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The Aim of the Workshop

The mission of the journal Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, whose 30th anniversary we are celebrating in this volume is to provide a unique forum for discussing European issues in an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary manner. The Journal welcomes articles which contribute to the improvement of social science knowledge and to the setting of a policy-focused European research agenda.

Arguably, social science research and research programming are two sides of the same coin; although this metaphor might be misleading as there are important differences between the two sides in terms of their perspectives, priorities, and expectations. However, research communities need funding and there are legitimate expectations from those who fund the research – especially in the public sector. This, in turn, creates some tensions with respect to the necessary autonomy and the creativity of research that might not always have a “successful” outcome. Innovation is by definition a new way of designing structures and actions; they might be successful or lead to fail – the latter being a somewhat frustrating for both the researchers and the research funders. At the same time, without creativity, commitment, imagination and a degree of risk taking the social sciences cannot fulfill their mission.

The late Martin Peterson has defined the highest demands made of our journal: “Innovation has offered rare opportunities to break down the rigors of orthodox academic boundaries and reach across disciplines and faculties. (…) Innovation has always attracted those who wanted to try out new angles to established topics” (2012, 9).

The aim of the workshop is to explore new ways to meet the societies’ needs whilst preserving the necessary autonomy of science and research. Over the past 30 years the journal has tried to fulfil the demands Martin Peterson has set for the journal and for the social science research. What paradigm change are needed, what methodologies, what interactions with the society, politics and the economy?

The workshop aims to address these questions and invites researchers and political actors from the public sector and the civil society likewise to stimulate the interaction between science and society.
The Programme

13:00 - 14:00 Registration & Welcome Address by Claudia Gamon, MP, NEOS Speaker for Science and Research

14:00 - 15:30 Panel I: What Future the Social Sciences? Interdisciplinary and Transdisciplinary Approaches
   Moderator: Andrew Sors, Brussels
   Panellists:
   John Crowley, UNESCO, Paris, Society as an Ethical System
   Liana Giorgi, Social Scientist & Psychoanalyst, Vienna, Travelling Concepts – an interdisciplinary history of identity
   Nico Stehr & Alexander Ruser, Zeppelin University, Friedrichshafen, Social scientists as technicians, advisors and meaning producers
   Alice Vadrot, Cambridge University Visiting Fellow & FWF Research Grantee, Knowledge, International Relations and the Structure-Agency Debate: Towards the concept of “Epistemic Selectivities”
   Stuart Blume, University of Amsterdam, In Search of Experiential Knowledge

15:30 – 16:00 Coffee Break

16:30 – 18:00 Panel II: What Future the Social Sciences? Theoretical Approaches and Alternative Methodologies
   Moderator: Bernd Marin, Vienna
   Panellists:
   Andrew Sors, Brussels: Prospects for SSH in European research polices- a (pragmatic) reality check
   Ronald J Pohoryles, ICCR Foundation & The European Association for the Advancement of Social Sciences, Back to the future? From the Pragmatic Approaches in the Social Sciences to the Development of the Patchwork Theory
   Joe Ravetz, University of Manchester & Amanda Ravetz, Manchester School of Art, Seeing the wood for the trees... Social Science 3.0 and the role of visual thinking
   Hans-Liudger Dienel, TU Berlin & Christoph Henseler, NEXUS Institute, Maps of Uncertainties
   Discussants:
   Nikolaos Kastrinos, European Commission (tbc)
   Dorothea Tommasi, ICCR Foundation & University of Vienna

18:00 – 19:00 Social Gathering with a Glass of Wine
Session I: Theoretical Approaches

John Crowley, Society as an ethical system

John Crowley is Chief of Section for Research, Policy and Foresight in the UNESCO Division of Social Transformations and Intercultural Dialogue. Since joining the UNESCO Sector for Social and Human Science in 2003 he has also been a programme specialist in social science (2003-05) and head of the communication, information and publications unit (2005-07), chief of section for ethics of science and technology (2008-11) and team leader for global environmental change (2011-14). Before joining UNESCO, he worked as an economist in the oil industry (1988-95) and as a research fellow at the French National Political Science Foundation (1995-2002). From 2002 to 2015, he was editor of the UNESCO-published International Social Science Journal. He has published around 100 academic articles and book chapters, mainly on political theory and comparative politics.

