



© VERSUSstudio/shutterstock.com



Leibniz Institute for  
Research on Society and Space

# Cities and Regions as Open Arenas

Research Programme 2019 - 2021



# Contents

- Introduction** ..... 5
- Dynamics of Economic Spaces** ..... 9
  - 1 Department Profile** ..... 9
  - 2 Lead Project: Platform Ecology: Creative Collaboration in Overlapping Virtual and Concrete Spaces. The Case of Fashion Design**..... 10
    - 2.1 Problem outline ..... 10
    - 2.2 Questions ..... 11
    - 2.3 Theoretical approaches..... 12
    - 2.4 Methods ..... 13
- Institutional Change and Regional Public Goods** ..... 15
  - 1 Department Profile** ..... 15
  - 2 Lead Project: Critical Infrastructures: The Political Construction, Spatiality, and Governance of Criticality**..... 16
    - 2.1 Problem outline ..... 16
    - 2.2 Questions ..... 17
    - 2.3 Theoretical approaches..... 18
    - 2.4 Methods ..... 19
- Dynamics of Communication, Knowledge and Spatial Development**..... 21
  - 1 Department Profile** ..... 21
  - 2 Lead Project: Smart Villagers: Digitalisation and Social Innovations in Rural Areas**..... 22
    - 2.1 Problem outline ..... 22
    - 2.2 Questions ..... 23
    - 2.3 Theoretical approaches..... 24
    - 2.4 Methods ..... 25
- Regeneration of Cities and Towns** ..... 27
  - 1 Department Profile** ..... 27
  - 2 Lead Project: Immigration: Governance Dilemmas of Cities and Towns** ..... 28
    - 2.1 Problem outline ..... 28
    - 2.2 Questions ..... 29
    - 2.3 Theoretical approaches..... 30
    - 2.4 Methods ..... 31

<b>Department for Historical Research/Scientific Collections for the History of Building and Planning in the GDR .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>1 Department Profile .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>2 Lead Project: Socio-spatial Disparities and Policies for Social Cohesion in Cities of the GDR and FRG .....</b>	<b>34</b>
2.1 Problem outline.....	34
2.2 Questions .....	35
2.3 Theoretical Approaches .....	36
2.4 Methods.....	37
<b>National and International Research Cooperations with Universities and Non-university Research Institutions .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>1 National Cooperations .....</b>	<b>39</b>
1.1 National Cooperative Relations with Universities .....	39
1.2 National Cooperative Relations with Non-University Institutions.....	40
<b>2 International Cooperations .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Staff of the Research Departments and the Scientific Collections .....</b>	<b>56</b>

## **Introduction**

The central focus of the Leibniz Institute for Research on Society and Space (IRS) is the analysis of socio-spatial transformation processes. Through empirical research we investigate the forces that drive and sustain these processes, comparing them nationally and internationally as well as over various periods in time. From a conceptual perspective, the processes entailed in the social construction of spaces are of particular interest. In the Department for Historical Research and the Scientific Collections for the History of Building and Planning in the GDR, historical research on the path towards urbanisation and planning cultures in the 20th century and the evaluation of archival records are systematically interlinked.

A high potential for dynamism and structural change, spatial and social relevance, and long-lasting significance and influence: these are the criteria around which research topics at the IRS are organised. As a member institute of the Leibniz Association, the IRS pursues research on society and space in the form of basic knowledge- and application-oriented research. It is the only research institute in Germany to consolidate the full range of spatial social-science disciplines under one roof, and to use this range to investigate socially relevant issues in interdisciplinary, thematically focused teams.

### **New Title: Cities and Regions as Open Arenas**

We live in a time in which the development of cities and regions is increasingly subject to external influences arriving from beyond their own territories. These processes take place in the context of the digital networking of our world, and increasing international migration, globalisation, and social inequality. In this sense, cities and regions can be understood as open arenas. In the Research Programme 2019-2021, the (departmentally overarching) interest is directed towards places in which the opening up of cities and regions has been exemplary, and whose biographies have been complex; towards urban and regional strategies that promote an ongoing willingness for adaptation, in order to encounter new and, perhaps, critical developments; towards new forms of governance that generate new knowledge through the combination of endogenous, local, and regional potential with exogenous, external resources; and not least towards new forms of social action evolving in connection with the overlapping of virtual and socio-material spaces.

As in the predecessor programme, the title of the Research Programme 2019-2021 is meant to fulfil a double function. Outside of the institute, it should bring the content of current IRS research succinctly into focus. Within the institute, it should have the effect of lending coherence. For even if the departmental profiles, in their topics of research, theoretical approaches, and methodologies carry the signatures of their heads of department and research associates, the requirement remains that each research department carries out their specific contribution within a coherent overall concept.

### **New Cross-Cutting Issue: Mediatiation and Digitalisation of Action**

Particular challenges to, and chances for, cities and regions as open arenas are presented by mediatiation and digitalisation, and the Research Programme 2019-2021 consequently handles

these subjects within a new, empirical cross-cutting issue (henceforth: “digitalisation”). This is an area the IRS has previously turned to, with the third-party funded project “The Mediatisation of Urban Development Planning and Changes to the Public Sphere”, investigated jointly by the research department “Dynamics of Communication, Knowledge and Spatial Development” and the Department for Historical Research, as well as in both larger digitalisation projects carried out within the framework of the Scientific Collections between 2010 and 2015. What interests us above all is how forms of action and knowledge specifically change as a result of mediatisation and digitalisation processes, and what consequences this has, for example, for spatial development processes. Here the IRS wishes to map out its own course by investigating digitalised forms of action and knowledge processes and their spatial dimensions in connection with processes of creativity and innovation, spatial planning processes, the urban public sphere, and critical infrastructures.

The following table lists the lead projects (LP) and third-party funded projects being undertaken, at the time of publication, within the Research Programme 2019-2021 as part of the cross-cutting issue “digitalisation”:

Table: New Cross-Cutting Issue: Mediatisation and Digitalisation of Action

Dimension	Project
<b>Creativity and innovation processes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Platform Ecology: Creative Collaboration in Overlapping Virtual and Concrete Spaces. The Case of Fashion Design (2019-2021; LP RD Economic Spaces)</li> <li>• Smart Villagers: Digitalisation and Social Innovations in Rural Areas (2019-2021; LP RD Dynamics of Communication)</li> </ul>
<b>Spatial-planning processes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Mediatisation of Urban Development Planning and Changes to the Public Sphere (Leibniz Competition; 2017-2020; RD Dynamics of Communication and RD Department for Historical Research)</li> <li>• Urban Security 3D/Perceptions of (In-)Security at Urban Places: Best Practices for Urban Design and Digital Planning (Federal Ministry of Education and Research; 2018-2021; RD Dynamics of Communication)</li> <li>• Digital Urban Planning: Planning Practices and Physical Arrangements (sub-project in the SRA “Re-Figuration of Spaces”; 2018-2021; RD Dynamics of Communication)</li> </ul>
<b>Urban public spheres</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Mediatisation of Urban Development Planning and Changes to the Public Sphere (Leibniz Competition; 2017-2020; RD Dynamics of Communication and RD Department for Historical Research)</li> </ul>
<b>Critical infrastructures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical Infrastructures: The Governance and Political Construction of Criticality (2019-2021; LP RD Institutional Change)</li> </ul>

The three previous interdisciplinary topics (innovation, resilience, and governance) retain their importance within the IRS Research Programme 2019-2021, providing focus to the wide field of socio-spatial research and thus integrating the projects of the various research departments with one another. For inter-departmental communication and cooperation, however, they will be given lower priority than the topic “Mediatisation and Digitalisation of Action”.

## **Elaborating the Theoretical-Conceptual Profile: Space-Time Dynamics**

A further goal of the IRS and its research is to adequately comprehend the complexity of space, social action, and transformation processes from a theoretical-conceptual perspective. In its spatial-theory based work, the institute combines observations on the social construction of spaces to relational spaces, to spaces as the objects and resources of development processes, to the relationship of space and place, and to the interaction between spatial and temporal dimensions in social action. The last of these will be dealt with in greater depth as part of the Research Programme 2019-2021, under the title “Space-Time Dynamics”, constituting the leading theoretical-conceptual profile of research at the IRS.

Actions and their contexts have fundamental temporal structures. The sociologist of time Hartmut Rosa has suggested that in light of technological developments, and not least as a result of increasing mediatization and digitalisation of action, fundamental changes in the temporal structures of modern societies have taken place, and that these changes have led in the direction of social acceleration (cf. Rosa 2016, 32). From the perspective of socio-spatial research, for example, there is evidence for a variety of collective time patterns among actors working within the same fields of policy and action; that “chronopolicies” can become a component of spatial development strategies (particularly noticeable in the case of Cittaslow cities); and that processes of social acceleration both between various spaces (e.g. in different cities and regions) and within them (e.g. regional social subdivisions such as business or technology on the one hand, and politics or civil society on the other) can take various forms.

Central to this are the following overarching questions:

- Through what processes do spaces and various fields of action of spatial development evolve?
- To what extent are differing tempi of development (de-synchronisation or possibly synchronisation) observable?
- What time regimes and concepts of time can be observed in present-day and past societies?
- What impact do these have, particularly for spatial development?

In the Research Programme 2019-2021, the five lead projects offer a portfolio of approaches from the sociology of time, organisation studies, and governance-oriented and historical research. The aim is not simply to further develop these individual approaches in relation to the various areas of empirical spatial analysis, but rather to gain a cross-disciplinary overview in order to show the systematic interactions that exist between them. It remains a future task to consider the interrelations of action, space, and time more systematically than has heretofore been done, and thus, as suggested by Rosa, to take the dynamic changes occurring in space-time relations themselves into account.

## **Special Conditions**

The present Research Programme 2019-2021 has been developed within the context of two special conditions. Firstly, the measures towards ensuring continued liquidity, implemented since 2017 by the IRS in light of significant financial cuts made as part of the Joint Initiative for Research and Innovation III (2016-2020), has first of all meant that, for each research department, the personnel capacity able to be financed through the core and departmental budgets has had to be adapted. For this reason, empirical research abroad in the Research Programme 2019-2021 will predominantly be undertaken within third-party funded projects.

Secondly, there is a pending change in leadership at the IRS, the previous director having retired on 30 September 2018. Once the position of director is reoccupied, the position of head of the research department “Institutional Change and Regional Public Goods” will also be redesignated in a joint appointment procedure. Both changes of personnel might lead to modifications in the Research Programme 2019-2021 presented here.

## **Successful Evaluation and Senate Statement**

On 11 July 2018, the Senate of the Leibniz Association concluded its scientific evaluation process with a positive statement. The Senate pointed to convincing further development of the overall concept of the institute, the considerably improved visibility resulting from its renaming as the “Leibniz Institute for Research on Society and Space”, the well-profiled research departments, which achieved assessments as high as “very good to excellent”, the substantive publication record and the unique inventory of the Scientific Collections for the History of Building and Planning in the GDR. Not least, the Senate attested the social relevance of the themes researched at the IRS and, furthermore, its success at engaging in dialogue with policy and society. The Senate recommended that the IRS develop a succinct Mission Statement for the entire institute and supported the special financial framework (Sondertatbestand) recommended by the evaluation group for the further indexing of the Scientific Collection’s inventory via databases and online services, as well as for the development of exemplary procedures for small archives and collections. A realisation of this intention on the basis of additional institutional funding was recommended.

The Senate thus followed the judgements and recommendations of the evaluation group that had assessed the IRS on 15 and 16 November 2017, and recommended both the Federation and State to maintain funding to the IRS for the period of seven further years. Dynamics of Economic Spaces.



# Dynamics of Economic Spaces

## 1 Department Profile

Within the IRS, the research department “Dynamics of Economic Spaces” represents social-science research into economic processes and their multifaceted spatial manifestations. Forming its profile are empirical and conceptual studies on the themes of the knowledge economy, new forms of knowledge work and organisation of creative processes in various economic sectors, as well as innovation research, including user-driven innovation in civil society. In addition, research in the department profiles the concept of resilience. This applies, for instance, to research on career resilience in creative professional fields or on the role of experts in crises.

The research is highly influenced by practice-based theories of knowledge, as well as by innovation theories from economic geography. A particular contribution of ours has been presented in the discourse on “Communities of Practice”. The debates around territorial innovation models have been enriched through an explicit processual perspective on innovation and creativity. With the concept of the “Open Region”, these findings have crystallised into a systematic heuristic for regional innovation policies. With regard to spatial concepts, the studies are located within economic geography, and members of the research department have distinguished themselves through a topological perspective on knowledge generation and innovation processes. In terms of methodology, qualitative methods for the collection of longitudinal data on innovation and creative processes (idea-centred network analyses, creative biographies), as well as on the spatio-temporality of crises have been further developed.

The work of the department proceeds along three lines of research (LR):

**LR 1 “New places of creative knowledge collaboration”:** Knowledge, the central resource of a knowledge economy, has the quality that it multiplies when shared. This line of research collects projects in which distinctive spatio-temporal arrangements are investigated that have been specifically created in order to support the sharing of knowledge.

**LR 2 “The governance of creative collaboration”:** Creativity is the basis of regeneration processes in various contexts. It is thus seen less as an individual quality or accomplishment, and rather as a result of social collaboration. This line of research brings together projects in which the structures, dynamics, and spatial constellations of creative collaboration are made the central object of discussion. The lead project will also belong to this line of research.

**LR 3 “Knowledge practices in the context of crises and crisis interdependencies”:** Crises are open-ended situations of increased uncertainty in which an increased urgency to act prevails. They are characterised by the ambivalence created by a feeling of existential threat coupled with the potential for positive change. Projects in this line of research question how uncertainty can also be used as a problem-solving resource, and what can be learned from extraordinary individual cases.

## **2 Lead Project: Platform Ecology: Creative Collaboration in Overlapping Virtual and Concrete Spaces. The Case of Fashion Design**

### **Project team**

Prof. Dr. Oliver Ibert (Head, Economic Geography)

Prof. Dr. Suntje Schmidt (Deputy Head, Economic Geography)

Anna Oechslen (Doctoral Researcher, Social Sciences, Modern South- & South-East Asian Studies)

T.B.A (Doctoral Researcher)

### **Keywords**

Creativity, online platform, fashion design, regional value creation, spatio-temporality of creativity.

### **2.1 Problem outline**

An idea makes its way to becoming a product through an abundance of heads and hands. When a fashion designer, for example, seeks to create a new material, she requires a range of expertise to bring her idea to fruition – whether from weaving company or from a research institute for nanotechnology. Raw materials must be selected and prototypes developed. Later the focus shifts to attracting attention and locating possibilities for financing the project. The design process is thus closely bound with the interplay of various contacts who might be spatially dispersed. At almost all of these stages, from research to publicity, there now exist online platforms offering alternatives to, or supplementing, the already long-established forms of direct or mediated exchange: crowdfunding platforms, social networks, or collaborative platforms such as “Jovoto”. Online platforms thus expand the possibilities of spatially distributed work within core sectors of the creative economy. Van Dijck defines online platforms according to their technical functions as digital media in which certain behavioural assumptions and related beneficial and obstructive behavioural stimuli are incorporated. Owing to their behaviour-structured character, she furthermore defines online platforms as “performative infrastructures” (2013, p. 29).

Central to the lead project is, on the one hand, an exploration of the world of opportunity offered by such platforms; on the other hand, creative processes and the spatial distribution of value creation need be considered. The investigation of creative work, with a particular focus on virtually mediated interactions, opens the way to considering a new spatiality of creative inputs and value creation. Thus, while potential new chances for participation are offered up to formerly excluded social actors and peripheral spaces, at the same time possibilities for value extraction are centralised by the pivotal role of the platform, and simultaneously removed from creative actors and hubs. Connected to the lead project, Anna Oechslen’s PhD project, “Global Platform Labour – Negotiating the Value of Work in Transcultural Settings”, is concerned with processes of negotiation in this context.

