



RESEARCH PROGRAMME

2015–2018

- Spatial Social Research –
Seismograph and Catalyst



IRS

Leibniz Institute for
Regional Development
and Structural Planning

Contents

- Introduction..... 3**
- IRS Mission Statement: Social Science-based Spatial Research 7**
- Unique Characteristics of the IRS..... 9**
- Research Department 1: Dynamics of Economic Spaces..... 10**
 - 1 Department Profile 10
 - 2 Lead Project: Local Anchors of Translocal Knowledge Communities: New Focal Points of Knowledge Generation and their Territoriality 11
 - 2.1 Description of the Problem 11
 - 2.2 Questions 14
 - 2.3 Theoretical Approach 14
 - 2.4 Methodology 15
- Research Department 2: Institutional Change and Regional Public Goods..... 17**
 - 1 Department Profile 17
 - 2 Lead Project: New Spaces of the Energy Transition between Power, Materiality and People..... 18
 - 2.1 Description of the Problem 19
 - 2.2 Questions 20
 - 2.3 Theoretical Approach 20
 - 2.4 Methodology 22
- Research Department 3: Dynamics of Communication, Knowledge and Spatial Development 24**
 - 1 Department Profile 24
 - 2 Lead Project: Innovations in Rural Municipalities. Conditions, Actors and Processes of Creative Community Development..... 26
 - 2.1 Description of the Problem 26
 - 2.2 Questions 27
 - 2.3 Theoretical Approach 28
 - 2.4 Methodology 29
- Research Department 4: Regeneration of Cities and Towns..... 31**
 - 1 Department Profile 31

Research Department 5: Department for Historical Research/Scientific Collections for the History of Building and Planning in the GDR	33
1 Department Profile	33
2 Lead Project: The “Car-Oriented City” as an Area of Conflict. Open Space Planning in Inner-City Areas as an Urbanisation Strategy in East and West Germany since 1945	34
2.1 Description of the Problem	35
2.2 Questions	36
2.3 Theoretical Approach	37
2.4 Methodology	37
3 Projects of the Scientific Collections for the History of Building and Planning in the GDR	38
3.1 Profile/Objectives	38
3.2 Strategic Projects	39
National Collaborations and Networks with University and Non-University Researchers	42
International Research Collaborations and Networking	52
Promotion of Young Researchers	55
1 Support for Doctoral Candidates	56
1.1 Systematic Recruitment of Doctoral Candidates	56
1.2 Development of Working Conditions for Doctoral Candidates at the IRS	57
1.3 Offerings of Structured Advanced Training	57
2 Promotion of Postdoctoral Researchers	58
2.1 Systematic Recruitment of Postdoctoral Researchers	59
2.2 Two-staged Support of Postdoctoral Researchers	59

Introduction

Spatial Social Research – Seismograph and Catalyst

High potential for dynamism and structural change, spatial and social relevance, long-term significance and impact are the criteria according to which the IRS organizes its research work. In fact, these topics are derived from the status of the IRS as a non-university research organisation whose main task consists of the social-scientific examination of cities and regions, and the problems and potentials they face within their national and international contexts. Moreover, our selection of topics is also influenced by our membership in the Leibniz Association and our commitment to its motto “*theoria cum praxi*”, theory with practice. The IRS engages in social science-based spatial research, both knowledge- and application-oriented fundamental research, and as such promotes the transfer of scientific knowledge to the relevant areas of practice.

The research programme of 2015-2018 is entitled “Spatial Social Research – Seismograph and Catalyst”. It is through these two metaphors that the Leibniz motto “*theoria cum praxi*” finds its expression. The new topics chosen for the lead research projects illustrate the ways in which the title of the new research programme will be operationalised in the course of the next four years.