Email: j.crowley@unesco.org

Abstract

The idea of society on which the social sciences are premised is one of a structured pattern of interdependence and interaction that drives participation in a shared communication space and, thereby, a degree of common consciousness. These are also the preconditions for ethics to operate as an internal mode of self-understanding rather than an external imposition. Societies, in other words, are ethical systems. In order to understand in what sense societies, in the context of contemporary transformations, can still be thought of and analysed as ethical systems, the article focuses on inequality as both a practically important and normatively complex challenge – one that the international community, through the 2030 Agenda for Inclusive and Sustainable Development, has recognized to be one of its action priorities. These considerations further bear on the relation between the social sciences and the humanities, which is one important dimension of the future of the social sciences.
Liana Giorgi, Travelling concepts and crossing paths: a conceptual history of identity

Bio

LIANA GIORGI is Senior Project Manager at adelphi (Germany) and a practicing psychoanalyst (in training under supervision). A graduate of MIT and the University of Cambridge and former Vice-Director of ‘The Interdisciplinary Centre for Comparative Research in the Social Sciences’, she has accumulated extensive expertise and experience in social research methods, European public policy analysis, social and political theory and cultural sociology. She is editor and co-author of two book on the European public sphere: Festivals and the Cultural Public Sphere (Routledge, 2011) and Democracy in the European Union; Towards the Emergence of a Public Sphere (Routledge, 2006).

Abstract:

The concept of identity is ubiquitous in public discourse even though its meaning is often imprecise or nebulous – it is maybe because of this that its contents can be taken for granted. One speaks of individual, personal, group, social, collective and political identity; of identity formation, crisis, diffusion, conflict and politics; a multiple identity may be pathological or a component of an integrated identity; culture and ideology but also knowledge and experience supposedly enrich identity; identity may be rigid or open to development and growth – and so on. Against this background the present paper explores the argumentative uses of the concept of identity in psychoanalysis and in social psychology and sociology.
Social scientists as technicians, advisors and meaning producers

Bio

NICO STEHR is Karl Mannheim Professor of Cultural Studies at the Zeppelin University, Friedrichshafen, Germany. He is a fellow of the Royal Society (Canada) and a fellow of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts. His research interests center on the transformation of modern societies into knowledge societies and developments associated with this transformation in different major social institutions of modern society (e.g. science, politics, governance, the economy, inequality and globalization); in addition, his research interests concern the societal consequences of climate change. He is one of the authors of the Hartwell Paper on climate policy.

ALEXANDER RUSER is currently deputy professor for cultural theory and analysis at Zeppelin University, Friedrichshafen. He holds a PhD in Sociology from the Max-Weber-Institute of Sociology at Heidelberg University and was a Dahrendorf Post Doctoral Fellow at the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin and at the London School of Economics and Political Sciences. He habilitated on Science in Society in 2016. Alexander has published in peer-reviewed journals such as Global Policy, Current Sociology and Journal of Civil Society and is an active member of an international research network on social philosophy of science coordinated by the Russian Academy of Science.

Abstract:

In our paper, we are addressing three issues that are at the core of scholarly reflections about the societal role of social science knowledge: (1) Social scientists tend to follow – although this is not always a deliberate choice – one of three models that describe their role as the producers of practical knowledge. For the sake of simplicity we have called the three models the “model of the technician”, the “model of the advisor” and the “model of the meaning producer”. (2) Due to the need for social inquiry to adopt a particular, restrictive perspective of its domain, useful knowledge is a complicated matter. Hence the need to put into question a widely supported notion at least among social scientists: When asked about the reasons for the limited “power” of social science knowledge the response frequently is that the adequacy and practical usefulness of social science knowledge is a function of its capturing the full complexity of what indeed are complex social phenomena. (3) Social scientists often tend to lament the marginal impact their intellectual efforts have on society, and they look with great envy across the divide of the so-called two cultures, wondering how and when they will be able to achieve the same kind of success and prestige the natural sciences and technology appear to enjoy in most societies. However, this unhappy view systematically understates the actual power of social science knowledge, in particular its role as a mind maker or meaning producer.
Bio

Alice B.M. Vadrot is an Erwin Schrödinger Fellow of the Austrian Research Fund (FWF), based at the Centre for Science and Policy (CSaP) for a research stay of two years. Her research interests include science policy interfaces, biodiversity politics and global environmental governance. Alice is also an external lecturer at the Department of Political Science at the University of Vienna. Before that, she had a four-year research post at the ICCR Foundation to thereafter move to NEOS Lab, a political think tank based in Vienna, for which she served as Head of Research.