The growing relevance of online platforms opens up three research gaps within the discourse of economic geography. Here, firstly, value creation in the creative economy is located above all where creative individuals and companies are established (critical here is Shearmur, 2016). If online platforms are becoming increasingly bound together with creative practices, this implies that platform providers are also participating. Depending on the business model of the platform

involved, this entails a heretofore little understood redistribution of participation by regions and groups of actors in the creation of value. A platform economy undermines the monopoly of value creation in existing centres of knowledge creation, but also itself tends in the direction of hyper-clustering. The lead project aims to explore new spatial patterns and their underlying mechanisms.

Secondly, it is currently assumed in, for instance, discourse around knowledge bases (Asheim, Coenen and Vang, 2007) that creative industries principally operating with symbolic knowledge are to a higher degree locally bound than technology- or research-intensive sectors cultivating a synthetic or analytical knowledge base. Through the overlapping processes of mediatisation and digitalisation, the possibilities of spatially distributed work have been refined and expanded, even in these predominantly symbolic knowledge domains.

Thirdly, creative work has until now been considered to be largely autonomous and little standardised (Florida, 2014). With online platforms as new “mediators” of social action, the possibilities for participation and interaction are fundamentally structured by the digital medium utilised. Interfaces and the algorithms that operate in the background provide a framework for possibilities of action dependent on the economic model pursued, and this in turn can be used strategically by their users. The, in this sense, “performative infrastructure” (van Dijck, 2013, p. 29) that online platforms offer also invites a new conceptualisation of the character of creative work.

Fashion design has been selected for the empirical object of study in this project. Physical co-presence, such as at fashion trade fairs, continues to play a large role in the industry; at the same time, models such as crowdsourcing or crowdfunding are gaining in significance. Fashion design is no stranger to pre-digital forms of spatially dispersed, international division of labour. There is, however, usually a clear separation between the more highly valued creative tasks undertaken in fashion centres located predominantly in Europe, and additional work accomplished outside of these centres. The involvement of online platforms establishes new dynamics and possibilities for exchange. Precisely because analogue qualities such as materiality and physical touch are of such importance in the industry, an investigation of fashion design promises to deliver particularly instructive results concerning the interaction of socio-material and virtual elements.

## 2.2 Questions

Both the problem outlined and the gaps in research identified within economic geography will be investigated from two different but related perspectives. Firstly, a more systemic consideration of platform ecologies will be given, focusing most of all on the expanded and modified structures of opportunity for creative social collaboration within one sector. On this basis, secondly, a processual observation of the integration of online platforms in creative practices will be made.

**Platform ecology:** Multiple studies already exist on individual platforms (such as Graham et al. 2017, on the theme of crowdfunding, etc.). Conceptual studies also exist, examining the importance of the concept of platforms for the research agenda in economic geography (Langley and Leishon, 2017). Our contribution consists above all in delivering an empirically substantiated, integrated observation of the expanded structures of opportunity for creative collaboration through the chronologically sequential and parallel interactions of different types of platforms. The expanded structure of opportunity, or platform ecology, of fashion design is spatially em-

bedded in a complex way. The following sub-questions should assist in a closer understanding of platform ecology:

- What types of platform exist in relation to various functions (e.g. the mobilisation of capital, resources, cooperative possibilities) within creative processes? What, in each case, are their characteristic features (users, providers, locations, business models)?
- How does the design of the intersection between concrete and virtual spaces appear, and what performative effects does the intersection design have?
- What new kinds of space are constructed by the platforms' business models?
- To what extent are existing spatial inequalities in creative work being used anew and, conversely, what consequences do newly distributed possibilities for the extraction of value have on existing spatial inequalities?

**Spatial-temporal process analysis:** From the perspective of socio-spatial research, it is particularly interesting to understand at what point in creative processes which types of platforms can be involved, and how media-mediated exchange and direct socio-material practice overlap. It will be investigated, from a spatio-temporal perspective, how the structure of opportunity of a platform ecology is put to use in concrete creative processes, and how physical-material contexts of practice, relations, and virtually mediated spaces thus overlap.

- How are platforms integrated sequentially and in parallel in creative projects?
- How in each case is the interplay of concrete and digitally mediated socio-material practices designed?
- How do the uses of analogue and digital media stand in relation to each other?
- Under what conditions are classical forms of co-presence preferred, and when are the virtual alternatives favoured?

### 2.3 Theoretical approaches

The conceptual embedding of the research project connects with the already present focus areas of the department with respect to the topics of knowledge, knowledge practices, creativity, and the creation of value. In addition, actor-network theory (Latour 2005) forms a source of inspiration for the lead project. We do not merely take a general interest in the relationships between humans and technologies, working on the assumption that these relationships equally influence social action as it does relationships between humans; rather our interest is above all specific to the effect of digital media (Barad, 2003; Suchman, 2007). This perspective alone would, however, take the power structures which have a joint influence on these processes too little into account, and must therefore be supplemented by a view towards the political economy of platforms (cf. van Dijck 2013, p. 26 ff.). A synthesis of both perspectives is to be found in Couldry's (2004) approach of "media as practice". He argues for an integrated consideration of practices directed towards media, as well as the role that media occupies in the ordering of social action (p. 115). This approach makes it possible to consider the intersection between practices and technologies and takes the interconnectedness of production and consumption of content into account (Couldry, van Dijck 2015). Star and Ruhleder (1996) enter in particular into the production methods of information systems and their integration into practices. Together with Star's approach (1999) of an "ethnography of infrastructure", this offers valuable points of reference for observing infrastructure as relational and embedded in specific contexts. Translating this to digital plat-

forms as “performative infrastructures” means that both their design, with regard to the interests and business models of the platform provider, and the behaviours of users in socio-technical practices should be taken into consideration. Infrastructure is thus more than the virtual user environment; it is much more a dynamic product of negotiation processes.

The project pursues a social-constructivist approach to space and spatiality, here in particular the connection of material and immaterial elements in “synthetic situations” (Knorr-Cetina 2009) characterised by standardisation and automation. The interplay of people and technology has frequently been discussed under the concept of “technicity” (e.g. Kitchin, Dodge 2011; Niederer, van Dijck 2010). Working from a constructivist and relational approach, space will be understood here as a product of the relationship between humans, as well as the interaction between people and technology. The performative qualities of online platforms here promise a further development of the relational concept of space.

With regard to the influence of technologically supported communication on the meaning of proximity and distance, Grabher et al. (2017) argue for a recalibrated understanding of co-presence – from “being there” to “being aware”. This aspect forms above all an important conceptual framework for the question of integration of online platforms in creative collaboration. We expect results that suggest a new dynamic of proximity and distance relations in creative work.

## **2.4 Methods**

The broad field of fashion-design practices will be investigated by means of theoretical sampling. Two-thirds of the collected data will derive from pioneers in the researched field, who proactively use the opportunities created by digitalisation and mediatisation, or even expand on them through their own initiative. The remaining third of the data, conversely, will address actors who work more traditionally within their field. In both areas, companies of varying size will be investigated. This approach creates the advantage that processes of transformation are characterised by the simultaneity of the non-simultaneous. By comparing pioneering and traditional practices, a diachronic analysis will to some extent be possible, in which novel possibilities will emerge more clearly recognisable against the background of traditional patterns.

The research project is based on the presupposition that design practices span virtual and socio-material spheres; accordingly, a combination of different approaches is also necessary in the selection of methods. For the observation of the interplay of design practices with the performative infrastructure of platforms, Stars (1999) provides a helpful approach in the concept of an “ethnography of infrastructure”. Further insights into socio-technological practices should also be gained through netnographic observations on the one hand, and through interviews with practitioners and experts on the other. The following mix of methods will be employed in the collection of data:

- Desktop research: By means of a systematic online enquiry of existing platforms, their various features and functions, user conditions, surveying of interface design, and role assignment.
- Qualitative interviews:
  - Expert interviews with providers: Counted here as experts are specialists who set up and provide interfaces and who understand underlying algorithms of platforms, infrastructure hardware, and localisation of organisations and value creation. These provide information about the technical and organisational design principles underlying the platforms, as well as the anticipated and desired forms of their use.

- Interviews with platform designers and users: By these means, processual data on the course of creative collaborations will be collected, with a focus on the (possible) use of digital media.
- Virtual “click-alongs” with designers: This involves a hybrid survey technique which, like walk-along interviews, combines qualitative interviews with elements of participatory observation, but which is practised not in the concrete spatial environment, but transferred to virtual space (Møller Jørgensen, 2016). Designers explain to researchers their use of platforms in real time while clicking through the various functions. This creates two data layers: interview transcripts and observation logs, which will be analysed in combination.

The nature of the object of study makes it necessary to conduct the empirical research in several places, including international visits, that in this preliminary stage cannot yet be precisely specified. Interview partners and cases in Berlin will function as a starting point. Afterwards, the geography of spatially distributed collaborations will lead the research process onwards to other significant locations. This comes with increased travel expenses, but also the option of substituting face-to-face interviews with Skype interviews. Under consideration, but as yet still to be specified during the course of the project, are from one to three research trips to regions in which important functions, from fashion centres to the hubs of online-platform providers, have conglomerated, enabling the collection of a large amount of data within a short period of time.

# Institutional Change and Regional Public Goods

## 1 Department Profile

The object of our research is to investigate those spatial-development transformation processes that can be traced back to the socio-material characteristics and the social and political constructions of socio-technical systems. These processes, in their spatio-temporal dynamic, are understood as institutional changes and transformations of governance forms. Of particular interest are those institutional arrangements and governance forms able to serve as mediators between political management within a multi-level governance and decentralised action by actors from economy, civil society, politics, and administration. The conceptual framework of the research department combines four key dimensions of the human-environment relationship that, within the debate surrounding socio-technical “transitions” (Geels, Schot 2007) lie outside of the central focus: institutional change, materiality, power, and space (Gailing, Moss 2016). The empirical investigations are directed towards spatial problems that are subject to a transformation process and which distinguish themselves through their interconnected institutional and socio-material elements and structures. These in turn exhibit various spatial relations and forms of production of space. Areas of investigation are the spatial transformation of interconnected and critical infrastructure, the formation of new energy spaces in the context of energy transitions, as well as the ways in which climate change is dealt with locally and regionally.

The work of the department proceeds along the following lines of research (LR):

**LR 1 “Infrastructures and criticality”:** This line of research brings together projects addressing the spatiality of infrastructures. Infrastructures are interpreted in the social sciences as socio-technological systems or as socio-material arrangements. In science and technology studies (STS), a dualistic perspective on infrastructures is accordingly assumed: they are on the one hand produced by society, but also have an influence on that same society. The criticality of infrastructures arises from their growing interdependence and transformation, which are consequently embedded in various social sub-sectors and spaces. The lead project stands central to this line of research, engaging with the spatiality of critical infrastructures while giving special attention to the political construction, spatiality, and governance of criticality.

**LR 2 “Spatial governance of the energy transition and of climate change”:** This line of research bundles together projects concerning new energy spaces and climate governance. Energy-system transformation (including renewable energies) and climate change are of persisting relevance, both from a political perspective and with regard to their implications for spatial development. New spatial challenges exist here in the need for an “upscaling” of experimental and innovative governance (Fuhr et al. 2018), the necessity of a thus far neglected sufficiency strategy in climate and energy policy (Schneidewind, Zahrnt 2014), as well as the comparison of regional productions of space across the various national socio-technical contexts of energy transitions (Kuchler, Bridge 2018).

## **2 Lead Project: Critical Infrastructures: The Political Construction, Spatiality, and Governance of Criticality**

### **Project team**

Dr. Ludger Gailing (Head, Planning Sciences/Human Geography)  
Prof. Dr. Kristine Kern (Senior Researcher, Political and Administrative Studies)  
Andreas Röhring (Senior Researcher, Economics)  
Felicitas Klemp (Doctoral Research, Human Geography)  
T.B.A. (Postdoctoral Researcher)

### **Keywords**

Infrastructure, governance, criticality, critical infrastructure, energy transition, climate policy, spatiality.

### **2.1 Problem outline**

Extreme weather events such as Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans 2005 or the heat waves in Europe 2018 had fundamental effects on living conditions in cities and regions. They thus place the functional capability of communal existence in question, leading as they do to the failure or impairment of essential infrastructures. Other, ever more frequently mentioned events are cyber attacks or large-scale power failures (cf. Petermann et al. 2010). Alongside such disruptive events, infrastructures can be placed in danger by gradual processes, including insufficient investment in maintenance or the digitalisation of societal life. The latter has increased the dependency of society on the supply of electricity. Equally, systems integration in the course of the energy transition has had the consequence that mobility and heat supply, for instance, are dependent on more volatile energy supply.

In the context of such dangers, infrastructures are seen from a new perspective: namely, they are considered “critical”. In this discussion, infrastructures will be recurrently referred to, whose failure or impairment have consequences such as supply shortages or disruption to public security (BMI 2009). In the normative concept of “critical infrastructures”, a change in the public discourse about infrastructure policy is to be acknowledged, because attention shifts to the vulnerability and dependence of differentiated and technology-based societies on networked infrastructures. Infrastructure policy that refers back to the criticality of infrastructures no longer orients itself predominantly towards the argument of essential “public services”, but equally towards the aspect of “security”. Protecting critical infrastructure recognised as essential from threats, and the search for suitable resilience strategies, is thus central (Pesch-Cronin, Marion 2017).

Critical infrastructures are spatial as a result of their boundedness to areas, networks, and locations (Neisser, Pohl 2013). This finds expression not least in a principle formulated in the Spatial Planning Law (§ 2 Paragraph 2 No. 3) taking into consideration the protection of critical infrastructure. Their spatial dimensions have nevertheless not been researched adequately (Graham 2010, Birkmann et al. 2016), in particular as concerns a social-science analysis of the issue informed by spatial concepts. Since October 2016, KRITIS (2222), a graduate training school at the TU Darmstadt funded by the German Research Foundation, has been run (Engels, Nordmann 2018), focusing on critical infrastructures in cities.

The interest of this lead project is to analyse and understand the political construction and governance of critical infrastructures in connection with their spatiality. Analysing critical infrastructures and “criticality” as a political construction implies a desire to understand how infrastructures, under certain circumstances, become topics of political discourse and are conceived from the perspective of certain actors as “critical”. The lead project concentrates, from an empirical perspective, on two fields of action within multi-levelled governance in Germany: on the “Ener-



giewende” (as the process of energy transition has come to be known in the German context) and on urban climate-adaptation policy. Within this, aspects of digitalisation play as prominent a role as the networking of various infrastructures. Both are understood as inherent aspects of critical infrastructures.

The energy transition seems a suitable field of action because, following the foundational technologies of the transition (the development of wind energy, and photovoltaic and biomass energy plants), its second phase has seen it directed towards a comprehensive systematic integration of volatile, renewable energies, and a coupling of the electricity, heating, transport, and industrial sectors. It also accompanies a fundamental electrification of the other sectors (Fischedick 2015, Leopoldina et al. 2017). There are thus challenges to be met in relation to the criticality of energy infrastructures: sector coupling involves the interlinking of the consumer sector, the energy carriers, and final-energy forms, together with the infrastructures linked to each of these. On the basis of digitalisation and electrification, the energy transition is also prerequisite to making the energy system more flexible (Fraunhofer ISI 2018). Digitalisation does, however, increase its vulnerability as a critical infrastructure.

The second area of activity within urban climate-adaptation policy is distinguished by the fact that cities are important actors in, and important target areas for, climate policy (Kern 2014). For all measures to adapt to the effects of climate change, infrastructures play a central role. Extreme events such as heat waves and (flash) flooding caused by heavy rain come along with infrastructure damage (BReg 2015), the outcome of which, in the case of a failure of various interlinked infrastructures, could potentially cause the true damage. At the same time, especially by being digitally linked, infrastructures present a possibility for handling climate change and extreme weather events.

The two fields of action are differentiated through their space-time dynamics. In both, a role is played by the specific dialectic between disruptive events and gradual processes. The manner in which certain events are connected to year-long developments in the political construction of criticality does, however, differ between one field of action and another. It is to be assumed heuristically that greater regard is given to extreme events in climate-adaptation policy, whereas the energy transition is foregrounded in institutionally led processes.

In the context of the research gaps sketched out above, three perspectives will be combined in the lead project: the political construction of criticality, and the spatiality and governance, respectively, of critical infrastructures.

