Policy Process (SIPP) are a key part of the theoretical framework: it is the formation of common views on policy content within a social group which then shape actor behaviour so that it benefits the in-group. While the SIPP definition focuses on policy actors and policy processes, I apply it here to charitable sector actors and processes within sector organizations. In this study, I ask: how does government funding for charities change following elections? This question examines the extent to which identity-based clusters exist around public funders who are expected to be explicitly partisan in some of their resource allocation decisions. Using existing charitable tax return (T3010) panel data and government grants data, and controlling for provincial and federal riding characteristics and partisanship, overall government spending levels, and

overall macroeconomic conditions, is there large-scale evidence of ideological or identity-based alignment between specific charitable subsectors or organizational clusters and parties and, if there is evidence, what are the effects of alignment? This is a question that can be uniquely addressed in Canada because of the availability, depth, and detail of administrative data from charity tax returns, which includes a breakdown of the amount coming from each order of government. This research uses quantitative methods and Canadian public data on charities and political actors; so, the relationships and shared identities that I will be looking at will have to be those that appear in public data. While there are a few ways that people can engage with organizations, only a few types of engagement are publicly reported: board membership, gifts from foundations, and grants from government. Additionally, lists of political donors and candidate lists are publicly available in Canada and have been aggregated by others, while other types of shared identities like religious affiliations and club memberships are not. For this reason, I look at the intersection of political identity (people who have an affiliation to a party through donating, standing for an election, or holding office) and resource flows and board memberships (as proxies for relationships) in charities to examine the effect that being on the inside of a political relationship has on a charity (as compared to being on the outside) and to examine how different political parties (as a proxy for different political identities) affect these effects.

References:
Chapman, C. M. (2019). Toward a triadic understanding of charitable giving: How donors, beneficiaries, fundraisers, and social contexts influence donation decisions [PhD Thesis, The University of Queensland]. https://doi.org/10.14264/uql.2019.357

Hornung, J., Bandelow, N. C., & Vogeler, C. S. (2019). Social identities in the policy process. Policy Sciences, 52(2), 211–231. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-018-9340-6

Mehta, K. (2016). The Power and Politics of Immigrant Philanthropy: Charitable Giving and the Making of the New Canadian Establishment [Doctoral, University of Toronto]. http://hdl.handle.net/1807/73071

Sociocultural and sociopolitical elements of school counselling professional identity

Ahlam Rahal (Acadia University)

This research aims to explore the impact of social identity on the construction of School Counselling Professional Identity (SCPI). School counselling is a mental health profession in educational settings (Foxx et al., 2013) that aims to promote students' socioemotional, career, and academic development (ASCA, 2012). Most countries adopt the American model, definition, and policies of school counselling (Harris, 2013). Today, one of the main problems that challenge counsellors worldwide is establishing a clear School Counselling Professional Identity (SCPI) (Al-Varez et al, 2012; Erhard, 2014). SCPI refers to the lens through which professionals make sense of their occupations, understand their roles, and make decisions (Hansen, 2009; Hendricks, 2008; Remley & Herlihy, 2014). Most of the SCPI studies (e.g., Gibson et al., 2015; Heled & Davidovich, 2021; Woo et al., 2017) have focused on professional components that shape a coherent SCPI such as role expectations and professional experience. Such studies overlook sociopolitical and sociocultural contexts that shape SCPI such as counsellors' sociocultural values and beliefs, gender, and clients' needs (Hansen, 2010). Thus, the purpose of this study was to explore the SCPI of Palestinian school counsellors, taking into consideration sociocultural and sociopolitical elements that shape SCPI. Methodology: Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 21 Palestinian school counsellors, accompanied by arts-based methods of data collection. The data were analyzed by thematic content analysis and critical discourse analysis. The main results showed that Palestinian SCPI is largely formed by the counsellors' sociocultural and political values; preferred interventions were formed by these values; and the counsellors' social and professional identities were interrelated. However, these interrelated social/professional identities create complications and challenges in working according to official policies and American individualistic theories of mental health without adapting them to the sociocultural backgrounds of counsellors and their clients. This research challenges the implementation of universal Western-individualistic school counselling policies and theories overseas and enriches the limited research on contextual aspects of mental health professions. Recommendations for adapting policies to sociocultural and sociopolitical contexts and for future international studies on SCPI were provided in this study to promote multicultural perspectives on SCPI.

Does identity matter for development in Asian Countries? Gender and other identity correlates of project success in South and Southeast Asia.

Jasleen Kaur (University of Texas at Austin)

Social identity, especially gender has become substantially important in aid development programs over the past 40 years. Development projects funded, and, implemented by Asian Development Bank (ADB) in South and Southeast Asia aim to tackle issues related to health, agricultural and food insecurity, education gaps, gender inequality, urban development, climate change and others. Each ADB project has a team comprising of a leader and 4-10 members with different areas of expertise. Using the rich set of data from ADB, I study how staff's social identity at the decision-making and implementation roles in aid organizations can impact project outcomes. Does the staff's sense of belongingness to a certain social identity lead to a difference in their preferences, attitudes, behaviors, choices, and actions, thus affecting outcomes? Do women take on an advocacy role based on their shared identity, shared values, and experiences? Does staff of a certain nationality perform better on development projects from their country of origin? Data for this analysis are collected by delving into 4000 completed projects at ADB and coding information into pre-created surveys from the year 2000 to 2021. I use robust multinomial logit regressions to find the association between the gender, and nationality of the project leaders and team members to project success. The outcome variable is project success which is determined by the project's relevance to the current development scenario, the timeliness of the project, the efficiency with which it was carried out, whether gender goals were met, and its sustainability in the long run. The independent variables are the gender, nationality, and ratio of female to male staff members. I control for project characteristics such as funding levels, project delays, staff characteristics such as their education, performance rating etc. I use country, sector, and year fixed effects. I find a surprisingly negative association of female leaders and female team members with some measures of project success like the efficiency of the project, and a non-significant association for other outcomes. These results are puzzling and point towards a need for broader discussion of how active representation is measured in literature and the need for an in-depth qualitative work including but not limited to key informant interviews with those working closely in the organization to understand more about the role of social identity in policy design and implementation. This research sheds light on methods to measure gender and nationality, using them as independent and intersectional variables. It is a perfect fit for this panel as it tries to understand the role of social identity in aid organizations. It quantitively and qualitatively tries to highlight how project staff at every level of ranking not only interact with each other, but how and why they design and implement policies which can impact outcomes of development projects in an entire continent.

Work or Labour? Examining the employment experiences of PVTGs under MGNREGS in Palamu, India

Monimala Sengupta (Lingnan University, Hong Kong)

Cleopas Sambo (University of Zambia)

Recent scholarship highlights the important role of social identities in the public policy process. However, much of this work has focused on policy actors and not necessarily the social identities of the targets of public policy. Based on interviews with the beneficiaries of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Scheme (MGNREGS), a large-scale employment initiative that debuted in the Indian subcontinent's rural areas in the year 2006, this paper explores the experiences of poverty within a social assistance programme for an indigenous population group in India. The group known as Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Group (PVTG) a rural and disadvantaged group is entitled to participate in the minimum 100 days of work programme under MGNREGS. Taking the disjuncture between work and labour, this paper will explore the meanings that PVTGs attach to their participation in MGNREGs as well as to what extent such participation furthers the inclusion of this otherwise isolated social group into Indian society.

Keywords: Poverty, Inclusion, Work, Indigenous, Social Assistance