The New Lead Projects and their Topics

Headed by Prof. Dr. Oliver Ibert, the IRS Research Department 1 will continue its previous research on knowledge practices and the spatio-temporal character of innovation processes by embarking on its new lead project called “Local Anchors of Translocal Knowledge Communities: New Focal Points of Knowledge Generation and their Territoriality”. In this context, the research highlights questions about how economic innovation processes and forms of organised creativity are embedded within territories. Conceptual insights gained from the previous cross-departmental project (2010-2012) are followed up by utilizing the concepts of vulnerability and resilience, which are then applied to the insecurity of knowledge work. The project explicitly aspires to render the findings from the lead project available to representatives of territorial units, i.e. for municipal and regional business promoters, as well as for stakeholders actively involved in regional development politics.

With its lead project “New Energy Spaces between Power, Materiality and People”, the Research Department 2 headed by Dr. Timothy Moss retains its research focus on the energy transition in Germany. In doing so, the energy transition is regarded as an expression of ecological crisis and the responses from both politicians and civil society. The department has developed a heuristic approach, which is based on explorative studies that were conducted during the previous research programme and which are now to be utilized in the form of case studies. Moreover, close collaborations with the current cross-departmental project (2013-2015) will contribute to a conceptual extension of the department’s research work by adding the dimension of key figures (“people”).

Under the direction of Prof. Dr. Gabriela Christmann, Research Department 3 will turn towards a new type of spatial settlement by embarking on its lead project “Innovation in Rural Communities. Conditions, Actors, and Processes of Creative Municipal Development”. While the two previous research programmes had conducted studies on urban neighbourhoods with special development needs, the focus has now shifted towards structurally weak rural areas with their structural deficits and decline. In particular, the focus is put on processes of innovative action and their relevance for community development. What kind of social-spatial conditions do stakeholders consider problematic, or even crisis-prone? In what ways do some actors react to this by breaking with former practical routines or by developing novel projects?

While the leadership position of the IRS Research Department 4 is likely to be re-staffed once the joint appointment process with TU Berlin has been successfully completed, the department has, thus far, thought about using its new lead project “UrbanReg – Urban Regeneration Policies and Socio-Spatial Disparities” mainly to study successful processes of urban regeneration. These processes are regarded as ambivalent in that they also usually entail processes of socio-spatial polarization. In order to be able to consider the question of whether a convergence of planning approaches is detectable across Europe, the department plans to conduct empirical and internationally comparative case studies.

Under the direction of PD Dr. Christoph Bernhardt, the IRS Research Department 5 will make a contribution to the history of urbanisation and planning in the 20th century with its lead project “The ‘Car-Oriented City’ as an Area of Conflict. Open Space Planning in Inner-city Areas as an Urbanization Strategy since 1945 in the East and West.” By focusing on questions related to (car) traffic issues and their formative power in regards to the appropriation of public urban spaces, it addresses an aspect of crucial relevance for post-1945 urbanisation processes. With the aid of path-dependent approaches, the project addresses networks of planners, conflicting appropriations of open spaces, as well as interfaces between physical structures and cultural dynamics.

The Profile of IRS Research

As a matter of course, the department profiles (i.e. their research issues, theoretical and methodological approaches, etc.) naturally bear the “signatures” of their heads and the research team members. Nonetheless, it is our firm commitment that every research department makes its specific contribution to a consistent overall concept. It is for this reason that we decided to formulate an “IRS Mission Statement: Social Science-based Spatial Research” and a “Unique Characteristic of the IRS” document some time ago. Considering that IRS research is based upon and occurs within various (sub-) disciplines and thematic discourses, both of the mentioned texts provide a valuable orientation. The key components that characterise the profile of the IRS research programme 2015-2018 can be summarised as follows:

1. In terms of its theoretical and empirical epistemological interest, IRS research is focused on the spatial aspects and contexts of social action. In doing so, spatial phenomena are explored in terms of both processual and historical dimensions. As to processes, the social construction of spaces is of particular interest. We un-

derstand governance as a generic term of social sciences that comprises all forms and mechanisms of coordination among players whose actions are interdependent. In this regard, the concept of governance is key to understanding procedural elements that underlie the social construction of spaces (Kilper, 2010).