Alice earned a PhD from the Department of Political Science at the University of Vienna in 2013 with a thesis on the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). In 2014 she published the book "The Politics of Knowledge and Global Biodiversity" (Routledge, Taylor & Francis).

Abstract

The aim of the contribution is to develop a framework within which the role and social construction of knowledge in International Relations can be understood and theoretically underpinned. In order to do so, the article discusses post-structuralist and neo-Gramscian answers to the structure–agency debate and argues that the role of knowledge remains rather implicit in both understandings on how structure and agency are mutually constituted. The main argument of the article is that the social construction of knowledge can only be understood, if International Relations are analysed in terms of a dialectically constituted relationship between structure and agency visible in and through processes whereby science and expert knowledge are referred to as true and policy relevant. On this basis, the article develops the concept of "epistemic selectivities", which describes how the use of science and expert knowledge to underpin strategic action leads to hegemonic patterns in the way in which (scientific) expert knowledge is related to particular claims of policies and facts.

Keywords: epistemic selectivities, International Relations, structure and agency, knowledge, strategic selectivities
Bio

STUART BLUME was born in Manchester and educated at Merton College Oxford. He subsequently worked at the University of Sussex, the OECD (Paris), the London School of Economics, and in various administrative positions including from 1975-1977 in the Social Research Coordinating Unit, The Cabinet Office, London, and from 1977-1980 as Secretary, Committee on Social Inequalities in Health, Department of Health, London (The ‘Black Committee’). In 1982 he moved to the University of Amsterdam as Professor of Science and Technology Studies, becoming Emeritus Professor in 2007. In 2009-11 he was ‘Professor 2’ at the Centre for Development and Environment, University of Oslo, and in 2013-4 held a ‘Prometeo’ Fellowship at the University of Cuenca, Ecuador. Publications include Insight and Industry: The Dynamics of Technological Change in Medicine (MIT Press, 1992); The Artificial Ear: Cochlear Implants and the Culture of Deafness (Rutgers University Press, 2011) and (forthcoming in 2017) Immunisation and its Discontents (Reaktion Books, London).

Abstract

In recent years, the concept of “experiential knowledge” has increasingly been used to characterize the distinctive contribution patients make to decision-making in the health field. Even though it seems well-nigh impossible to characterize it precisely, there is no doubting its significance for decision-making contexts ranging from the individual to the political. Since individual experiences of any condition or treatment differ widely, whose experiences come to constitute “knowledge”? In this paper, I argue that, rhetoric notwithstanding, numerous constraints “filter” the experiences which come to function as “experiential knowledge”. Looking to the future of health care, likely to be marked by growing inequalities, I suggest that a reflection on the notion of experiential knowledge leads to two challenges for social scientists.
Session II: Research Policies & Pragmatic Approaches

Andrew Sors, Prospects for SSH in European research polices- a (pragmatic) reality check

Bio

ANDREW SORS is a co-opted Board member of the European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities (EASSH) and is also a member of the European policy group of the UK Academy of Social Sciences. He has spent most of his career working in the field of European research policies. Having obtained a Ph.D. in Materials Science he worked in a chemical company followed by 7 years in an environmental research institute of the University of London. In 1982 he joined the European Commission’s DG Research and was 1993 appointed Head of the new Unit “Human Dimensions of Environmental Change” and in 1999 he became Head of the Unit “Social Sciences and Humanities”. In 2005 he was posted to New Delhi as the first Head of Science and Technology Cooperation in the Commission’s Delegation to India. In 2008 he became Rector of the Collegium Budapest Institute for Advanced Study. Following his return to Brussels, he was appointed as head of the newly established Brussels Office of the EuroTech Universities Alliance, from which retired in 2015.

Abstract

There is compelling evidence that Europe is a global leader in research across the social sciences and humanities (SSH). Furthermore, these disciplines are proving to be highly competitive with the so-called "hard sciences" in prestigious European funding schemes, especially the ERC and the Marie Curie-Skodowska programmes.

At the same time, it is widely considered that the SSH research community across Europe is relatively poorly integrated within other pillars of HORIZON 2020, notably in relation to societal challenges. The implications of this state of affairs extends far beyond funding; the critical importance of SSH knowledge in addressing grand challenges seems evident.