## 2.2 Questions

The three thematic question groups are subdivided as follows:

**The political construction of criticality:** The political construction of criticality in the fields of action of both “energy transitions” and “urban climate adaptation” arise on the one hand through scientific and political discourse (concerning threats, security, and vulnerability, for instance) and, on the other, through institutional frameworks in which critical infrastructures are integrated.

- Which infrastructures are assessed to be “critical”, and by whom?
- What collective imaginaries of the socio-technological future have been formulated and led to institutionalisation?
- What intersectional relationships between infrastructures contribute to the political construction of criticality?

**The spatiality of critical infrastructures:** To be able to understand the spatial dynamic of critical infrastructures, it is necessary to differentiate between various spatial dimensions (e.g. the territoriality of nation-state policy, the local manifestation of hazards which is often accompanied by a politically charged local discourse, the interdependence of spatial networks) and scalar levels of action (e.g. municipal, regional, subnational, national, and supranational).

- What dimensions of spatiality are constructed in connection with the criticality of infrastructures in the two fields of action, “energy transitions” and “urban climate-adaptation policy”?
- How, in its space-time dynamic, does criticality manifest itself as a process?
- What role does heuristic differentiation play between gradual processes and disruptive individual events in each field of action?

**Governance of critical infrastructures in multi-level systems:** A third overarching research interest is concerned with governance forms and their respective actor constellations, each of which contribute as instruments of collective coordination of action in the fields of “energy transition” and “urban climate-adaptation policy”.

- How does the governance of critical infrastructures in the fields of action investigated change according to the space-time dynamic of, on the one hand, gradual processes and, on the other, disruptive events?
- What new actor constellations are there?
- With which governance forms are resilience strategies for the handling of critical infrastructures in multi-level governance systems developed?

### 2.3 Theoretical approaches

The concept of criticality has to date played a subordinate role in socio-technological infrastructure research. Exceptions include studies by Engels and Nordmann (2018), on the content of ideology and on the genesis of criticality, publications on the construction of criticality in resource geography (Machacek 2017), as well as the debate around “securitisation” of infrastructures (Aradau 2010). These contributions will be drawn upon in order to record the powerful role of material and discursive practices of significance to a political re-conceptualisation of infrastructures (e.g. as “relevant to security”). They will be used to also include essentialist notions of criticality and to understand them with regard to their own constructed nature. Analysis categories will be gained from the theoretical concept of “socio-technical imaginaries” and nexus research. Using the STS approach of socio-technical imaginaries (Jasanoff, Kim 2015), the way that collective constructions in technologies and infrastructures are integrated will be investigated. Nexus research helps to systematise the networking of various infrastructures and to understand this as a political process (Williams et al. 2014). These concepts are of heuristic value for the investigation of the political construction of critical infrastructures.

For the analysis of spatial process perspectives, the lead project orients itself towards a spatial concept that returns to collective, social constructions of space and – typically for social-science infrastructure research – encompasses both material, institutional, and discursive spatial constructs. Here, findings from the preceding lead project on territorialisation, place formation, scale, and networks in energy spaces will be drawn upon, in which the TPSN approach of Jessop et al. (2008) will be utilised as a heuristic. There is much to indicate that in dealing with critical infrastructures, the opposition above all between technological networks and specific “endangered” places is influential. Regarding the space-time dynamic, the two fields of action distinguish

themselves – so it is assumed – through process logics in interaction with disruptive events and gradual processes (Pierson 2000) that can be described and mutually compared in their spatio-temporality.

In analysing the governance of critical infrastructures, more recent governance and management concepts will be applied. Adaptive governance takes the complexities and uncertainties of ecosystems into account and emphasises the significance of flexibility and learning (Olsson et al. 2004). Central to political-science approaches is above all the analysis of focused events leading to the opening of a “policy window” that can result in change (Birkland, Warnement 2014). An important foundation for the investigation of critical infrastructures are approaches from governance research based upon discussions on polycentric, multi-level governance (Tierney 2012), because the simplification to one spatial level would be unsuitable for the complexity of critical infrastructures. The discussion on risk governance will focus on the issue of how governance in situations characterised by complex problems, uncertainty, and ambiguity is possible. The approach of risk governance makes parallel reference to recent management concepts that will be discussed under the heading of VUCA (Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, Ambiguity). Important here is the organisational perspective and the issue of how the performance of organisations can be maintained and improved (Bennett, Lemoine 2014).

## **2.4 Methods**

In the lead project, the essential methods to be applied will be institutional analysis (Steinmo 2010), discourse analysis (Hajer 2000), and focus groups (Liamputtong 2011).

The material for analysis of the institutional framework and the discourse on critical infrastructures will initially be collected on the basis of a desktop analysis of critical infrastructures in Germany and the EU. Furthermore, a) scientific articles, reports, and studies, b) strategies and programmes, and c) laws, regulations, and guidelines will be drawn upon. The evaluation of the material will be achieved firstly through institutional analysis: this means analysing the formal institutional framework for critical infrastructures at the national (federal German) and European levels, thereby identifying the similarities and differences between each. In addition, a discourse analysis following Hajer (2002) will reconstruct dominant scientific and political discourses on critical infrastructure using a selection of key documents from this textual corpus. Hajer’s differentiation between the linguistic level of discourse, the investigation of policy vocabulary, and the reconstruction of basic epistemic convictions in discourse coalitions will be adhered to. We see a bridge between institutional and discourse analysis in Hajer’s dimension of “institutional practices”.

The subsequent analysis of the two fields of action of “energy transition” and “urban climate-adaptation policy” takes place from a methodological perspective primarily through the implementation in each case of a focus group. Focus groups are a social-science surveying method that aims to generate results from the questioning of and interaction between several interview partners (Gailing, Naumann 2018). To this end, a group of participants are invited to a group discussion on a determined topic. The discussion is structured by the input and questions of the researcher. The focus groups are prepared via document analysis from both fields of action, as well as through establishing the state of research in the above-mentioned theoretical-conceptual debates, on which basis an exposé of each focus group is created. This comprises a list of invited people, the lead questions, and details about the technological apparatus. The evaluation of the implemented and transcribed focus-group discussion takes place within the framework of an object-related theory formation. The design and the evaluation of the focus groups aim for findings, specific to the fields of action, relating to the political construction of criticality, as well as to spatiality and governance of critical infrastructures.



# Dynamics of Communication, Knowledge and Spatial Development

## 1 Department Profile

The research department “Dynamics of Communication, Knowledge and Spatial Development” investigates spatial transformation processes and treats them from the theoretical perspective of social constructivism as continuous spatial *reconstructions* (Christmann 2013). Thus, not only are changes in spatial attribution of meaning investigated, but also courses of action and of material structuring. The aim is to comprehend how and under what conditions such changes occur or are implemented. The interest in how spatial *reconstructions* manifest in *communicative* processes forms the department’s profile. Among other questions posed is to what degree specific forms of communicative action, including mediatised communicative action, influence the emergence and practical implementation of new spatial constructions. The theoretical basis in this regard is the approach of communicative constructivism (cf. Knoblauch 2013; Keller 2013; Christmann 2013, 2016), which can be used in combination with other theoretical concepts depending on the object of study.

The investigation is organised along the following lines of research (LR):

**LR 1 “Innovative processes in structurally weak spaces”:** Taking structurally weak areas in cities and rural regions, the processes of emergence, establishment, and dissemination of novel ideas, practices, and projects designated as social innovations will be analysed. The communicative action directed towards innovation by actors from local politics, administration, and civil society is therefore of just as equal interest as that of social enterprises. From a theoretical perspective, innovation theories, in particular the approach of “social innovation”, will be drawn upon.

**LR 2 “Socio-spatial transformation through the digitalisation of action”:** Considering digitalised action in urban-planning processes, it will be asked to what extent changes resulting from digital media in planning practices themselves, but also in the constitution of urban public spheres (e.g. in communicative planning) and in material spatial arrangements, can be observed. In this context, mediatisation approaches also play a theoretical role.

**LR 3 “Socio-spatial transformations in climate change”:** This line of research will investigate how global challenges caused by the consequences of climate change are perceived and discursively processed in different ways at the national, regional, and local levels, and in particular in what regard perceptions of vulnerability and resilience are influenced by both socio-cultural and material factors. Of additional theoretical significance here is actor-network theory.

Among the methodological repertoire of the research department belongs a variety of qualitative methods, as well as standardised surveys and statistical analytical techniques.

## 2 Lead Project: Smart Villagers: Digitalisation and Social Innovations in Rural Areas

### Project team

Prof. Dr. Gabriela Christmann (Head, Sociology)

Dr. Ariane Sept (Sociology/Urban and Regional Planning)

T.B.A. (PhD Researcher, Geography)

T.B.A. (PhD Researcher, Communication Studies)

### Keywords

Social innovations, technological innovations, digitalisation of action, structurally weak rural regions, socio-spatial transformations, temporal dynamics.

### 2.1 Problem outline

While “smart cities” and the possibilities for the future that they bring are on everyone’s lips, digitalisation in rural areas is less discussed, and this despite the new means of organisation for life in structurally weak rural regions that smart applications could enable. In fact, it can now be observed that, in some places, entire villages are making the transition to the digital age. Smart village communities are not, however, comparable to smart cities, not least because in the countryside it is often villagers themselves who, driven by problems in rural areas, struggle “bottom-up” for a digitalisation of their villages. That of course does not exclude the possibility of smart villagers being supported by local and/or regional policy.

It can thus be observed that rural inhabitants are becoming “smart villagers”, making use not only of new technological possibilities, but rather breaking with pre-existing ways of acting and combining the innovations of digital technology with new social practices in order to develop novel approaches to solving problem areas in their villages. These novel practices or problem-solving approaches will in the following be termed *social* innovations. To be even more precise we shall, in the context of these novel approaches, speak of digitally supported social-innovation initiatives.

Among the typical problems that such initiatives address belong, for example, below-average productivity, limited educational and professional prospects, insufficient local supply, reduced local public transportation services, and a deficiency of technological, social, and service infrastructures. Along with these comes the exodus of younger to middle-aged rural inhabitants, together with the increasing ageing of rural society – and the health-provision problems associated with it (Birg 2003; Müller, Siedentop 2003; Manthorpe, Livsey 2009, BMVBS, BBSR 2009; Weber 2012).

Against this background there is already a real diversity of existing, digitally supported initiatives. Examples include those (e.g. in villages from the rural district of Cochem-Zell, Rhineland-Palatinate) in which self-initiated public-private partnerships have been created to supply high-performance broadband, enabling distance learning and remote working, and preventing further migration by providing new educational and professional prospects. In addition, there are initiatives to improve the mobility of rural dwellers through car-sharing apps; others to organise food services by means of delivery apps, thus contributing to the networking of people and goods traffic, and optimising the transport chain and local supplies; others that organise various forms of neighbourhood assistance by means of a village-radio app (e.g. in Betzdorf, Rhineland-Palatinate). Online platforms (e.g. in Dutenhofen, Hessen) ensure that smaller businesses or shops in the countryside are able to market their local specialities throughout the whole of Germany. Meanwhile co-working spaces with office layouts and rooms equipped with broadband are being set up in villages, in order to bring together creative thinkers and to support new business ideas (e.g. in Bad Belzig, Brandenburg). In other locations (e.g. in the rural district of Fürth, Bavaria), local knowledge is being digitally staged, attracting tourists with augmented-reality cycle routes. Not least, digital assistance systems

allow elderly inhabitants in the countryside to be overseen, so that medical data can be transmitted to their doctor's practice and, where necessary, neighbours can be alerted to an emergency.

Broadband supply in rural areas in Germany admittedly remains unsatisfactory, above all when one draws comparison with the USA, Scandinavian countries (especially Sweden), or the Baltic states (especially Estonia). In fact, in 2017 only 52% of German households in rural regions had access to a bandwidth of 30 MB per second, while in cities the figure was 94%. In light of further technical developments, it could be necessary in future to increase this capacity to 50 MB per second. This does not hide the fact that digitalisation has – at least partially – made its entry into rural areas in Germany.

The phenomenon of “smart villages” is, on the one hand, indeed relatively new (DVS 2017, p. 31), but considering the existence of abundant initiatives it is also prevalent enough that it can be researched well empirically. Their investigation is thus in two ways significant. Firstly, the matter is of high social relevance, creating the potential (as noted above) for new possibilities in rural development. Secondly, it has at the same time high relevance within the framework of social-science innovation research. There has indeed for some time been research on *social* innovation (Moulaert, Mehmood 2011; Howaldt et al. 2015; Christmann et al. 2017), even in (structurally weak) rural regions (Bock 2016, Richter 2016, Christmann 2017), not least regarding their actor constellations and their processual nature. Since the development of academic interest in the variety of innovations, particularly in the course of the overarching concept of social innovation (Rammert 2010, Rammert et al. 2016), it has, however, become a central empirical issue how different kinds of innovation, such as digital-technological and social innovation, which for better investigation need be separated, are concretely connected to one another. Questions about the processual quality, but also about the background history and the additional dynamic of social innovation arise anew in connection to digitalisation and digital innovation, particularly in structurally weak rural regions that have – apart from the considerable penetration of technology into agriculture (often dubbed “Cowshed 4.0”) – to date been barely touched by digitalisation. In addition, the effects and consequences of social innovation have been illuminated to only a limited extent by research (Windeler et al. 2017, p. 13). This is true to a greater extent for the relationship of digital-technological and social innovation, especially in the context of (structurally weak) rural areas. This not least raises the question of which socio-spatial transformations can be observed in the course of digitally supported social-innovation initiatives for community development.

Against this background, the lead project will pursue the subject of “smart villagers” following three thematic groups of questions: questions about connections between technological and social innovations; about the history, processual quality, and the dynamics of these innovations; and about the consequences of innovation, i.e. about socio-spatial transformations in the development of the community and in the lives of inhabitants.

## 2.2 Questions

The three thematic question groups are subdivided as follows:

### **The combination of technological and social innovation in community development:**

- To what extent and through which actors are digital-technological solutions available, combined and/or further developed for digitally supported social innovations
- How can digital-technological solutions be described? What makes them possible, and what does not? In what ways do they structure actions?
- What forms of social innovation come hand-in-hand with digital solutions? To what extent are socially innovative forms starting points, parts, or consequences of digitalisation?

## **The history, processual quality, and dynamics of digitalisation and digitally supported social-innovation initiatives in community development:**

- Which local “histories” of digitalisation can be traced (for the last 15 to 20 years: reconstruction of the occurrence/provision of digitalisation, the digital technologies/applications used, the driving forces, pioneers, acceptance, and practices of inhabitants)?
- How can the processes and phases in the emergence and implementation of digitally supported social-innovation initiatives be described (for the last three to six years: reconstruction of the occurrence, actor constellations, (communicative) actions, chronological progression and stages)?
- What dynamics for further development did the initiative lead to (for the last one to two years: reconstruction of substantive expansion of the concept, e.g. from digital local supply to digital health provision in the community, and/or of a spatial expansion of the concept, e.g. from community A to communities B, C, D, etc.)?
- What similarities and differences are apparent between communities with regard to the history, processual quality, and further dynamics of innovation? What interference occur between the history, processual quality, and further dynamics of innovation?

## **Consequences of innovation – Socio-spatial transformations in the lives of inhabitants and in the development of the community:**

- What (positive or even negative) changes can be observed in the course of digitally supported social-innovation initiatives? How are these evaluated by the inhabitants with respect to:
  - Consequences of global connectivity and smart applications for the everyday life of inhabitants in the form of altered spatial actions, “communicative figurations” (in the structure of direct/interpersonal and digitally conveyed communications), and temporalities (through acceleration or deceleration processes)?
  - Consequences for various social groups (e.g. regarding varying degrees of competence in the use of digital technology)?
  - Consequence for spatial constructions (of the community, the countryside, or the world)?
  - Consequences for the development of the community?

### **2.3 Theoretical approaches**

The project is situated within the field of social-science innovation research and is focused on an innovation type characterised by its connection to digital-technological and social innovation. The issue of the emergence, implementation, and further development of innovation, as well as its consequences is connected to issues of (a) digitalisation in combination with, (b) temporality of, and (c) socio-spatial transformations resulting from innovation processes.