2. Action-oriented and social-constructivist approaches are fundamental for research conducted at the IRS. Examples include studies by Stehr (2001) on our understanding of knowledge as a capacity for social action, or by Wenger (1998) and Brown/Duquenois (2001) on communities of practitioners. In times of climate change, physical-material actors make themselves felt, for example in the form of heat waves, or may even actively interfere in socio-spatial processes. Once we analyse such processes, the actor-network theory by Latour (2005) will provide inspiring food for thought. Apart from Berger/Luckmann (1987), the “classics” of social constructivism, there are also more recent works on communicative constructivism (Knoblauch 2013; Rammert 2010) that provide us with the concept of innovative action.

In the research programme 2015-2018, three conceptual pairs serve as a linkage between action-oriented and social constructivist approaches: knowledge and innovation; crisis and resilience; institutions and governance. We regard innovation and knowledge as inexorably linked with practical action where knowledge is applied. It provides the basis for reflexive action within a framework of socio-spatial development processes. By referring to the conceptual pair of “crisis and resilience”, we address the dimensions of change and uncertainty as elements of social and spatial development, but also as social action in the form of resilience strategies that help individuals, actors and organisations adapt to change and uncertainties. We understand institutions as both formal and informal regulatory systems with a certain spatial scope and significance. On a relatively permanent basis, social action and forms of governance are subject to these institutions. As demonstrated below, these three conceptual pairs have now become a characteristic of the cross-departmental research foci for all research conducted at the IRS.

3. Research at the IRS is characterised by five concepts of space, which we regard as analytical distinctions: a) spaces of communication; b) spaces of identity; c) spaces for action; d) institutional spaces and e) spaces of social interaction. Material space is of relevance for IRS research in that it points to the natural and constructed environment and their limiting as well as enabling role, with respect to social action and interaction. Material space therefore matters to us as both a context for social action, as well as the result thereof.
4. With its scientific collections for the history of building and planning from the GDR and its comprehensive archive of literary and other texts, plans, drawings, maps, graphic documents and models, the IRS Department for Historical Research (where all this material is being collected, rendered available, processed and selectively evaluated) is a unique institution in Germany. As a place for social science-based spatial research, the IRS has witnessed an enhancement of its research profile in terms of urban history and planning history. Today, its research also includes pathways of urbanisation and 20th century planning cultures, with a particular focus on contemporary history after 1945. As a result, the IRS now presents contributions on spatial development processes in the modern era, which are conceived as a fundamental signature of the 20th century.

5. In terms of method, IRS research is predominantly rooted in a qualitative paradigm. It is dominated by explorative approaches and case studies, as well as by ethnographic inquiries. In recent years, the IRS has distinguished itself by conducting structural analyses of network relations in different thematic contexts – be it in innovation research or in research works on neighbourhood development. Network analyses in the sense of dynamic process analyses allow us to gain an adequate understanding of spatial transformation processes and their spatio-temporal dynamic. Methods of quantitative social research (such as the collection and interpretation of panel data and statistics) are applied in combination with methods of qualitative social research.

With this range of profile components, IRS research is characterised by a high degree of professionalism, which assures its originality in the academic discourse, and thus renders the IRS a prime source for spatial knowledge and practice-oriented governance approaches. In the following report, we will elaborate on the ways in which the five IRS research departments operationalise these components with their distinctive departmental profiles. We will outline the novel issues they will tackle throughout the next four years in the context of their lead and qualification projects, and will discuss the individual strategies they will follow to attract third party funding. We will also introduce the strategic objectives of the scientific collections of the history of building and planning in the GDR. The outlines of our research departments will be preceded by synopses for the new lead projects, which are meant to provide a quick overview.

We have always placed particular emphasis on the idea that IRS research needs to be more than the sum of the research work conducted by the individual research departments. The fact that we will also adhere to this strategy during our research programme 2015-2018 becomes particularly evident once we take a look at the chapter on cross-departmental cooperation. For the very first time, we will break new ground not only for the IRS but also for all member institutions of the Leibniz Association by dedicating a chapter to IRS contributions to three Leibniz Research Alliances.