In my short Panel intervention I will attempt to offer a personal- and highly partial-perspective on some of the lessons we have learnt to date and how these might be exploited during the coming debates.
Ronald J Pohoryles, Back to the future? From pragmatic approaches in the social sciences to the development of the patchwork theory

Bio

RONALD J. POHORYLES is Chairman of the board of directors of the ICCR Foundation and ass. Prof. for comparative political systems, experienced in social science research for more than 35 years. His research expertise covers European integration emphasizing public policy analysis, science and technology, green economy & environment and technological integrated assessment. Overall, his work relates to a comprehensive understanding of sustainability, bringing together economy, environment, society and democracy.

Furthermore, he is editor-in-chief of the journal The European Journal of Social Science Research — Innovation, which he has launched in 1986. Since 2013 Ronald J Pohoryles is Member of the Commission for the Promotion of the Environment of the Austrian Ministry of the Environment (§ 7 Law on the Promotion of the Environment).

Abstract

The debate on the function of the social sciences in complex societies, and more generally of the role of knowledge, leads necessarily to a discussion on pragmatism. The gap between theoretical approaches and empirical research still exists and has even widened, in part because of the use and abuse of social science knowledge in politics and by the media. However, the academic system is equally to blame for this. Mutual ignorance and scholastic fights are barriers against openness, creative and imaginary thinking. The structures and the practices of the academic system reinforce this trend. Pragmatism aims at overcoming these cleavages by looking at commonalities between different approaches rather than by disputing their validity. It aims at a comprehensive understanding of the process of knowledge production and at the productive use of results. Defining itself in this tradition, the patchwork theory goes beyond the traditional pragmatic approaches: it catches part of the reality of social phenomena from a certain perspective that allows for an overview without having the full picture. Methodologically, the approach guided by patchwork theory emphasizes the relevance of stakeholders’ knowledge and citizen science, and calls for public participation and democratic access to the production and use of knowledge in a discursive manner.

Keywords: role of the social sciences, pragmatism, legitimacy crisis, patchwork theory, knowledge and democracy
Seeing the wood for the trees: Social Science 3.0 and the role of visual thinking

Bio

JOE RAVETZ is Co-Director of the Centre for Urban Resilience & Energy at the University of Manchester. He has pioneered the art of strategic thinking for sustainable cities and regions, which brings together environment-climate policy, urban planning and design, new economics and governance, innovation and futures studies, systems thinking and complexity science. With a background as an architect, planner and development manager, he is also a creative graphic facilitator and foresight trainer. He furthermore Principal at SAMI Consulting; policy advisor currently to Naples (Italy), and Vellore (India); and delivers training, seminars, consultancy, keynotes and reviews in many countries.

AMANDA RAVETZ is a visual anthropologist with research interests and expertise in the interdisciplinary connections between anthropology and art/design; the theories and practices of observational cinema; and artist development. In 2012 Amanda was SAR Fellow at the National Film and Sound Archive, Australia. During 2014 she was Visiting Fellow at two Australian institutions, The School of Art and the Humanities Research Centre, Australia National University, and The Centre for Cultural Partnerships, Victorian College of the Arts, University of Melbourne.

Abstract

Social Science is increasingly called on to address “grand challenges”, “wicked problems”, “societal dilemmas” and similar problematiques. Examples include climate change, the war on drugs and urban poverty. It is now widely agreed that the disciplinary structure of academic science, with its journals, curricula, peer communities, etc., is not well suited to such trans-disciplinary, ill-bounded, controversial issues, but the ways forward are not yet clear or accepted by the mainstream. The concept of a next generation paradigm of “Science 3.0” has emerged through work on sustainability systems analysis, and for this multiple channels for learning, thinking and communications are essential. Visual thinking in its many forms (from technical representation or mapping, to photography or video, to design or illustration, to fine art) can bring to the table tacit and “felt” knowledge, creative experience and links from analysis with synthesis. This paper first sketches the contours of a Social Science 3.0, and then demonstrates with examples how visual thinking can combine with rational argument, or extend beyond it to other forms of experience.
Maps of the uncertain: a new approach to communicate scientific ignorance

BIO

HANS-LIUDGER DIENEL is full professor for Work, Technology and Participation (www.technik.tu-berlin.de) of Berlin University of Technology (Technische Universität Berlin) and at the same time director of the nexus Institute for cooperation management in Berlin (www.nexusinstitut.de). Dienel is editorial board member of a couple of research institutes, including IZT, IASP and ZTG and journals including FQS Forum for qualitative social research, Zeitschrift für Technikfolgenabschätzung in Theorie und Praxis and Innovation European Journal of Social Science Research. His research in the field of technology, society and education focusses on involvement, cooperation, participation, and knowledge.