From a theoretical perspective, the approach developed by Rammert (2010, Rammert et al. 2016, Hutter et al. 2016) places *social innovation* centre stage. It was conceived for social-science investigation of innovation and distinguishes between innovations of the most different kind (economic, technological, social, etc.). Alongside emphasising that innovations occur not only in the fields of business or technology, but also in all conceivable social areas, and that different innovation types are often connected to one another (e.g. technological and social innovation), the approach also represents the theory that innovation is often reflexively



advanced (that is, intentionally and in a coordinated manner) and has become an important factor for social development. Even the production of the new comes under focus, seen by Knoblauch (2016, p. 119) – following communicative constructivism – as reflexive communicative construction of the new as new.

(a) Since the project investigates *mediatised action* as part of innovative action in rural communities, further considerations from the mediatisation approach of Krotz (2001) and Hepp (2013; Hepp, Krotz 2012) will be taken into account. The approach contends that “new” (digital) media and technologies are, over the course of time, introduced into all social areas (Hepp 2013, p. 84f.), bringing with them altered practices, kinds of experience, and reality constructions, as well as consequences for social processes.

(b) As *temporality*, present in the creation of the new, is also of interest to the project – namely in the background histories, the processes (progressions and stages), and the dynamics of the further development of innovation with their sequences of events, actor constellations, and (communicative) actions – and as temporality of innovation consequences is also of interest, the figurational sociology of Elias (1986) will be drawn upon. Here, figurations are placed at the centre of analysis. These are structures of interdependence between individuals and their forms of interaction. Elias starts from the assumption that figurations are fundamentally processual and continually bring about transformations in micro-contexts. Processes of change at the micro-scale of action are even pursued by Elias over the course of historic time (over 100 years) and interpreted as social transformation processes in macro-contexts.

(c) Last but not least, as *socio-spatial transformations* will be investigated as consequences of innovation, Christmann’s (2016) approach from communicative spatial (re)construction will be utilised. The approach is based upon communicative constructivism and conceptualises micro- and meso-processes of socio-spatial transformation. This concept will be expanded through the integration of dimensions of mediatisation and digitalisation, and of temporality. In the course of this, time-sociological considerations about acceleration and deceleration (Rosa 2005) will be taken into account.

## 2.4 Methods

Methodologically, a focused ethnography (Knoblauch 2005) will be employed, combining expert interviews (Bogner et al. 2009) and document analysis (Wolff 2008), media-biographical interviews (Hickethier 1982), problem-centred interviews (Witzel 2000), and participatory observations (Atkinson, Hammersley 1994).

Six rural communities will be investigated, selecting (according to criteria as yet to be determined) five in Germany and, as a contrasting case, one in Estonia, enabling the consideration of an advanced digitalisation context.

For the reconstruction of the general and local digital histories of the countryside, interviews will be conducted with experts who have specialist knowledge of (local) rural digitalisation (e.g. technology experts, political actors, village chroniclers, and digital pioneers from the place or region investigated). In addition, documents containing information on the history of digitalisation will be analysed. Furthermore, interviews with inhabitants will be carried out, focusing on issues of digitalisation.

Data for the reconstruction of the emergence and implementation processes of concrete – digitally supported – innovative initiatives, as well as of the dynamics of their further development will be collected through problem-centred interviews with actors involved in innovation (among whom belong key figures as well as supporters in their specific and broader operating environment). Both local and external actors involved in digital-technological solutions will be surveyed. In addition, documents containing information on these processes will be analysed.

To investigate the consequences of innovation (changes in social practices and socio-spatial transformations) participatory observations will be carried out in the rural communities. Participatory observations of (communicative) practices within village communities are planned, e.g. in combination with various apps, but also in connection to other uses of digital technolo-

gy. In addition, problem-centred interviews with both involved and uninvolved inhabitants will be conducted in order to gain an evaluation of changed practices in daily life and of socio-spatial transformations in the community, including changed spatial constructions. Further problem-centred interviews with innovation actors and other significant community representatives will be conducted (e.g. with mayors, local leaders, association chairpersons, etc.) to allow an evaluation of consequences for community development.

The collected data will be analysed using the encoding technique from the grounded-theory approach (Strauss 1997). In the analyses, the collected data will be related to each other according to the thematic question groups stated above (e.g. in order to present in detail the interferences between the history, processual quality, and the further dynamic of innovation, and to give answers to question about the connection between technological and social innovations in community development).

# Regeneration of Cities and Towns

## 1 Department Profile

The perspective from which the research department “Regeneration of Cities and Towns” addresses urban development processes focuses on the interplay of market processes and their integration through policy and planning. Of central interest are negotiation processes between policy and planning that underlie the concrete forms of this interplay. The department thus orients itself towards the concept of a “double movement”, with which Polanyi (1944) conceived the dialectic of liberalisation and nationalisation, and of displacement and embedding of markets from and into society.

Cities are conceptualised as arenas of social negotiation processes. These are locally situated, but at the same time connected to other levels of political and social action. They are understood as the result of collective action by manifold actors. In its research on cities and towns, the department is particularly interested in political dynamics and planning challenges that arise at the urban level out of the simultaneity and interplay of displacement and embedding, of deceleration and acceleration, and of globalisation and localisation.

The investigation is organised along the following lines of research (LR):

**LR 1 “Local governance of immigration”:** The management of immigration by local actor constellations will be investigated, analysing various power relationships between public, private, and civil-society urban actors through the use of the political-science approach of urban governance. Local planning policy will thus be investigated in the field of tension between the influence of the various actors. Central to this are the conflicts of interest between, on the one hand, cosmopolitan and migration-friendly commercial enterprises and universities and, on the other hand, right-wing populist parties and the section of the population that position themselves in opposition to immigration. In this first line of research, a contribution will be provided to the further development of agonistic planning theory and to the empirical analysis of the role of planning in an increasingly pluralistic society.

**LR 2 “Transformation of urban development and housing policy”:** The focus of research lies on the interplay of globalisation and financialisation of the housing market, and the political steering of urban development and the housing sector. Of particular interest are dynamic processes of change that question established institutional practices and which lead to change. Access to this topic will be made firstly via research projects that investigate, by means of international comparison, the transformation of institutional frameworks for neighbourhood development. Secondly, a postdoctoral project will address the changing legitimacy basis of planning, in which the genesis, development, and utilisation of the concept of the “common good” in various planning cultures will be investigated.

## 2 Lead Project: Immigration: Governance Dilemmas of Cities and Towns

### Project team

Dr. Manfred Kühn (Head, Urban Planning)  
Dr. Matthias Bernt (Senior Scientist, Political Science)  
Dr. Laura Calbet (Research Fellow, Urban Planning)  
Gala Nettelbladt (Doctoral Researcher, Social Sciences)

### Key words

Immigration, migration, urban governance, neighbourhood development, agonistic planning.

### 2.1 Problem outline

The investigation of the tension between spatially and temporally dynamic international immigration processes and local planning policy forms the main focus of the department's lead project.

Issues of integration and of the control of migration have received a new dimension with the increased immigration of refugees, becoming central to the mobilisation of new right-wing parties and xenophobic movements. At the same time, the transition of Germany into a country of immigration has been discussed and a new immigration law should create legal pathways for labour migration. The change in conditions leads to a multiplicity of new challenges for municipal decision makers.

Research has identified a series of dilemmas in this context that complicate the handling of migration in cities and towns. These include, among others, the following points:

1. National vs. local agency: Cities and towns are dependent upon national "migration regimes" (Hollifield 2004; Pott, Raas, Wolff 2018) that, through immigration laws and labour market, visa, asylum, and refugee policies govern the movement of migrants across territorial borders (Scholten, Penninx 2016). This leads to a tension between the national steering of the flow of migration and the local responsibility for integration of the stock of locally situated migrants. Cities and towns are consequently accountable for the integration of foreign immigrants without, however, being able to direct their recruitment.
2. Local growth vs. conservation coalitions: Immigration from overseas is highly contested in many cases of municipal policy. While economic actors are often proactively open to migration, urge for the intake of labour forces, or emphasise "multiculturality" as a positive characteristic in the competition between locations (Pütz, Rodatz 2013), segments of the citizenry are hostile towards foreigners and right-wing populist parties have won much support by problematising migration. Local urban policy thus operates within the "liberal paradox" (Hollifield 2004) between the economic logic of openness, and the political logic of opposition towards migration.
3. Ethnic segregation as a problem vs. as a resource: In cities shaped by international migration there often develop "arrival neighbourhoods" (Saunders 2011) characterised by a higher concentration of particular ethnic groups, along with poverty, unemployment, and lower educational levels. Although a growing number of contributions have emphasised the significance of such neighbourhoods for the integration of migrants, the spatial concentration of migrants has usually been perceived from the perspective of socially disadvantaged "problem areas" (Pütz, Rodatz 2013). In municipal-planning practice, this leads to a contradictory approach.

The possibility for an evolving of diverse lifestyles as a basis for social participation, policies with the goal of “social mixture” (Münch 2010) through upgrading, the utilisation of diversity for city and town branding, as well as integration measures through neighbourhood- and group-based social work all exist alongside, and in part stand in contradiction to, one another.

In local politics, these dilemmas overlap and lead to a complex conflict of interests. As different immigrant groups enjoy different political and social rights and are addressed even in municipal practice in very divergent ways, it is necessary to differentiate between approaches taken. Here, urban-development policy regularly orients its strategies rather one-sidedly towards the highly qualified and towards students, while policies for other groups are developed more from the perspective of social welfare, thereby resulting in a “dual regime” between urban development strategies that target the highly qualified, and integration processes that confronts the actually occurring immigration.

The research is guided by the hypothesis that the increase in international immigration is taking place amid differing and, at present, opposing orientations in urban policy, and that this antagonism is reflected in a greater politicisation of the issue as well as in inconsistency in the finally implemented courses of action.

Two assumptions are central to the research. Firstly, it is supposed that the spatio-temporal dynamic of migration movements leads to an acceleration and disorientation of established planning policies, which aim at longevity, predictability, and stability. Secondly, it is presumed that immigration – when faced with the heavy politicisation of the issue by right-wing populist parties and civil initiatives – leads to contradictory orientations that can no longer be resolved by consensus. This leads to new challenges for urban planning.

## **2.2 Questions**

Although the dilemmas described are largely known, their handling has to date hardly undergone empirical investigation. In its research, the lead project will pursue three question complexes:

### **The scope of local planning and policy:**

- What proactive approaches to the steering of immigration do cities and towns develop given their dependence on national policies within the multi-level governance system?
- Where does local scope for action exist?
- In what constellations and situations are restrictions determinant?

### **Participation from economy and civil society:**

- What influence do actors from economy and civil society wield over the development of municipal immigration policies? What conflicts arise through the differing perspectives of these actor groups?
- What migration-related growth or conservation coalitions form the local governance of cities and towns?
- In what way are various interests integrated into planning? What forms of conflict resolution and participation can be seen?

### **Local management of ethnic segregation:**

- What rationales determine local policy for handling ethnic segregation?
- What objectives and interests form the guiding basis of action for the various actors in this field?
- How are these reflected in urban planning practice towards “arrival neighbourhoods”? Are conflicts to be found, in which different planning practices exist in contradiction to one another?

The lead project focuses on analysing the relationships between these fields and the respective underlying conditions.

### **2.3 Theoretical approaches**

The project aims to combine “agonistic” planning theory (Ploeger 2004, Berding 2008) with governance approaches from local policy research (Pierre 2011) and theories about migration regimes (Pott, Tsianos 2014; Pott et al. 2018).

The following theoretical concepts are central to the project:

- a) “Migration regimes”: The term “migration regimes” (Hollifield 2004; Pott, Tsianos 2014) describes the totality of political regulation controlling migration (inwards and outwards), access to the labour market, and social inclusiveness or exclusiveness in the treatment of migrants. In general, the concept is applied to the national level; the number of contributions that also speak of “local” or “urban” migration regimes is, however, multiplying (Pott et al. 2018). The relationships between various spatial levels nonetheless remains to date under-conceptualised and presents a research field still to be processed.
- b) “Growth regimes” and “conservation regimes”: From the literature on urban regimes (Stone 1989; Stoker, Mossberger 1994; Savitch, Kantor 2002; Di Gaetano, Strom 2003; Kantor, Savitch 2005; Pierre 2014), we adopt the concept of “growth regimes” and “conservation regimes” (Mossberger, Stoker 2001). The concept of “growth regimes” describes processes of coalition formation between private and public urban actors who aim for a growth of population and economic strength. The concept of “conservation regimes” describes coalitions that aim to preserve a status quo. At a theoretical level, it thus forms an opposing pole to the “growth regime”. While both concepts offer an established analytical key for the understanding of local policy processes, they have to date hardly been used in connection with issues of migration. The connections, in particular, to national migration regimes and to issues of regime change appear underexplored.
- c) “Agonistic pluralism”: Newer approaches from planning theory see conflict as immanent to a pluralistic society and distance themselves from established approaches from communicative planning theory (Gribat et al. 2017, McClymont 2011, Ploeger 2004). Based on Chantal Mouffe’s theory of “agonistic pluralism”, they interpret planning as a political and democratic practice necessarily based on different and often conflicting interests, and which can only be negotiated with a limited degree of consensus. The project transfers this theoretical approach to conflicts between cosmopolitan and right-wing populist actors in the local man-

agement of migration, and investigates the role of planning in the resolving of conflicts between these actors.

These theoretical approaches form the conceptual points of reference for the lead project. They will be used for the purpose of analysis and serve as instruments with whose assistance the project's hypotheses can be refined and, in relation to present levels of knowledge, further developed.

## **2.4 Methods**

The lead project focuses empirically on an explorative study in the medium-sized city of Cottbus. This location is particularly suitable for the investigation for the following reasons:

- The city is dependent on immigration. Its urban policy aims to reach the threshold population for larger cities of 100,000 inhabitants.
- The economy of the second-largest city in the state of Brandenburg is relatively structurally weak, and the number of potentially influential economic actors thus limited. At the same time, the city has, in the Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus-Senftenberg, a location-defining "cosmopolitan" educational institution.
- The immigration of refugees in Cottbus is highly contentious and has led to a moratorium on the assignment of any further intake. The share of the vote given to the right-wing populist AfD party is above average.
- The proportion of foreign inhabitants has risen sharply in several housing estates, leading to a series of housing and infrastructure challenges.

In total, 30 to 40 central actors in Cottbus will be interviewed about the above-mentioned themes. In addition, an analysis of planning documents, election programmes, and other local political documents will be undertaken, and methods from participatory observation will also be applied. The elaboration of the findings will be largely interpretive and aims to give impetus to the further development of the above-discussed theoretical concepts.

Supplementing the qualitative investigation, municipal statistical data will be evaluated and a spatial and chronological description of immigration patterns elaborated.

From a methodological perspective, the project is oriented towards the approach of qualitative policy analysis (Blatter et al. 2007), in which the implementation of case studies (Yin 1994) and the coupling of inductive and deductive procedures is crucial.

In order to meet the central risks of the explorative case-study approach (uncontrolled selection of cases, a high degree of subjectivity in the interpretive work, unclear validity of the research findings), a focused comparison with other cities will also be implemented, for which empirical surveys and findings conducted by the department in third-party funded projects can be used.





# Department for Historical Research/Scientific Collections for the History of Building and Planning in the GDR

## 1 Department Profile

The focus of this research department is the analysis of the pathways towards urbanisation and the planning cultures of, in particular, the historical period after 1945. Our research contributes analyses of modern processes of spatial development viewed as a principal characteristic of the twentieth century. The intention is to integrate the lines of development of urbanisation and planning culture in East and West Germany – officially the German Democratic Republic (GDR) and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), respectively – within international and long-term contexts. To this end, urban development pathways and power relationships, and the history of planning interventions, are examined and combined with analyses of the acquisition of urban spaces by social groups and of citizen initiatives. Studies on the circulation of planning principles and networks of planners and other actors at the local to international level form a focus of the departmental research. These are carried out using the profile-forming concept of “biographies of places” and the approaches of historical governance research. Thus the formation of socio-spatial disparities and the related policies designed to compensate for these receive special attention, along with urbanisation-process path dependencies and development pathways up to the present day.