The present programme has a term of four years. This is due to the fact that the Leibniz Association's senate will evaluate the IRS in the last quarter of 2017. Our suggestion that we concentrate our attention on the development of our new research programme only when the evaluation has been completed in 2018 has received the full support of our scientific advisory board.

IRS Mission Statement: Social Science-based Spatial Research

Preamble

The IRS Research Vision conveys the institute's self-image and rationale for operation:

- It acts as a guiding principle for the development of our unique research profile, which takes account of the accelerated dynamics of change in spatial and social contexts of action.
- It provides the overall direction for research and ensures the efficiency of its organisation, paying particular attention to optimising productivity and increasing the validity of our research findings.
- It presents our corporate identity as an expression of shared values and provides employees with guidance.
- Simultaneously, its purpose is to increase the public profile of the institute – highlighting its past achievements and future prospects, ensuring that the IRS is respected for its instructive knowledge production and praxis-relevant research on governance.

Our Objective: To Help Safeguard the Future Viability of Regions and Cities

Research conducted at the IRS focuses on increasingly complex social realities and most notably on the social construction of spaces. Accordingly, our work is based on an overarching social science perspective, one located at the interface between constructivist and action theories and focused on institutions, governance and knowledge. We examine societal dynamics of development within their respective socio-spatial contexts and assess the ways (and extent to which) cities and regions are affected by processes of globalisation and European integration.

We are fully aware that coping with new economic and socio-spatial problems calls for innovative political approaches, strategies and ways forward that remain sensitive to history. Our aim is to systematically grasp and explain the economic, social, and political processes through which space is produced. We aim to identify local and regional opportunities for development and attempt to provide the knowledge required to shape and organise transformation processes. Finally, one of our prime objectives is to explore pathways of sustainable and future-oriented urban and regional development at both national and European scales.

Our Capabilities: Interdisciplinary Orientation and Scientific Specialisation

The distinguishing feature of our work is its interdisciplinarity. Highly qualified, inquisitive researchers from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds (social sciences, history and planning) cooperate closely at the institute. Our work in interdisciplinary teams allows us to mobilise and bring together previously disparate specialised knowledge. By this means, it becomes possible to generate new knowledge on questions related to the future of social and spatial development and to further advance already existing problem-solving competences in a targeted fashion.

Successful interdisciplinary collaboration allows us, from a firmly social scientific perspective, to formulate innovative research questions and provide relevant guidance to political and societal actors. Given our highly distinctive profile, we are a much sought-after research partner in our fields of expertise. We are embedded in important academic networks and have good contacts to the national and international levels. In particular, we collaborate closely with leading European universities and

non-university research institutions with a background in social scientific spatial research and related research fields.

Our Path: Exceptional Basic Research and Knowledge Transfer

Our research adheres to high methodological standards. Though our work in the field of spatial sciences is based upon current and advanced theories, we maintain rigorous standards of empirical research with reference to well-established and innovative methods. As a result, our research makes an ongoing contribution to the generation of new theoretical insights. We combine exceptional basic research with scientific consulting services for societal institutions. By this means we promote the transfer of scholarly knowledge to relevant societal areas of practise.

How our Research is Organised: Transparency, Openness, Efficiency

We understand our basic research as being part of the broader public research conducted across the Federal Republic of Germany. Rather than regarding research as a purely academic matter, we believe it should be publicly disseminated as a subject of broad societal concern. The open-minded attitude of our employees towards various addressees enables us to maintain and strengthen the confidence of those inside and outside the institute. We welcome societal dialogue on our research and publicise the key findings and proposals for action which emerge from our research.

Our organisational structure encourages and supports self-reliance within research teams, opens up new forms of scientific access and coordinates the collaboration between in-house researchers. Within the scope of defined research programmes, it allows scholars to fully express and develop their creativity. Our aim is to ensure that the IRS has a reputation for professional quality, effectiveness, reliability and flexibility. We are well aware of our responsibility to utilise the public resources of the IRS in an appropriate and efficient way. For this reason, we manage transparent monitoring processes for the administration and all our research departments.