Recent publication:


CHRISTOPH HENSELER is Head of Unit “Networks and Society” at NEXUS Institute for Cooperation Management and Interdisciplinary Research, Berlin.

Abstract

While uncertainty and the unknown are not only accepted but favoured within scientific debates, these concepts are less tolerated in instances of exchange with society. In scientific communication, definitive statements are expected and thus delivered; and this societal expectation of the scientific community has obviously been internalized by the scientists themselves. After giving an overview of the lively discussion about scientific uncertainty and nescience (landscapes of the uncertain), this paper presents a new tool for the communication of scientific uncertainties: Maps of the Uncertain. These maps take the form of infographics, which allow a different kind of communication of uncertainties, and thus a different relationship between science and society. The paper presents and discusses examples of six maps.
In remembrance of our colleagues to whom we owe our success

It all began in Cracow in the 1980s: Jan Jerschina, Professor of Sociology of Education at the Jagiellonian University of Krakow, was organizing an annual one week’s event dedicated to current political developments. For this purpose, he became the founder of the “One Europe Research Group” to build bridges between the East and the West. Of course – it was still the Communist phase of Poland – he could not openly disclose the real topics discussed at these events, and the events did not take place in Cracow, but in holiday resorts around Cracow that belonged to the university, in Rabka and in Koniniki. The aim of the meetings was to bring together scholars from the East and the West of Europe to discuss current societal changes in the East and in the West by delivering papers of high academic standards. The idea of starting an academic journal was obvious. After the dissolution of the “One Europe Research Group” that has fulfilled its mission, the challenging journey, in the word of the late Martin Peterson, to break down the rigors of orthodox academic boundaries continued and brought us together with Routledge. Sadly enough, some of the eminent scholars who joined the first advisory board of our journal have passed away in the meantime. The organization of a workshop on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the journal includes the sad duty of the editor to commemorate gratefully those eminent scholars.

Already in 1990 Friedrich R. Filippov, Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, was the first of those who passed away. He was among the few early Soviet academics who were calling for reforms of the academic system and for opening up international cooperation for young researchers. He successfully encouraged them to participate at the deliberations of the “One Europe Research Group”. One should not forget that this was at that time quite risky: in the Soviet Union totalitarianism was still prevailing.

Yngvar Løchen (31 May 1931 – 28 July 1998) was a quite renown academic in Norway and some even claim that he was one of the fathers of the modern Norwegian Sociology. He was among the founders both of the “One Europe Research Group” and of our journal. Yngvar was not only an eminent scholar, but an active citizen. He was among few scholars who has realized the potential for the transformation of the Communist Eastern Europe, and hence delivered not only intellectual input, but also contributed also to the funding of the Cracow events. He was convinced that the social sciences have a mission to contribute to the further democratization.

In 2015, Martin Peterson (1941 – 2015) passed away. Martin was a quite knowledgeable historian by profession, but we would call him rather a general intellectual. Let the scientic communities judge about his academic reputation and his broad academic scope: when Martin was given the emeritus status in 2006 his assistants organized a Festschrift to honour his academic performance. Nearly all social science disciplines were represented and contributed to this book, called for good reasons: “A Case of Identities” (Hammarlund and Nilson 2006).

It should be note here that like Yngvar, he not only had relevant intellectual inputs into the development of interdisciplinary social science research, but was one of the founding fathers of the “One Europe Research Group” and has joined the journal from its first issue onwards till his last days.
In the course of a journal that is published for 30 years there were changes in both the editorial board and the advisory board. Among those, who joined the editorial board later and passed away in the meantime there were

- **John Rex**, who during his lifetime was not just one of the leading scholar in studying Max Weber, but studying migrant communities and was involved in the fight against the South African Apartheid regime; and
- **James Coleman**, well known for his methodological work in the social sciences.

To commemorate the colleagues who left us is our duty. We owe gratefulness to all of those who left us. And we, of course, are indebted to all of those who served in the Advisory Board for some time, and those who are still with us and continue to support our journal.

Ronald J. Pohoryles
ICCR Foundation & The European Association, Vienna, Austria