The studies are organised along the following lines of research (LR) and are closely interwoven with the work of the Scientific Collections:

**LR 1 “Socio-spatial disparities in urbanisation processes”:** Historical processes involved in the drifting apart of social groups and milieus in the two German nations will be investigated, with attention given to current tendencies of disparity formation in Europe as well. On the one hand are theoretical questions to be examined, arising from the deficit in research on cross-system analysis of socio-spatial disparity. On the other, there is a particular interest in the empirical research of medial aspects, as well as the significance, of political interventions and urban building culture in processes of socio-spatial fragmentation and integration. Alongside the lead project, further contributions to this line of research will be provided by third-party funded projects, in particular that funded by the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research, “Urban Regeneration at the turning Point: The role of citizens’ groups against inner-urban decline for the collapse of the GDR”, as well as the postdoctoral thesis “Conquering (with) concrete. German Construction Companies as Global Players in Local Contexts” by Dr. Monika Motylin-ska.

**LR 2 “Circulation of (planning) knowledge”:** Central are the mechanisms by which the cross-border transferral processes of guiding principles in urban development operate at the local level and, conversely, how the value of local projects and concepts is realised nationally and internationally. This line of research ties into preliminary work from previous lead projects, as well as the third-party funded project “The Mediatization of Urban Development Planning and Changes to the Public Sphere” (MedPlan). Besides the current lead project, this line of research will also be investigated in the context of the German Research Foundation’s university graduate training programme “Cultural and Technological Values of Historical Constructions” at the Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus-Senftenberg. In the course of this, complex place biographies and biographical analyses will be given particular attention.

The systematic integration of research with the work of the archive in the Scientific Collections presents a profile-forming, distinguishing feature of the department. Alongside close collaboration in the joint identification and acquisition of sources, as well as in the “Workshop Series on the History of Building and Planning in the GDR”, the online portal released during the last work

programme forms an important platform for the joint work of the department and its public image. The special status envisaged as a result of the evaluation in 2017 allows for the development of the digital infrastructure of the Scientific Collections and for an extensive expansion of services in the coming years, including an increase in the research possibilities for external archivists and the development of professional consultation services for other smaller archives. Together with the safeguarding of long-term tasks (indexing, user support, etc.), the continual strengthening of the international visibility and continuation of exhibition activities continue to form an essential cornerstone of the Scientific Collections' work.

## **2 Lead Project: Socio-spatial Disparities and Policies for Social Cohesion in Cities of the GDR and FRG**

### **Project team**

Prof. Dr. Christoph Bernhardt (Head, History)

Dr. Kai Drewes (Scientific Collections, History)

Dr. Harald Engler (Deputy Head, History)

Dr. Monika Motylinska (Post-Doctoral Researcher, Art History)

### **Key words**

Socio-spatial disparities, biographies of places, urbanisation pathways, transnational knowledge transfer, spatial policies, spatial appropriation.

### **2.1 Problem outline**

Workers employed in GDR combines (industrial conglomerates in the former socialist countries) were, especially as party members, not seldom better placed than employees and academics, for example in the provision of living space and consumer goods – a form of social privileging that was inconceivable in cities and towns in the West-German Republic. Here is succinctly expressed the fact that, in the two societies, completely different political-system logics were at play that determined the causes and forms of socio-spatial inequality as well as the political and planning strategies for their alleviation and compensation. According to a widespread belief – even in some research – the social structure of GDR society and its cities and towns was, due to socialist building policy, in general much more strongly levelled out and spatially integrated than in the West-German municipalities.

More recent investigations suggest, to the contrary, that beneath the fundamental differences in system there were also analogous tendencies in socio-spatial development, such as in the exclusion of minorities from the majority society, and that socio-spatial disparities in the GDR were substantially more pronounced than has largely been previously assumed. Thus the privileging of professional or status-differentiated groups important to the system (e.g. engineers or party members) determined the situation in many GDR communities regarding socially selective housing allocation and the spatial exclusion of so-called “asocial” or foreign contract workers. Locally, problem areas were further exacerbated by the continuous neglect of small towns or the varying financial strengths of the districts. Ideological slogans of a radically socialist policy for social cohesion – such as the alignment of living conditions between town and country – were increasingly displaced, under the pressure of long-term economic decline, by a policy of piecemeal support for selected urban centres. With the mechanisms of exclusion from socialist majority society on the one hand, and the retreat of the state from comprehensive structural programmes to fragmentary measures on the other, two issues relevant to GDR research emerge for discussion. Their analysis enables both the review of enduring myths, such as that of social mixing in large housing estates, as well as further cross-system insights.

New forms of social fragmentation and segregation also developed from the 1960s in West-German cities and towns, for which the approaches of more recent historical research into social exclusion promise to provide new understanding. Belonging among these were social discrimination against and spatial exclusion of immigrants, or forms of stigmatisation by academics and the media of certain urban spaces, such as modern large housing estates. Rapidly advancing suburbanisation in many places accelerated spatial disintegration. Additionally, the instruments of the welfare state's policies for social cohesion tended to lose their efficacy under the pressure of receding incomes in public-sector households and rising unemployment figures. New concepts of, among others, local cultural funding and the structural-aesthetic revaluation of problem neighbourhoods were developed in response, and were likewise discussed in the GDR.

A more precise, *integrated* examination of the socio-spatial disparities and policies for social cohesion in the East- and West-German cities has thus far been lacking. Such an examination is of relevance, beyond the individual questions mentioned above, because socio-spatial polarisation in *both* societies has long been consolidated in the form of isolated neighbourhoods, milieus, spatial perceptions of and belief in social (in)justice, and lack of participation, some of which still exist and continue to have an effect today. It is thus important, firstly, to develop viable cross-system categories, helpful approaches to which are offered by more recent research into exclusion. With regard to policies for social cohesion, an integrated consideration of socialist-centralist and federal welfare-state instruments of spatial-development policy can focus methodically on system-related differences as well as individual analogies. Urban planning as well as the planning of social and cultural infrastructure are fields of local policy for which these questions will be illustratively examined. In accordance with the long-term research of the department, the international transfer of ideas as a strategy of urban planning and municipal social policy, in which actors from both countries participated and which took effect, in individual instances, at the local level, is thus to be integrated.

## 2.2 Questions

The investigations address three groups of questions that are, firstly, directed towards the development of cross-system approaches for the examination of disparities in cities that are viable for empirical analysis and which have been proven reliable. The second group of questions concerns the planning- policies for social cohesion in both systems. Thirdly, it will be examined how the socio-spatial polarisation and policies for social cohesion have consolidated themselves within place biographies and urban patterns. It is planned that these investigations will be carried out by means of a comparative analysis of one city each from East and West Germany from the time of division up to and beyond 1989.

### **Formation of disparities from a cross-system perspective:**

- What current social-science and historiographical approaches (e.g. from research on exclusion) lend themselves to an integrated, cross-system analysis of the historical formation of disparities in East and West Germany, and how can the existing approaches be further developed?
- What analogous and what different disparities and “contrast spaces” can be found between and in the cities of both systems, from a social and a structural-spatial perspective, and how do these continue to have an effect from 1989 onwards?
- What analogous and what fundamentally different patterns of socio-spatial disparities are present in contexts outside of Europe (M. Motylinska's postdoctoral project), and how does the picture of the situation in the GDR change in the selective integration of one such “postcolonial” perspective?

### **Policies for social cohesion in the context of the circulation of knowledge and the “social history of domination”:**

- What differences and similarities influence the political-planning concepts around the dismantling of disparities in East- and West-German cities, and what role is played by wider, system-specific strategies?
- What measures were particularly employed in the fields of urban planning and the planning and implementation of social and cultural infrastructures, and with what effects and unforeseen consequences (such as an intensification of disparities)?
- In what ways did the transfer of knowledge occur from the relevant international socio-political and specialist planning debates towards the local level and vice versa? Which actor groups were active here and what mechanisms of a “social history of domination” were effective?

### **Variants of urbanity and spatio-temporal logics in complex place biographies:**

- How and to what extent did the identified disparities and policies for social cohesion determine the characteristics of various local forms of urbanity?
- How did these differing patterns of socio-spatial disparities and urbanities influence individual place biographies in the long term, and what spatio-temporal convergences or (a)synchronous paths of development can be seen in comparison within Germany?

## **2.3 Theoretical Approaches**

The theoretical approaches come overridingly from research on historical disparities and exclusion, as well as from literature on the history of planning and urbanisation. For the investigations on disparity formation newly incorporated into the work of the department, relevant recent approaches from research into inequality in eastern socialist (Mertens 2002) and western market-economy societies (Kälble 2017) have been harnessed and evaluated for their potential for cross-system analysis. Among other things, it will be necessary to relate the respective determinants and indicators of social segregation in market economies such as the Federal Republic to those in state socialism, from the chances available to different social groups, to the supply of housing or cultural infrastructures, and the mechanisms at work in social exclusion and privileged political status.

The expansion of these approaches to concepts of social-science and historical research on exclusion promises new insights focusing around the marginalisation of minorities by majority society (Bude 2007). Important here is to determine *space-sensitive* opportunities and fields of investigation. Of particular assistance here are studies from historical research on urbanisation that, starting from previous research on segregation, continue on to integrate issues relating to communication and medial stigmatisation of milieus and specific locations (von Saldern 2006). It is precisely the divergences in the external- and self-attributions in relation to certain neighbourhoods, living arrangements, and so on that are of interest. Relevant preliminary work exists in the form of investigations on the evaluation of west European large housing estates in public discourse (Haumann, Wagner-Kyora 2013) and on the long-term lines of development of social segregation and mixing in various cities from an internationally comparative perspective.

In investigating the circulation of planning and socio-political knowledge from the international to the local level, the department is able to draw upon the previously developed concepts of “social history of domination” (Rowell 2006) as well as the “circulation and appropriation” of knowledge. More comprehensive studies on the history of spatial policies for social cohesion in the more

narrow sense exist for the Federal Republic (Leendertz 2008), and can be integrated into transnational developments. For the GDR, lead-project research can build on its own governance analyses on disparity formation and spatial policy under socialism (Kuhl, Werner 2017).

Contributing to the institution-wide, in-depth analysis of spatio-temporal process dynamics, the lead project will develop its findings on historical logics of time in “complex biographies of places” and “contrast spaces”. Besides the approaches thus far developed, the various rhythms and divergent temporalities of social life, and their consequences for various spaces and historical situations, will be given closer consideration. To this end, the findings from international research on historic temporalities (Escudier, Holtey 2011), as well as the concepts from “Spatio-Temporal Studies” at the University of Erfurt (Dorsch, Rau 2013), which investigate the social constructions of various space-time constellations from the perspective of cultural history, will be developed and brought to fruition.

## **2.4 Methods**

In the analysis of planning documents, administrative procedures, and public debates, classical qualitative historiographical methods of hermeneutic source interpretation come into use. In the context of the development of viable categories for the cross-system examination of socio-spatial disparities, the analysis of contemporary social-science approaches are of particular significance. To this end, qualitative methods from conceptual history and historiography will be integrated.

With the support of colleagues at the Scientific Collections, historical source materials from within and external to the IRS will be accessed, and relevant specialist bequests acquired, as was previously accomplished for the documents of the leading GDR disparity researcher Siegfried Grundmann. Particularly promising is, in addition, the inventory of internal socio-spatial investigations of the GDR Building Academy and its individual institutes archived in the Scientific Collections.

With regard to the newly focused topic of socio-spatial disparity formation, supplementary secondary evaluations of quantitative data, for instance on income distribution, infrastructural facilities, housing markets, and so forth, will be undertaken using simple methods from descriptive statistics. Source material from the not very extensive but nevertheless significant tradition of the Weimar School of GDR Urban Sociology (including F. Staufenberg), as well as “grey literature” from the Institute of Urban Planning and Architecture (ISA), can also be evaluated. In the analysis of policies for social cohesion, planning-historical methods will be applied, while analysis of urbanity patterns and local biographies will utilise selective iconological methods.

For the analysis of dynamics of “social history of domination”, socio-historical methods as well as those of historical network research will be used, and relevant source groups, such as the “entries” of the GDR population or the public proclamations of protest groups in the FRG will be appraised.

Interviews with contemporary witnesses, to whom the researchers and archivists of the research department have many contacts and privileged access, can provide information on source material and informal planning and policies for social cohesion. To this end, guided expert interviews will be carried out in accordance to the standards of academic oral-history research. In individual cases, these will also take the form of group interviews and interviews with contemporary witnesses.

From a methodological perspective, comparative procedures are of particular significance, especially the comparative and transfer analyses developed around the concept of the “asymmetrically entangled history” of the GDR and FRG (Klessmann, 2006).



# National and International Research Cooperations with Universities and Non-university Research Institutions

## 1 National Cooperations

### 1.1 National Cooperative Relations with Universities

From the perspective of the IRS as a non-university institution, universities are important cooperative partners in three respects:

- The proximity in content to thematic areas of research at the IRS, including in particular geographic institutions and institutions for spatial, urban, and regional planning, but also sociological and political-science institutions, makes universities attractive research partners.
- Joint appointment procedures with universities allow us to gain highly qualified research personalities for leading positions at the IRS. Universities are, in addition, important partners for the implementation of the IRS strategy of promoting junior researchers, given that completion of a PhD or postdoctoral qualification is only possible in Germany through universities.
- In addition, the Senate of the Leibniz Association expects its partner institutes to cooperate in qualification procedures, namely academic degrees enabling progress to PhDs, doctoral and postdoctoral theses, and junior professorships. Not least, it expects participation in coordinated programmes, above all in relevant programmes of the German Research Foundation (DFG) – its Collaborative Research Centres, Research Training Groups, Research Units, Priority Programmes, and Research Centres – as well as excellence clusters.

The proximity in content to thematic areas of research at the IRS, excellence in research performance, and national and international reputations of a university are fundamental criteria that guide the selection and design of cooperative relations with universities.

The following presents the coordinated programmes in which the IRS will cooperate with universities during the term of the Research Programme 2019-2021.

#### **DFG Collaborative Research Centres**

The IRS will collaborate with the Technische Universität Berlin in the Collaborative Research Centre “Re-Figuration of Spaces” (spokesperson: Prof. Dr. Martina Löw). Prof. Dr. Gabriela Christmann is involved with the initial funding phase of the centre (2018-2021), and is Principal Investigator of the sub-project “Digital Urban Planning: Planning Practices and Physical Arrangements”. In addition, she is the spokesperson for Project Area B “Spaces of Communication” and is a member of the Collaborative Research Centre board.

#### **DFG Research Training Groups**

The IRS and the Technische Universität Berlin are also participating in the Research Training Group “Innovation Society Today: The Reflexive Production of the New” (spokesperson: Prof. Dr. Arnold Windeler). Prof. Dr. Gabriela Christmann cooperated in the successful application for the second funding phase (2016-2020). The third and final cohort in this phase began in April

2018 and has a term of three years. It is anticipated that Prof. Dr. Gabriela Christmann will, as in previous years, be supervisor to a doctoral student.

At the Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus-Senftenberg, the IRS, with Prof. Dr. Christoph Bernhardt, is one of seven participating applicants for the DFG Research Training Group “Cultural and Technical Values of Historical Buildings”. In May 2018 the responsible DFG committee gave their approval for the second funding phase (2018-2023). The third and final cohort begins in April 2019 with a term of three years. As in the first two cohorts, Prof. Dr. Christoph Bernhardt will supervise at least one doctoral student.

## **DFG Research Units**

The IRS is involved at the Freie Universität Berlin in the Research Unit “Organised Creativity: Practices for Inducing and Coping with Uncertainty” (spokesperson: Prof. Dr. Jörg Sydow). Dr. Jana Kleibert will work as Principal Investigator in the DFG Junior Researcher Network on the project “The Spaces of Global Production: The Territorial Dimensions of Global Production Networks and World City Networks”.

