

# 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)

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

Nils Bandelow (Technische Universität Carolo-Wilhelmina Braunschweig)

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

Christopher Dougherty (University of St. Andrews)

### **Sociocultural and sociopolitical elements of school counselling professional identity**

Ahlam Rahal (Acadia University)

### **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)

### **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)