Unique Characteristics of the IRS

The IRS explores the spatiality of social action, looking at processes, reflexivity, and history. In particular, IRS research places emphasis upon the foundations, players, processes and consequences of spatial development, with special consideration given to the inter-personal learning and innovation processes among the stakeholders and individuals involved. With its interdisciplinary teams and long-term research foci, the IRS conducts social science-based spatial research.

The following cross-cutting issues are characteristic of the IRS:

- Path development, institutional change and spatial governance
- Dynamics of communication and spatial structures of interaction
- Innovation processes from a spatial perspective
- History as a resource of urban and regional development

Notably, the department for historical research with its scientific collections of the history of building and planning in the GDR is unique: These collections consist of a comprehensive archive of documents, plans, maps, photographs and models, all of which have been collected, rendered accessible, processed and selectively evaluated by the IRS.

Research Department 1: Dynamics of Economic Spaces

1 Department Profile

The research department “Dynamics of Economic Spaces” is interested in the complex interactions between a) economic action and learning and b) spatial and institutional structures. During the term of the two previous research programmes, the department has shaped its profile by conducting comparative research on innovation processes in selected segments of knowledge-based economies. In doing so, the department took an analytical perspective that observed dynamics of proximity and distance in the course of learning processes. A systematic comparison of innovation processes was possible due to the advanced typology of ‘Communities of Practice’ developed at the IRS.

Thus far, these issues have been dealt with by putting an explicit focus on processes. The new lead project “Local Anchors of Translocal Knowledge Communities: New Focal Points of Knowledge Generation and their Territoriality” aims to further consolidate and shape this research topic. This will be achieved by placing emphasis on the territorial embeddedness of these analyses. By analysing economic innovation processes, the research department is able to make a major contribution to the IRS developed research focus on “knowledge and innovation”. With increased attention paid to the territoriality of particular practices and the study of innovations in public urban and regional planning (“social innovation”), important inputs will be provided for the IRS research focus on “institutions and governance”.

During the previous research programme, the department’s profile was extended to include the issue of creativity – a shift in focus that will be further intensified throughout the research programme 2015-18. Something is described as creative if there is something “novel and valuable” (Amabile 1996) about it. For this reason, we must consider creativity as an inherent component of innovation processes. In its research, the department places special emphasis on organised creativity as well as on new forms of extremely volatile work that have been mainly developed by pioneers in the creative sector. In both cases, the question of how we deal with the fundamental uncertainties that are part of both creation processes and the marketing of creative contents is addressed. Actors who are involved in volatile labour markets tend to place particular emphasis on reducing their individual vulnerability by determining the particular adaptability measures that best suit them. The research department contributes actively to advancing the IRS research focus on “crisis and resilience” by specifying the concept of resilience in terms of “adaptation” or “adaptability”, but also by way of conducting new research on expert knowledge in the context of crisis (research which is developed in the context of the Leibniz Research Alliance “Crises in a Globalised World”).

Moreover, by applying the concept of “valuation” (Stark 2011; Hutter/Stark 2014) that has also gained prominence in creativity (Amabile 1996) and innovation research, the research department has entered the hitherto underdeveloped fields of the social

construction of values and the emergence of markets. It is planned to further consolidate this profile feature in the years to come.

An examination of these issues from a spatial perspective presupposes advancement, particularly with regard to two conceptualizations of space. First, the concept of “action spaces” is constitutive to the department and its research work. Analyses of knowledge practices and complex forms of governance both imply a focus on spaces created through practical action. Second, relational spaces that emerge from an interaction among various actors are also of particular interest. For example, data on changes in idea-centred knowledge networks have been gathered over the course of innovation processes. Moreover, this was accompanied by an analysis of the interrelationship between learning progresses on the one hand and the handling of proximity and distance within networks on the other hand.