## **1.2 National Cooperative Relations with Non-University Institutions**

### *1.2.1 Leibniz Research Alliances*

In spring 2013, the Executive Board of the Leibniz Association placed the topic of “Leibniz Research Alliances” on the agenda of all its member institutions. With this new format, the Leibniz Association has to date essentially pursued the following strategic targets: funding of national, thematic priority setting within the Leibniz Association; transdisciplinary formulation and structuring of research areas; problem-oriented and time-limited pooling of the competencies of Leibniz institutes; increase in the national and international visibility of Leibniz research; initiation, co-establishment, and use of government funding programmes. Terms of between five and, at a maximum, 15 years have been designated.

Already in July 2013 in its position paper “Perspectives of the German Science and Research System”, the German Council of Science and Humanities made the recommendation to continue the strategic process begun by the Leibniz Research Alliances and Networks of developing the thematically oriented alliances into a core value of the Leibniz Association. The director and departmental heads of the IRS were, from the outset, leading participants in the development of research concepts, structural and process organisation, as well as in the initiation and moderation of preparatory meetings for three Leibniz Research Alliances.

Findings and recommendations resulting from the self-commissioned evaluation of the Leibniz Research Alliances, carried out by an expert committee from the Austrian Academy of Sciences in 2017, are currently in the process of finalisation. It is already becoming apparent that the work of the Leibniz Research Alliances and Networks will be reorganised in the future. Once strategic planning in the Leibniz Association has been completed, the IRS will also strategically realign its contribution to the Leibniz Research Alliances and Networks.

Subject to necessary adjustments to future developments, the IRS currently plans to participate in the following alliances:

- Crises of a Globalised World (head of RD Economic Spaces),
- Historical Authenticity (head of RD Department for Historical Research),
- Energy Transition (acting head of RD Institutional Change).



## **Leibniz Research Alliance “Crises of a Globalised World”**

The Leibniz Research Alliance “Crises of a Globalised World” was founded in 2013. It includes 24 member institutions of the Leibniz Association, from four areas: Humanities and Educational Research (Section A), Economics and Social Sciences (Section B), Life Sciences (Section C), and Environmental Sciences (Section E).

The aim of the alliance is to make knowledge available to interdisciplinary working groups, to further the understanding and explanation of the mechanisms of crises in all their complexity. It should develop options for future expedient social processing of crises, asking by what forms of action, and under what conditions, crises can be managed or contained constructively, or taken advantage of productively.

Four crisis phenomena of worldwide significance will be empirically examined: financial market and debt crises, global food crises, environmental crises, and crises of political systems. In keeping with theoretically and empirically based research, the following analytical dimensions will receive particular attention and consideration: 1. the interdependence and systematic character of crises; 2. crisis dynamics; 3. modes of crisis response and governance forms; and, from a social-science and humanities perspective, 4. the constructivist dimension of crises.

- Sub-project “Concepts of Crises” (Prof. Dr. Oliver Ibert, RD Economic Spaces)

The sub-project is not itself an implementation of any empirical research, but rather develops meta-thematic aspects of the Research Alliance “Crises of a Globalised World”. It performs an intersectional function for other sub-projects within the alliance. The theoretically based sub-project develops the current state of research in various fields of crisis research. Among other things, the group asks what it is that constitutes a crisis, which theories are useful in understanding crises, and how crises can be defined and compared. The group creates a heuristic that aids the association in reflecting on the use of “crisis” in the research alliance’s thematically based sub-projects and, in this context, the IRS contributes three articles to the “Handbook of Crisis Research” (Verena Brinks/Oliver Ibert: The Spaciality of Crises; Heiderose Kilper: The Interdependence of Crises; Verena Brinks/Oliver Ibert/Veronika Wendland: Crisis Management: Expertise in and for Crises). The activities to date of the project group “Experts in Crises”, in which the role of consultation in crisis contexts is systematically illuminated, and that of Leibniz researchers in their self-conception as scientific advisors is reflected upon, will continue further under the umbrella concept of crisis concepts. Alongside its consultative function, the research alliance will undertake empirical research of its own within the sub-project, with the financial support of third-party funds. An example is the project carried out at the IRS and led by Prof. Dr. Oliver Ibert, “Resilient Crisis Management: The Role of Consultation in the Creation and Use of ‘Opportunities’ in the Course of Crises” (RESKIU, BMBF, 2017-2020). The research project confronts the potential for crises to emerge as a problem solver and attempts to explore what can be done by actors handling a crisis situation to not only ameliorate crisis symptoms, but also to create or use opportunities for structural change.

## **Leibniz Research Alliance “Historical Authenticity”**

The Leibniz Research Alliance “Historical Authenticity” was founded in January 2013. It includes 19 Leibniz institutes from three areas: Humanities and Education Research (Section A), Eco-

nomics and Social Sciences, Spatial Sciences (Section B), and Life Sciences (Section C), as well as three external partners.

The alliance realises a novel form of cooperation between institutes of basic historical research, research museums, and educational establishments, ranging from cultural studies to social, technological, and life sciences. It seeks to promote a reflective, critical understanding of the perceptions and instrumentalisation of the “original” and “real” in museums, World Heritage Sites, urban development policy, general political debates, and other discourses. The research alliance works on four sub-projects: authenticity from the perspective of ideas and concepts; mediation and determination of the authentic in the museum and collection-oriented institutions; traditions of historical authenticity; and historical authenticity as a political and cultural argument.

The IRS is engaged with Prof. Dr. Christoph Bernhardt (RD Department for Historical Research) in the thematic line “Historical Authenticity: Spaces of Tradition”, whose central object of investigation are the processes of urban-landscape authentication.

- Thematic line “Historical Authenticity: Spaces of Tradition”

In this sub-project, fundamental questions of the negotiation of historical authenticity in discourses and procedures of urban and rural development, and their reflection in historical cartography, will be analysed. Current debates should be interrogated with regard to whether and how significant the appeal to authenticity is in each case – and to what extent it is deconstructed. Basic hypotheses and central controversies should thus be identified and established research positions questioned, such as from the perspective of monument preservation, the orientation and impact of UNESCO World Heritage Sites, or the “traditionalist turn” in European urbanism around 1975. Prof. Dr. Christoph Bernhardt is one of the Principal Investigators involved in the design of the sub-project, developing its overarching research questions and organising its meetings. In 2019/20 he will, among other things, participate in the implementation of the guest-researcher programme, be responsible for the submission of a project application, and collaborate on the conception of the final conference and the editing of the “Handbook of Historical Authenticity”, the alliance’s central publication. As a member of the steering committee, he will furthermore participate in the re-profiling of the content and organisation of the alliance beyond 2019.

### **Leibniz Research Alliance “Energy Transition”**

The Leibniz Research Alliance “Energy Transition” formed in 2013 and united the competences of 20 Leibniz institutions from four areas: Humanities and Educational Research (Section A), Economics and Social Sciences, Spatial Sciences (Section B), Mathematics, Natural, and Engineering Sciences (Section D), and Environmental Sciences (Section E).

The distinctiveness of the alliance comes on the one hand from the methodological linking of social, economic, and spatial aspects with scientific and technological themes in problem-oriented research projects, and on the other in the overall view of the energy-relevant sectors of electricity, heating, and transport. Central are new governance forms, business models, and social innovations in participation and ownership of new energy infrastructures. Questions of the acceptance of adapted production, transport, and storage capacities, as well as problems of connecting to networks with other technology and infrastructure sectors are of particular interest. The alliance aims to generate and develop research projects beyond the borders of scientific disciplines and subject areas in order to gain insight into the challenges and chances of the German energy transition for research and politics. The research programme orients itself ac-

ording to the following three fields of tension within energy transition: centralised versus decentralised energy systems, public versus private interests, global versus local effects.

The IRS is represented by Dr. Ludger Gailing (RD Institutional Change) in the steering group of the Leibniz Research Alliance. In addition, he leads a sub-project within the ReNEW project (“Research Network on Energy Transitions: Bridging Disciplines to Address Core Challenges to Germany’s Energiewende”). The ReNEW project is the central research project of the Leibniz Research Alliance “Energy Transition”. Its focus is to systematise and investigate the three above-mentioned fields of tension within energy transition, and to communicate the respective results to the professional public.

- Sub-project within ReNEW on the field of tension “public versus private interests”

Through workshops and conference sessions, the sub-projects organises the interdisciplinary exchange of knowledge and cooperation of scientists who work for a variety of public and private interests in the area of energy transition. At the same time it serves as a postdoctoral qualification for one of our researchers. With its work package on the ReNEW project, the IRS supports the Leibniz Research Alliance on the “Energy Transition” by coordinating a working group that has submitted research proposals on the field of tension “public versus private interests in the energy transition”.

### 1.2.2 5R Network

The spatial social research and service institutions of the Leibniz Association form a unique network of non-university spatial research in Germany. Their collaboration within Section B of the Leibniz Association can now look back on a considerable and solid tradition. One milestone was the signing of a cooperative agreement in 2000, with which the 4R Network<sup>1</sup> was formally founded. The incorporation of the Research Institute for Regional and Urban Development (ILS, Dortmund) as an associated member of the Leibniz Association saw this expanded to the 5R Network, which was also reflected in the amendment to the cooperation agreement in 2012. The biannual meeting of the 5R-Network directors, the annual 5R doctoral colloquium, and the exchange and coordination between the responsible colleagues for research communication and public relations have been vibrant cooperative practices for years.

Since 2010 the jointly published journal “Raumordnung und Raumordnung – Spatial Research and Planning” (RuR) has counted among the most prominent of the network’s activities, being a recognised platform for interdisciplinary spatial research. Since its founding, an international scientific advisory board has accompanied the journal’s development. Alongside scientific contributions, RuR also includes reports from research and practice, as well as commentaries to important new publications at home and abroad. English articles are published alongside those in German. The high quality of the articles is ensured by a review procedure performed according to international standards (a double-blind procedure). The journal appears six times a year, both in its usual, thematically flexible format featuring topical articles and, increasingly, in the form of special issues.

Concurrent to the start of the Research Programme 2019-2021, a change of publisher from Springer Nature (Heidelberg) to De Gruyter Open (Warschau/Berlin) will be completed. Bound

---

<sup>1</sup> The 4R Network previously comprised the Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL) – Leibniz-Forum for Spatial Sciences (ARL) in Hannover, the Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography (IfL) in Leipzig, the Leibniz Institute of Ecological Urban and Regional Development (IÖR) in Dresden, and the IRS in Erkner.

together with this change is the transition to “gold” open access. This brings the editors of RuR the promise of increased visibility for the journal, and thus raises its appeal to authors, together with the chance of higher citation rates.

The network’s central joint event is the Spatial Colloquium. This has taken place every two years since 2005 in alternating locations nationwide. The colloquium offers a forum for the discussion of current issues in spatial development and is oriented towards politicians, scientists, and administrative specialists. The event is organised by the members of the network in turn, with its content jointly arranged. The IRS will be responsible for the organisation of the Spatial Colloquium 2019, which will be devoted to the topic “Anchors in space? Small and mid-sized towns in structurally weak areas”.

## **2 International Cooperations**

The IRS pursues socially significant questions that have relevance for national and international applied basic research. It has thus long been recognised and established as an excellent actor within spatial social research.

Strategic measures taken in the past by the IRS for a consistent growth in international research cooperations and connections have been successful. Among the most important measures are: the establishment of an international affairs position to advise and support the preparation of international research proposals; the provision of an internationalisation budget; and, in relation to this, the “IRS Fellowship Programme”. In the Fellowship Programme, funding is made available for the residencies of first-rate, international guest researchers at the IRS. The residencies are used for the further development of research cooperations, for instance through the joint preparation of research proposals or publications. The past successes of these strategic measures will further develop in the Research Programme 2019-2021. The communication of research findings in an international context also has the highest priority in the coming programme, evident in the positioning of IRS topics at important international conferences, whether through the organisation of sessions, individual lectures, or publication in recognised peer-reviewed journals and special issues with a high international coverage.

Areas of particular focus for international cooperation continue to assist in concentrating the activities of the institute – which as a whole is itself small. Within Europe, Poland, Great Britain, and Scandinavia have been determined as target areas, together with Canada and the USA further afield. Nevertheless, the Junior Research Group TRANSEDU (see below) now extends the scope of the IRS focus areas to Asia.

### **International Research Projects**

While internationalisation was still predominantly organised through the lead projects in the Research Programme 2015-2018 (IRS researchers undertook investigations in regions abroad in four out of five lead projects), international research in the new programme will be implemented above all via international third-party funded projects, in which the IRS acts as lead partner together with foreign research institutions.

- “Social Entrepreneurship in Structurally Weak Rural Regions” (RurAction, EU/Horizon 2020, MSCA-ITN, 2016-2020)

The IRS coordinates a total of 15 partners in this EU project, encompassing seven European countries (Ireland, Denmark, Poland, Germany, Austria, Greece, and Portugal). Under the leadership of Prof. Dr. Gabriela Christmann and with one common thematic

framework, ten Early Stage Researchers (ESRs) examine in their PhD projects how socially innovative solutions to existing problems can be developed in economically weak rural areas of Europe, and what role social enterprises play in this.

- “Socio-spatial Transformations in German-Polish ‘Interstices’: Practices of Debordering and Rebordering“ (DE-RE-BORD, DFG-NCN, Beethoven II, 2018-2020)

In this project, implemented jointly with the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, socio-spatial transformation processes at either side of the German-Polish border from 2007 to 2019 are examined. Under the leadership of Prof. Dr. Gabriela Christmann, it analyses how processes of debordering were effected, and to what extent new (small-scale) demarcations arose at the same time.

- “Similar but Different: Neighbourhood Change in Halle (Saale) and Łódź“ (DFG-NCN, Beethoven II, 2018-2020)

The project, implemented by Dr. Matthias Bernt in cooperation with the University of Łódź, discusses the various development of neighbourhoods in Halle (Saale) and Łódź following the change of system just over 25 years ago. Its point of departure is the assumption that, despite apparently comparable initial conditions, there has been no convergence in the development of the two neighbourhoods, but rather that different institutional formations have led to divergent logics, dynamics, and patterns of neighbourhood development. Suburbanisation and gentrification processes as well as the development of large housing estates will, in particular, be analysed.

- “Estates After Transition” (ERA.Net RUS Plus Call 2017, 2018-2022)

The project is run by Dr. Matthias Bernt in cooperation with the European University at Saint Petersburg and the University of Tartu, and seeks to provide a comparative analysis of current urban development processes in post-socialist large housing estates. Central are the actors, interests, and resources, and the development dynamics yielded by their interaction. The research project is based on comparative case studies of six residential areas in East Germany, Estonia, and Russia.

- “Constructing Transnational Spaces of Higher Education: International Branch Campus Development at the Interface of Network and Territorial Embeddedness” (TRANSEDU, Leibniz Competition, 2018-2023)

The project is implemented in collaboration with the National University of Singapore and the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (Belgium). Under the leadership of Dr. Jana M. Kleibert, the Leibniz Junior Research Group comprising three doctoral researchers will examine globalisation’s driving factors within, and effects on, universities in Europa, the Gulf States, and South-East Asia. It will analyse how university education is becoming increasingly internationalised, among other things through the establishment of International Branch Campuses (IBC). IBCs will be illuminated at various levels, from the transformation of European internationalisation strategies to events within the transnational “Education Cities” in the global South.

In the Research Programme 2019-2021, the IRS will continue to apply for cooperation projects within EU research-funding programmes (e.g. Horizon 2020, Horizon Europe) as well as research projects supported by European structural funds (e.g. INTERREG).

### **Cooperation Partners with Cooperation Arrangements**

The IRS continues to foster its cooperative relations with research institutions abroad after the motto: “Better to successfully cooperate with a few, than to have superficial relations with many”. With this in mind, the IRS has entered into formal cooperative agreements with the following institutions: Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań (Poland), the University of Manchester (Great Britain), the University of Leicester (Great Britain), the University of Eastern Finland, Joensuu (Finland), and the University of Turku (Finland).

### **International Networks and Editorships**

The maintenance of international networks is a matter of course for IRS researchers. Of highest relevance for the entire IRS in the Research Programme 2019-2021 are the following international organisations: the Association of American Geographers (AAG), the Royal Geographical Society (RGS, with IBG), the International Sociological Association (ISA; especially here the Research Committees RC 21 “Regional and Urban Development”, RC 39 “Sociology of Disasters”, and RC 14 “Sociology of Communication, Knowledge and Culture”), and the Regional Studies Association (RSA). These offer numerous opportunities for participation and networking (e.g. at annual conferences and participation in specialist groups). In addition, the following multinational networks will be central to the research departments:

- “European Colloquium on Culture, Creativity and Economy” (CCE), RD Economic Spaces;
- “Development of a quantitative assessment framework of inclusive green growth to improve policy decisions” (Hanse-Wissenschaftskolleg, Institute for Advanced Studies), RD Institutional Change;
- “EMES International Research Network” (on Social Enterprises and Social Innovations), RD Dynamics of Communication;
- “Cities after Transitions” (CAT), RD Regeneration; and
- “European Association for Urban History” (EAUH), RD Department for Historical Research.

Prof. Dr. Kristine Kern is, in addition to her position at the IRS, active as Adjunct Professor at the Åbo Akademi University (AAU) in Turku (Finland), forming the basis for international and interdisciplinary cooperation within the strategic initiatives of the Academy of Finland.

Moreover, researchers at the IRS also contribute in the function of editors to renowned international journals: Dr. Matthias Bernt in the “International Journal of Urban and Regional Research”, Prof. Dr. Gabriela Christmann in “Urban Planning” and in the “Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Urban and Regional Studies”, and Prof. Dr. Oliver Ibert in “Palgrave Communications”.

## References

### Introduction

Rosa, H. (2016): *Resonanz – Eine Soziologie der Weltbeziehung*. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.

### Dynamics of Economic Spaces

Asheim, B. T.; Coenen, L.; Vang, J. (2007): Face-to-face, buzz, and knowledge bases: sociospatial implications for learning, innovation, and innovation policy. In: *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 25 (5), 655-670.

Barad, K. (2003): Posthumanist performativity. Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. In: *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28 (3), 801-831.

Couldry, N. (2004): Theorising media as practice. In: *Social Semiotics* 14 (2), 115-132.

Couldry, N.; van Dijck, J. (2015): Researching social media as if the social mattered. In: *Social Media + Society* 1 (2), 1-7.

Engelbrecht, H. (2014): A general model of the innovation – subjective well-being nexus. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 24 (2), 377-397. DOI: 10.1007/s00191-014-0343-y

Florida, R. 2014. *The Rise of the Creative Class – Revisited: Revisited and Expanded*. New York: Basic Books.

Grabher, G.; Melchior, A.; Schiemer, B.; Schüßler, E.; Sydow, J. (2017): From being there to being aware: Confronting geographical and sociological imaginations of copresence. In: *Environment and Planning A* 36 (3), 1-11.

Graham, M.; Hjorth, I.; Lehdonvirta, V. (2017): Digital labour and development: Impacts of global digital labour platforms and the Gig Economy on worker livelihoods. In: *Transfer* 23 (2), pp. 135-162.

Kitchin, R.; Dodge, M. (2011): *Code/Space. Software and Everyday Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Knorr-Cetina, K. (2009): The synthetic situation: Interactionism for a global world. In: *Symbolic Interaction* 32 (1), 61-87.

Langley, P.; Leyshon, A. (2017): Platform capitalism: The intermediation and capitalization of digital economic Circulation. In: *Finance and Society* 3 (1), 11-31.

Latour, B. (2005): *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Møller Jørgensen, K. (2016): The media go-along. Researching mobilities with media in hand. In: *MedieKultur: Journal of Media and Communication Research* 60, 32-49.

- Niederer, S.; van Dijck, J. (2010): Wisdom of the crowd or technicity of content? Wikipedia as a sociotechnical system. In: *New Media & Society* 12 (8), 1368-1387.
- Shearmur, R. (2016): Why local development and local innovation are not the same thing: The uneven geographic distribution of innovation-related development. In: Shearmur, R.; Carrincazeaux, C.; Doloreux, D. (Eds.): *Handbook on the Geographies of Innovation*. Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Star, S. L. (1999): The ethnography of infrastructure. In: *American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (3), 377-391.
- Star, S. L.; Ruhleder, K. (1996): Steps toward an ecology of infrastructure: Design and access for large information spaces. In: *Information Systems Research* 7 (1), 111-134.
- Suchman, L. A. (2007): *Human-Machine Reconfigurations. Plans and Situated Actions*. 2. Aufl. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijck, J. (2013): *The Culture of Connectivity. A Critical History of Social Media*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### **Institutional Change and Regional Public Goods**

- Aradau, C. (2010): Security That Matters: Critical Infrastructure and Objects of Protection. In: *Security Dialogue* 41 (5), 491-514.
- Bennett, N.; Lemoine, J. (2014): What a Difference a Word Makes. Understanding Threats to Performance in a VUCA World. In: *Business Horizons* 57 (3), 311-317.
- Birkland, T. A.; Warnement, M. K. (2014): Focusing Events in Disasters and Development. In: Kapucu, N.; Liou, K. T. (Eds.): *Disaster and Development. Examining Global Issues and Cases*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 39-60.
- Birkmann, J.; Wenzel, F.; Greiving, S.; Garschagen, M.; Vallée, D.; Nowak, W. et al. (2016): Extreme Events, Critical Infrastructures, Human Vulnerability and Strategic Planning. Emerging Research Issues. In: *Journal of Extreme Events* 3 (4), 1-25.
- BMI [Bundesministerium des Inneren] (Hrsg.) (2009): *Nationale Strategie zum Schutz Kritischer Infrastrukturen (KRITIS-Strategie)*. Berlin.
- BReg [Bundesregierung] (2015): *Fortschrittsbericht zur Deutschen Anpassungsstrategie an den Klimawandel*. Berlin.
- Engels, J. I.; Nordmann, A. (Hrsg.) (2018): *Was heißt Kritikalität? Zu einem Schlüsselbegriff der Debatte um Kritische Infrastrukturen*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Fischedick, M. et al. (2015): Phasen der Energiesystemtransformation. In: *ForschungsVerbund Erneuerbare Energien (Hrsg.): Forschung für die Energiewende – Phasenübergänge aktiv gestalten. Beiträge zur FVEE-Jahrestagung 2014*. Berlin (FVEE-Themen), 12-18.



- Fraunhofer ISI [Fraunhofer-Institut für System- und Innovationsforschung] (Hrsg.) (2018): Sektorkopplung – Definition, Chancen und Herausforderungen. Karlsruhe (Working Paper Sustainability and Innovation, S 01/2018).
- Fuhr, H.; Hickmann, T.; Kern, K. (2018): The role of cities in multi-level climate governance. Local climate policies and the 1.5 °C target. In: *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 30, 1-6.
- Gailing, L.; Moss, T. (Eds.) (2016): *Conceptualizing Germany's energy transition. Institutions, materiality, power.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gailing, L.; Naumann, M. (2018): Using focus groups to study energy transitions: Researching or producing new social realities? In: *Energy Research & Social Science* 45, 355-362.
- Geels, F. W.; Schot, J. (2007): Typology of sociotechnical transition pathways. In: *Research Policy* 36, 399-417.
- Graham, S. (Hrsg.) (2010): *Disrupted cities. When infrastructure fails.* New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hajer, M. (2002): Discourse analysis and the study of policy making. In: *European Political Science* 2 (1), 61-65.
- Jasanoff, S.; Kim, S.-H. (Hrsg.) (2015): *Dreamscapes of modernity. Sociotechnical imaginaries and the fabrication of power.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jessop, B.; Brenner, N.; Jones, M. (2008): Theorizing sociospatial relations. In: *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26 (3), 389-401.
- Kern, K. (2014): Climate governance in the European Union multilevel system. The role of cities. In: Weibust, I.; Meadowcroft, J. (Eds.): *Multilevel environmental governance. Managing water and climate change in Europe and North America.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 111-130.
- Kuchler, M.; Bridge, G. (2018): Down the black hole. Sustaining national socio-technical imaginaries of coal in Poland. In: *Energy Research & Social Science* 41, 136-147.
- Leopoldina [Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften Leopoldina]; acatech [Deutsche Akademie der Technikwissenschaften]; Akademienunion [Union der deutschen Akademien der Wissenschaften] (2017): „Sektorkopplung“ – Optionen für die nächste Phase der Energiewende. Kurzfassung der Stellungnahme. München (Schriftenreihe Energiesysteme der Zukunft).
- Liamputtong, P. (2011): *Focus Group Methodology. Principles and Practice.* London: SAGE.
- Machacek, E. (2017): Constructing criticality by classification. Expert assessments of mineral raw materials. In: *Geoforum* 84, 368-377.
- Neisser, F.; Pohl, J. (2013): „Kritische Infrastrukturen“ und „material turn“ – Eine akteur-netzwerktheoretische Betrachtung. In: *Berichte zur deutschen Landeskunde* 87 (1), 25-44.
- Olsson, P.; Folke, C.; Berkes, F. (2004): Adaptive Comanagement for Building Resilience in Social-Ecological Systems. In: *Environmental Management* 34 (1), 75-90.
- Pesch-Cronin, K. A.; Marion, N. E. (2017): *Critical infrastructure protection, risk management, and resilience. A policy perspective.* Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press Book.

- Petermann, T.; Bradke, H.; Lüllmann, A.; Poetzsch, M.; Riehm, U. (2010): Gefährdung und Verletzbarkeit moderner Gesellschaften – am Beispiel eines großräumigen und langandauernden Ausfalls der Stromversorgung. Büro für Technikfolgen-Abschätzung beim Deutschen Bundestag. Berlin (Arbeitsbericht, 141).
- Pierson, P. (2000): Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics. In: *The American Political Science Review* 94 (2), 251-267.
- Schneidewind, U.; Zahrnt, A. (2014): *The politics of sufficiency. Making it easier to live the good life.* München.
- Steinmo S. (2010): Historical institutionalism. In: Della Porta D.; Keating M. (Eds.) *Approaches and methodologies in the social sciences: A pluralist perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 118-138.
- Tierney, K. (2012): Disaster Governance. Social, Political, and Economic Dimensions. In: *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 37 (1), 341-363.
- Williams, J.; Bouzarovski, S.; Swyngedouw, E. (2014): Politicising the nexus: Nexus technologies, urban circulation, and the coproduction of water-energy. Brighton (Nexus Network Think Piece Series, 1).

## **Dynamics of Communication, Knowledge and Spatial Development**

- Atkinson, P.; Hammersley, M. (1994): Ethnography and Participant Observation. In: Denzin, N.K.; Lincoln, Y.S. (Hrsg.): Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 248-261.
- Birg, H. (2003): Die demographische Zeitenwende: Der Bevölkerungsrückgang in Deutschland und Europa. München: Beck.
- BMVBS; BBSR (Hrsg.) (2009): Ländliche Räume im demografischen Wandel. BBSR-Online-Publikation 34/2009 [urn:nbn:de:0093-ON3409R142, 05.01.2016].
- Bock, B.B. (2016): Rural marginalisation and the Role of Social Innovation: A Turn towards Nexogenous Development and Rural Reconnection. In: Sociologia Ruralis 56 (4), 552-573.
- Bogner, A.; Littig, B.; Menz, W. (2009): Experteninterviews. Theorien, Methoden, Anwendungsfelder. Wiesbaden: VS.
- Christmann, G. (2013): Raumpioniere in Stadtquartieren und die kommunikative (Re-) Konstruktion von Räumen. In: Keller, R.; Knoblauch, H.; Reichertz, J. (Hrsg.): Kommunikativer Konstruktivismus. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. 153-184.
- Christmann, G. (2016): Das theoretische Konzept der kommunikativen Raum(re)konstruktion. In: Christmann, G. (Hrsg.): Zur kommunikativen Konstruktion von Räumen. Theoretische Konzepte und empirische Analysen. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. 89-117.
- Christmann, G. (2017): Analysing Changes in Discursive Constructions of Rural Areas in the Context of Demographic Change: Towards Counterpoints in the Dominant Discourse on "Dying Villages". In: Comparative Population Studies 41 (3-4), 359-378.
- Christmann, G.; Ibert, O.; Jessen, J.; Walther, U.-J. (2017): How Does Novelty Enter Spatial Planning? Conceptualizing Innovations in Planning and Research Strategies. In: Rammert, W.; Windeler, A.; Knoblauch, H.; Hutter M. (Hrsg.): Innovation Society Today: Perspectives, Fields, and Cases. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. 247-272.
- [DVS] Deutsche Vernetzungsstelle Ländliche Räume (2017): Themenheft „Digitale Lösungen für's Land“. LandInForm (3).
- Elias, N. (1986): Figuration, sozialer Prozess und Zivilisation: Grundbegriffe der Soziologie. In: Elias, N.: Aufsätze und andere Schriften III. Band 16. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- Hepp, A. (2013): Medienkultur. Die Kultur mediatisierter Welten. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Hepp, A.; Krotz, F. (Hrsg.) (2012): Mediatisierte Welten: Beschreibungsansätze und Forschungsfelder. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Hickethier, K. (1982): Medienbiographien. Bausteine für eine Rezeptionsgeschichte. In: Medien und Erziehung 26 (4), 206-215.
- Howaldt, J.; Kopp, R.; Schwarz, M. (2015): Social Innovations as Drivers of Social Change. Exploring Tarde's Contribution to Social Innovation Theory Building. In: Nicholls, A.; Simon, J.; Gabriel, M. (Hrsg.): New Frontiers in Social Innovation Research. Basingstoke: Palgrave. 29-51.

- Hutter, M.; Knoblauch, H.; Rammert, W.; Windeler, A. (2016): Innovationsgesellschaft heute. Die reflexive Herstellung des Neuen. In: Rammert, W.; Windeler, A.; Knoblauch, H.; Hutter, M. (Hrsg.): Innovationsgesellschaft heute. Perspektiven, Felder und Fälle. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. 15-35.
- Keller, R. (2013): Kommunikative Konstruktion und diskursive Konstruktion. In: Keller, R.; Knoblauch, H.; Reichertz, J. (Hrsg.): Kommunikativer Konstruktivismus. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. 69-94.
- Knoblauch, H. (2005): Focused Ethnography. In: Forum Qualitative Social Research 6 (3). Online verfügbar unter: <http://nbnresolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0503440> [Zugriff: 17.01.2018].
- Knoblauch, H. (2013): Grundbegriffe und Aufgaben des kommunikativen Konstruktivismus. In: Keller, R.; Knoblauch, H.; Reichertz, J. (Hrsg.): Kommunikativer Konstruktivismus. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. 25-47.
- Knoblauch, H. (2016): Kommunikatives Handeln, das Neue und die Innovationsgesellschaft. In: Rammert, W.; Windeler, A.; Knoblauch, H.; Hutter, M. (Hrsg.): Innovationsgesellschaft heute. Perspektiven, Felder und Fälle. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. 111-131.
- Krotz, F. (2001): Die Mediatisierung kommunikativen Handelns. Wie sich Alltag und soziale Beziehungen, Kultur und Gesellschaft durch die Medien wandeln. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Manthorpe, J.; Livsey, L. (2009): European Challenges in Delivering Social Services in Rural Regions: A Scoping Review. In: European Journal of Social Work 12 (1), 5-24.
- Moulaert, F.; Mehmood, A. (2011): Spaces of Social Innovations. In: Moulaert, F. et al. (Hrsg.): Handbook of Local and Regional Development. London: Routledge. 212-225.
- Müller, B.; Siedentop, S. (Hrsg.) (2003): Räumliche Konsequenzen des demografischen Wandels. Teil 1. Schrumpfung – Neue Herausforderungen für die Regionalentwicklung in Sachsen, Sachsen-Anhalt und Thüringen. Hannover: ARL.
- Rammert, W. (2010): Die Innovation der Gesellschaft. In: Howaldt, J.; Jacobsen, H. (Hrsg.): Soziale Innovation. Auf dem Weg zu einem postindustriellen Innovationsparadigma. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. 21-51.
- Rammert, W.; Windeler, A.; Knoblauch, H.; Hutter, M. (2016): Die Ausweitung der Innovationszone. In: Rammert, W.; Windeler, A.; Knoblauch, H.; Hutter, M. (Hrsg.): Innovationsgesellschaft heute. Perspektiven, Felder und Fälle. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. 3-13.
- Rosa, H. (2005): Beschleunigung. Die Veränderung der Zeitstrukturen in der Moderne. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.
- Richter, R. (2016). Social Innovations in Rural Life Worlds. In: Carlow, V. M. (Hrsg.): Ruralism: The Future of Villages and Small Towns in an Urbanizing World. Berlin: Jovis. 140-147.
- Strauss, A.L. (1997): Grounded Theory in Practice. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Weber, G. (2012): Fünf Megatrends prägen Landleben und ländliche Raumbilder. In: Ländlicher Raum 63, 74-78.