2 Lead Project: Local Anchors of Translocal Knowledge Communities: New Focal Points of Knowledge Generation and their Territoriality

Project Team

Head: Prof. Dr. O. Ibert (Economic Geography)

V. Brinks (Economic Geography), C. Minninger (Business Administration and European Studies), F. C. Müller (Regional Studies), Dr. S. Schmidt (Geography and American Studies) and N.N. (PhD candidate)

Project Term: 01/2015 - 12/2018

Keywords: Creativity, Knowledge Practices, Regional Development, Vulnerability and Resilience, Locality, Translocality

2.1 Description of the Problem

New places of creative knowledge sharing (which we understand as “local anchors of translocal knowledge practices”) are at the heart of this lead project. Equal attention is paid to new actors in knowledge communities, whose active contribution to knowledge production is considered increasingly important today. Empirical examples of such places include co-working spaces, creativity labs, design thinking studios, grassroots labs, incubators and maker spaces (for an overview see Schmidt/Brinks/Brinkhoff 2014).

Local anchors are places, as defined by Tuan (1977), that are either established with the explicit intention to stimulate processes of knowledge generation or that are themselves actively involved in processes of knowledge generation. Apart from the concept of new places (which will take centre stage in the empirical analysis), we can consider more traditional forms of places of knowledge as local anchors, e.g. universities, laboratories and enterprises. Places serve as anchors in that knowledge is incorporated into the situational practices performed at these places. Locations help to anchor this knowledge within territories (cf. ‘anchoring’, Dahlström and James

2012). While the project itself puts emphasis on novel places of knowledge production, the underlying mechanisms of anchoring also apply to already better known forms of the local situatedness of knowledge.

The features that are specific to the new places of knowledge production become evident by the particular way they convey stability in a context of highly changeable and volatile knowledge dynamics (Pöher 2012; Ibert/Schmidt 2012; Brinks 2013; Schmidt/Brinks/Brinkhoff 2014). On the one hand, they are (usually) permanently institutionalised organisations with an established physical and material shell and technical infrastructure. On the other hand, their utilisation is inherently limited in time, and both social fluctuation and cultural openness are highly pronounced. These places thus work like “serendipity machines” (Olma 2012). By means of subtle processes, which we refer to as “social curating”, groups of people who represent various world views but still display a sufficient set of similarities are brought together in situations of a temporary co-location in a stimulating environment. This constellation is hoped to stimulate or launch creative processes. Owing to their stability, local anchors provide important starting points for individual strategies in dealing with the uncertainties of high volatile labour relations (Ibert/Schmidt 2012, 2014). Thus far, it has not been examined to what extent these stabilising functions also apply to creative processes, where both contributions as well as the potential recognition of individual contributions are highly uncertain.

These anchors are translocally embedded, in that knowledge communities cultivate and refine the knowledge practices attached to them. This shared practice thus connects all places where the knowledge in question is practised (Grabher/Ibert 2014). Today, working freely together in shared places has itself become a globally distributed practice – for example, there are already provisions for co-working in numerous locations scattered all over the world. Currently, global institutions such as the “fab lab association” are evolving, where the standards of co-working are negotiated (www.fablabinternational.org/de).

Wherever one of these local anchors is physically located, the place becomes part of the interplay between existing institutional spaces (e.g. classic territories such as municipalities or federal states) and action spaces (e.g. clusters or regions). For both, local anchors serve as focal points, i.e. they are relevant and highly contentious with regard to their impact. First, their locations entail interdependencies with existing institutional and action spaces. While local anchors therefore represent factors of regional development, both the direction and intensity of their impact have hardly been explored so far. Second, due to their translocal character, local anchors have regular exchanges with other territories and action spaces. In this context, it remains mostly unclear who benefits, and to what extent. Interdependencies and exchange relationships can either promote or impede development objectives for a territory.

One key innovation of the lead project is that our findings and their consequences will be conveyed to the actors whose thoughts and actions are territorially relevant. We consider this a conceptually ambitious task that needs to be further substantiated through empirical research. For this reason, we pursue both theoretical-conceptual questions and pose empirical questions to a novel, highly topical subject that is afflicted with uncertainties for practitioners involved in the field of regional development.

The idea of local anchors poses a challenge for existing relational concepts of space, which thus far have paid only little attention to the category of “place”. In contrast to the abstract concept of space that points to a relational order among elements, the idea of place emphasises the qualitative differences between spatial segments, i.e. those factors that make one spatial segment different from all others (Tuan 1977). Locally situated knowledge practices reflect these qualities of places and are inextricably interlinked with them (Ibert 2007). On the one hand, places are hence located parallel to the spatial dimensions explored at the IRS. On the other hand, they intersect with them in that it is also possible to describe the singularity of a place in terms of the specific and historical ways that institutional rules, social relations and cultural identities overlap and thus become manifest in a particular spatial segment. Topological spatial theories (Amin/Cohendet 2004) provide one promising alternative to integrate the conceptual pair space and place into a relational geography.

The following constellation of actors forms a group around these new local anchors:

- The sponsors for the creative processes on-site are primarily interested in stimulating new ideas, but also in the added value that could be achieved by using these ideas one day. From their perspective, local anchors are temporary episodes and locally situated stations embedded within overarching innovation processes (Ibert/Müller/Stein 2014; Schmidt/ Brinks/Brinkhoff 2014). While some sponsors may reside in the territory concerned, many of them have their headquarters somewhere outside the territory.
- In the light of variegated and fundamental uncertainties in processes of implementing novel ideas, local anchors provide something like material and institutional consistency for many knowledge workers (e.g. freelance designers or programmers). They are attractive in that they help develop ideas and promote careers. These knowledge workers occupy strategically relevant positions both within and between knowledge communities. For that reason, they do not merely participate in the sharing of knowledge (cf. Belk 2010), but are also able to make an active contribution to the advancement of collectively shared knowledge and the corresponding procedural rules. These actors may, but do not necessarily have to, hold leading positions in classic institutions of knowledge economies, such as universities, high tech companies or cultural enterprises.
- In the first place, representatives of territorial entities consider their action space as a potential location for local anchors. In this connection, they can hope for an emergence of regional competence centres where translocally shared knowledge will sediment locally – be it within the local anchor itself or in the form of newly established regional enterprises (“spin-offs”). Local anchors can help keep regions connected to translocally-shared knowledge (Crévoisier/Jeannerat 2009). The opportunities entailed by the sedimentation of knowledge are, however, also contrasted by the dangers connected to an exploitation of a regional creative potential.
- Primarily, the operators of local anchors have a fundamental interest in creating collective, encouraging framework conditions and striving to facilitate creative working processes. The role of operators, however, frequently collides with one of the abovementioned perspectives. Other interests may therefore influence the way local actors operate.

2.2 Questions

The abovementioned challenges suggest both theoretical and empirical approaches to deal with the lead project's main questions. These approaches address a) spatial concepts against the background of global interaction in locally embedded places, b) the interaction among new places of knowledge work and the territories where they are located and c) the functions of these places with regard to knowledge workers and their individual resilience strategies.

1. Spatial Concepts between the Poles of Local and Global Contexts of Action

- What is the relationship between conceptions of a “topological” understanding of space, as suggested by locally situated knowledge practices on the one hand, and conceptualisations that are developed from a decidedly territorial perspective on the other hand – as is the case in the discourse on regional development (policies)?
- Do any mediating concepts exist, or is it possible to come up with such concepts?

2. Interactions between Local Anchors and Territories

- What types of local anchors can be identified (according to the following dimensions: operator model, physical design, institutional arrangements and work contents)?
- How does each of these types deal with the tension between locally situated/translocally networked?
- What are the interdependencies between local anchors and the territories where they are located?
- What kind of opportunities and limitations are there when it comes to positioning the territory with the aid of local anchors?

3. The Role of Local Anchors as Established Places of Resilience for Knowledge Workers

- How do key actors from knowledge communities deal with the fundamental insecurities connected to openly shared knowledge?
- To what extent do they consider themselves vulnerable, and what kinds of resilience strategies do they apply?
- What role do local anchors play for individual resilience practices?