- Windeler, A.; Knoblauch, H.; Löw, M.; Meyer, U. (2017): Innovationsgesellschaft und Innovationsfelder. Profil und Forschungsansatz des Graduiertenkollegs „Innovationsgesellschaft heute. Die reflexive Herstellung des Neuen“. Technical University Technology Studies Working Papers TUTS-WP-2-2017. Online verfügbar unter: [http://www.ts.tu-berlin.de/fileadmin/i62\\_tstypo3/TUTS-WP-2-2017\\_Innovationsforschung Innovationsfelder.pdf](http://www.ts.tu-berlin.de/fileadmin/i62_tstypo3/TUTS-WP-2-2017_Innovationsforschung_Innovationsfelder.pdf) [Zugriff: 16.01.2018]
- Witzel, A. (2000): Das problemzentrierte Interview. In: Forum Qualitative Social Research (1) 1. Online verfügbar unter: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-eng.htm> [Zugriff: 17.01.2018].
- Wolff, S. (2008): Dokumenten- und Aktenanalyse. In: Flick, U. et al. (Hrsg.): Qualitative Sozialforschung. Reinbek b. Hamburg: Rowohlt. 502-513.

## **Regeneration of Cities and Towns**

- Berding, U. (2008): Migration und Stadtentwicklungspolitik. Eine Untersuchung am Beispiel ausgewählter Stadtentwicklungskonzepte. Saarbrücken, VDM.
- Blatter, J. K.; Janning, F.; Wagemann, C. (2007): Qualitative Politikanalyse. Eine Einführung in Forschungsansätze und Methoden. Wiesbaden, VS.
- Di Gaetano, A.; Strom, E. (2003): Comparative Urban Governance. An Integrated Approach. In: Urban Affairs Review 38(3), 356-395.
- Flick, U. (1996): Qualitative Forschung. Theorie, Methoden, Anwendung in Psychologie und Sozialwissenschaften, Reinbek bei Hamburg, Rowohlt.
- Gribat, N.; Kadi, J.; Lange, J.; Meubrink, Y.; Müller, J (2017): Planung als politische Praxis, In: sub\urban. zeitschrift für kritische stadtforschung, 2017/Heft1/2, 7-20.
- Hollifield, J. F. (2004): The Emerging Migration State. In: International Migration Review 38 (3), 885-912.
- Kanter, P. and Savitch, H. (2005): How to Study Comparative Urban Development Politics: A Research Note. In: International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 29, 135-151.
- McClymont, K. (2011): Revitalising the political: development control and antagonism in planning practice. In: Planning Theory 10(3), 239-256.
- Mossberger, K; Stoker, G. (2001): The Evolution of Urban Regime Theory: The Challenge of Conceptualization. In: Urban Affairs Review 36(6), 810-835.
- Münch, S. (2010): Integration durch Wohnungspolitik? Zum Umgang mit ethnischer Segregation im europäischen Vergleich. Wiesbaden, Springer VS.
- Pierre, J. (2011): The Politics of Urban Governance. London, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pierre, J. (2014): Can Urban Regimes travel in time and space? Urban Regime Theory, Governance Theory and Comparative Urban Politics. In: Urban Affairs Review 50(6), 864-889.

- Ploeger, J. (2004): Strife: Urban Planning and Agonism, *Planning Theory* 3(1), 71-92.
- Polanyi, K. (1944/2001): *The Great Transformation*. New York, Farrar & Rinehart.
- Pott, A.; Tsianos, V.S. (2014): Verhandlungszonen des Lokalen. Potentiale der Regimeperspektive für die Erforschung der städtischen Migrationsgesellschaft. In: Oßenbrügge, J; Vogelpohl, A. (Hrsg.): *Theorien in der Raum- und Stadtforschung*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 116-135.
- Pott, A.; Rass, Ch.; Wolff, F. (Hrsg.) (2018): *Was ist ein Migrationsregime? What Is a Migration Regime?* Wiesbaden, VS Springer.
- Pütz, R.; Rodatz, M. (2013): Kommunale Integrations- und Vielfaltskonzepte im Neoliberalismus. Zur strategischen Steuerung von Integration in deutschen Großstädten. In: *Geographische Zeitschrift*, 101-103 (3+4), 166-183.
- Saunders, Doug (2011): *Arrival Cities*. München: Blessing.
- Savitch, H. V.; Kantor, P. (2002): *Cities in the International Marketplace: The Political Economy of Urban Development in North American and Western Europe*. Sage, New Jersey.
- Scholten, P; Penninx, R. (2016): The Multilevel Governance of Migration and Integration. In: Garcés-Mascareñas und Penninx, R: (Hrsg.): *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe*, IMISCOE Research Series, 91-108.
- Stoker, G.; Mossberger, K. (1994): Urban regime Theory in comparative perspective. In: *Urban Affairs Review* 36, 810-835.
- Stone, C. (1989): *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*. Lawrence.
- Yin, Robert K. (1994): *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2.Auflage), London, Sage.

## **Department for Historical Research**

- Bren, P.; Neuburger, M. (Ed.) (2012), *Communism Unwrapped. Consumption in Cold War Eastern Europe*, Oxford: University Press
- Bude, H. (2008): Das Phänomen sozialer Exklusion. In ders.: Willisch, Andreas (Hrsg.): *Exklusion. Die Debatte über die „Überflüssigen“*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, S. 246-260
- Dorsch, S.; Rau, S. (Hrsg.) (2013): *Space/Time Practices*. Special Issue, *Historical Social Research* 3/2013)
- Escudier, A.; Holtey, I. (Hrsg.) (2011): *Vitesse et existence. La multiplicité des temps historiques*. Special Issue, *Trivium. Revue franco-allemande de sciences humaines et sociales*, H. 9/2011
- Fujita, K./Maloutas, Th. (Ed. (2012): *Residential Segregation in Comparative Perspective: Making Sense of Contextual Diversity*. London: Ashgate
- Gieseke J. (2013): Soziale Ungleichheit im Staatssozialismus. Eine Skizze. In: *Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History*, Online-Ausgabe, 10 (2013), H. 2, URL: <http://www.zeithistorische-forschungen.de/2-2013/id=4493>, Druckausgabe: S. 171-198

- Haumann, S.; Wagner-Kyora, G. (Hrsg.) (2013): Westeuropäische Großsiedlungen. Themenschwerpunkt. In: Informationen zur modernen Stadtgeschichte (IMS), H.1/2013
- Kälble, H. (2017): Mehr Reichtum, mehr Armut. Soziale Ungleichheit in Europa vom 20. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus
- Kuhl, L.; Werner, O. (2017): Bezirke on Scale. Regional and Local Actors. In: East German 'Democratic Centralism'. Historical Social Research, H. 42/2017, S. 243-266; DOI: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.2.243-266
- Leendertz, A. (2008): Ordnung schaffen. Deutsche Raumplanung im 20. Jahrhundert. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht
- Mertens, L. (2002) (Hrsg.): Soziale Ungleichheit in der DDR. Zu einem tabuisierten Strukturmerkmal der SED-Diktatur. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot
- Palmowski, J. (2010): Inventing a Socialist Nation. Heimat and the Politics of Everyday Life in the GDR 1945-1990, Cambridge: University Press.
- Rowell, J. (2006): Socio-Histoire der Herrschaft. Einführung. In: Droit, E; Kott, S.: Die ostdeutsche Gesellschaft. Eine transnationale Perspektive. Berlin: Ch. Links, S. 26-36
- von Saldern, A. (2006): Integration und Fragmentierung in europäischen Städten. Zur Geschichte eines aktuellen Themas. In: Archiv für Sozialgeschichte 46/2006, S. 3-60
- Zakharova, L. (2013): Le quotidien du communisme: pratiques et objets, In: Annales. Histoire, Science Sociale 68 (2013) H. 2, S. 305-314.

## Staff of the Research Departments and the Scientific Collections

Name	Academic Title/Discipline	Research Focus
<i>Director</i>		
T.B.A.		
Bürkner, Hans-Joachim	Prof. Dr. phil. State examination Geography and English Studies	Border-region research, geopolitics and daily life, socio-spatial disparities, urban research, regional development, creative economy, knowledge economy, spatial governance

Name	Academic Title/Discipline	Research Focus
<i>Research Department: Dynamics of Economic Spaces</i>		
Ibert, Oliver	Prof. Dr. rer. pol. M.A. Geography	<b>Head of Department</b> Labour-market research, governance research, entrepreneurship research, innovation research, creative economy, network research, urban research, knowledge economy, resilience research, crisis research
Bobée, Alice	M.A. Sociology European Societies	Institutional research, cultural globalisation, transnational (further) education, knowledge economy
Brinks, Verena	Dr. rer. nat. Diploma Geography	Labour-market research, expert and consultancy research, innovation research, crisis research, open creative labs, communities of practice, resilience research
Harmsen, Tjorven	M.A. Sociology	Expert and consultancy research, resilience research, societal-environmental relations, crisis research
Kleibert, Jana Maria	PhD Human Geography M.Sc. Political Science	Global production networks, globalisation, urban research, spatial capital-market research, knowledge economy
Kuebart, Andreas	M.Sc. Geography	Entrepreneurship research, network research, open creative labs, spatial capital-market research
Oechslen, Anna	M.A. Asia Studies	Labour-market research, creative economy, cultural globalisation, socio-materiality research
Rottleb, Tim	M.A. Politics and Economy of the Near & Middle East	Globalisation, spatial capital-market research, urban research, knowledge economy
Stadermann, Julia	M.Sc. Demography	Demographic change, innovation research, open creative labs, knowledge economy



Name	Academic Title/Discipline	Research Focus
Schmidt, Suntje	Junior professor Dr. rer. nat. M.A. Geography	Entrepreneurship research, innovation research, creative economy, open creative labs, communities of practice, resilience research, structural and regional policy, knowledge economy
Schulze, Marc	State examination Geography, Political Science and English	Globalisation, migration research, knowledge economy, transnational (further) education
Vogelgsang, Lukas	M.A. Social Sciences	Governance research, innovation research, knowledge economy, creativity research

Name	Academic Title/Discipline	Research Focus
<i>Research Department: Institutional Change and Regional Public Goods</i>		
Gailing, Ludger	Dr. rer. pol. Diploma Spatial Planning	Head of Department (acting) Energy transition, infrastructures, governance research, institutional research, cultivated-landscape research, public goods, socio-materiality research, governmentality research
Eichenauer, Eva	M.A. South-East Asia Studies, Sociology	Energy transition, sustainability, infrastructures, rural areas, democracy research, conflict research, lifestyle analysis
Kern, Kristine	Prof. Dr. rer. pol. Diploma Economy Diploma Administrative Studies	Environmental governance, governance research, sustainability, climate and energy policy, urban research, European Union
Klemp, Felicitas	M.Sc. Geography	Governance research, urban research, infrastructure research, urban policy
Krüger, Timmo Nils	Dr. rer. pol. M.A. Cultural and Political Studies	Energy policy, energy transition, policy analysis, discourse theory of de-growth, hegemony analysis, climate policy, political economy
Niederhafner, Stefan	Dr. phil. Diploma Political Science	Energy policy, governance research, institutional research, infrastructure policy, innovation research, climate research, policy analysis, resilience research
Röhring, Andreas	Diploma Economics	Energy transition, public goods, institutional research, cultivated-landscape research

Name	Academic Title/Discipline	Research Focus
<i>Research Department: Dynamics of Communication, Knowledge and Spatial Development</i>		
Christmann, Gabriela	apl. Prof. Dr. rer. soc. et phil. habil. M.A. Sociology, Political Science	<b>Head of Department</b> Citizen participation, innovation research, climate research, social entrepreneurship, urban research, digitalisation of urban-development planning, rural areas and rural communities, network research, resilience research
Baxter, Jamie Scott	Postgraduate Certificate with Merit (M.A. equivalent) Architecture	Urban research, rural areas and rural communities, social entrepreneurship, innovation research
Federwisch, Tobias	Dr. rer. Nat. Diploma Geography and Political Science	Citizen participation, demographic change, governance research, entrepreneurship research, rural areas and rural communities, innovation research, urban research, social entrepreneurship
Heimann, Thorsten	Dr. phil. M.A. Cultural Sciences	Resilience research, cultural globalisation, climate research, innovation research, border-region research, sustainability research, urban research, village and community development
Mélix, Sophie	Diploma Architecture	Urban development, digitalisation of urban-development planning
Richter, Ralph	Dr. phil. M.A. Sociology, Communications and Media Studies	Innovation research, urban research, rural areas and rural communities, migration research, social entrepreneurship
Schinagl, Martin	M.A. European Anthropology	Digitalisation of urban-development planning, urban cultures, working environments
Singh, Ajit	Dr. des. Diploma Sociology	Digitalisation of urban-development planning, citizen participation, urban-planning visualisation processes
Sommer, Vivien	Dr. phil. Diploma Sociology	Border-region research, mobility research, citizen participation, socio-materiality research, media research, conflict research
Stoustrup, Sune Wiingaard	M.A. Urban Studies	Urban research, rural areas and rural communities, social entrepreneurship, innovation research
Töppel, Mandy	Diploma Sociology	Citizen participation, digitalisation of urban-development planning, resilience research

Name	Academic Title/Discipline	Research Focus
<i>Research Department: Regeneration of Cities and Towns</i>		
Hillmann, Felicitas	Prof. Dr. rer. nat. M.A. Geography	<b>Head of Department</b> Labour-market research, demographic change, climate research, urban research, diversity and cultural heritage, migration and mobility research, resilience research
Bernt, Matthias	Dr. phil. Diploma Political Science	Urban research, gentrification, governance research, shrinking cities, urban reconstruction and renovation
Boeth, Henning	M.A. Urban Geography	Governance research, migration research, urban research, small and medium-sized cities
Calbet Elias, Laura	Dr. phil. des. Diploma City and Regional Planning	Urban research, urban reconstruction and renovation, housing policy, history of Berlin
Kühn, Manfred	Dr. rer. pol. Diploma Urban/Landscape Planning	Urban research, strategic planning, handling of marginalisation, migration management, small and medium-sized cities
Meißel, Jesko	M.A. Urban Geography	Migration research, urban research, urban reconstruction and renovation
Nettelbladt, Gala	MRes Interdisciplinary Urban Design	Urban research, governance research, migration research
Volkman, Anne	Diploma Urban and Regional Planning	Urban studies, neighbourhood development, urban reconstruction and renovation

Name	Academic Title/Discipline	Research Focus
<i>Research Department for Historical Research/Scientific Collections</i>		
Bernhardt, Christoph	apl. Prof. Dr. phil. State examination History and German Studies	<b>Head of Department</b> History of building and planning in the GDR, governance research, mobility research, urban reconstruction and renovation, history of Berlin
Butter, Andreas	Dr. phil. Diploma History of Art	History of building and planning in the GDR, history of Berlin, biographical research, urban research
Drewes, Kai	Dr. phil. M.A. Modern History	Head of the Scientific Collections History of building and planning in the GDR, biographical research, mobility research, bequests
Engler, Harald	Dr. phil. M.A. History	Biographical research, history of building and planning in the GDR, open-space planning, mobility research
Meißner, Kathrin	M.A. History	Urban research, urban-planning visualisation processes, media history, citizen participation
Motylińska, Monika	Dr. phil. M.A. Art History and Technology M.A. Historic Preservation and Heritage Science	History of building and planning in the GDR, cultural globalisation
Obeth, Alexander	Diploma History/Scientific Documentation	Special representative for bequests, user support
Pienkny, Anja	Diploma Information Science	Archivist to the Scientific Collections, user support