2.3 Theoretical Approach

In the context of the lead project, knowledge is understood as the capacity for social action (Stehr 2001). We consider knowledge as an inseparable part of practices. Consequently, it is impossible to get an understanding of knowledge without reference to the physicality of knowledge carriers, or without taking into account the social and material contexts for the exercise of knowledge. The debate on communities of practice (Lave/Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998; Brown/Duguid 2001) provides an approach that incorporates these different dimensions of knowledge integration. Building on a typology developed for the previous research programme's (2012-2014) lead project “Sources and Paths of Innovation”, our current lead project puts particular emphasis on exploring epistemic and creative communities, as well as communities of interest (Müller/Ibert 2014).

One distinctive feature of knowledge communities is that their members freely share knowledge and experiences. Each member contributes to the collective knowledge repertoire and, at the same, benefits from it. In an ideal-typical case, however, this happens without any expectation of reciprocity (Belk 2010). To a certain extent, community members consider the advancement of collective knowledge as an end in itself and, therefore, the motivation to participate is mainly intrinsic. In economic contexts, free knowledge sharing does not only engender opportunities, but also fundamental uncertainties as to who will benefit from this collective knowledge and in what ways. To conceive the individual handling of these uncertainties, we draw on the concepts of vulnerability and resilience (Christmann/Ibert 2012; Ibert/Schmidt 2012, 2014).

The “community of practice”-debate implicitly is grounded in a topological concept of space (Amin/Cohendet 2004). The concept of space is of interest here in that material and social contexts of knowledge practice take shape in the form of local constellations, as they themselves are unequally distributed in space. The main focus is on locality, its qualitative characteristics, the similarities or dissimilarities of particular local preconditions for exercising knowledge practices and translocality (“sharing practice without sharing context”, Grabner/Ibert 2014). In this way of thinking, space is a precondition for the fact that various local practices may become increasingly differentiated and coexist at the same time (Massey 2005).

2.4 Methodology

Questions are empirically dealt with in the context of three comparative territorial case studies. To this end, qualitative interviews with, and visual data gained from, various groups of actors are evaluated across all regions examined. In doing so, priorities differ according to the following three empirical questions:

- **Qualitative interviews with operators, sponsors and users of local anchors:** The interviews will collect information on usage regulations, business models and work content. On this basis, it is planned that a typology will be developed.
- **Qualitative interviews with users of the new places of creative collaboration:** Interviews with users will help to provide information about uncertainties related to labour situations, in particular with regard to jointly developed ideas, their future use and the individual strategies used to come to terms with these challenges.
- **Qualitative interviews with operators as well as stakeholders involved in regional development or territorial economic development:** These interviews will provide information related to the interdependencies and tensions between local/translocal knowledge practices and territorial development.
- **Gathering of visual data:** For the first time in its history, the research department is working with visual data. To this end, it is planned that all interviewees will be encouraged to participate in a documentation project and to take photographs related to key concepts of this field. The aim is to also include their selection of motifs in the analysis.

A preliminary selection of research spaces now includes the urban regions of Berlin, Stockholm and Detroit. All of these regions are characterised by the fact that they have recently become stages for a range of newly – and quite successfully – established local anchors of transnational knowledge practices. At the same time, however, these urban regions differ considerably as to their socio-economic framework conditions. Stockholm, for instance, is a prosperous big city where new places of creative collaboration have emerged alongside established knowledge economy sectors and are in strong competition with other forms of land use. In harsh contrast to Stockholm, these new places appear as something like a last hope for a former industrial city like Detroit, which has been strongly affected by structural change and is now desperately looking for new ways to regain prosperity. On the scale between prosperous and structurally weak, between utilization pressure and unused urban “in-between” spaces, Berlin occupies an intermediate position. Due to its good accessibility, Berlin is a natural choice to explore the field and its basic dimensions. In Stockholm and Detroit, these studies will then be further deepened and extended by focusing on the specifics connected to the respective characteristic features of these research spaces. Towards the end of the research process, it is planned that practitioners will attend a gathering in Berlin so they can jointly reflect on the insights drawn from the international research spaces. The lead project research programme, therefore, sees itself as an integral part of interregional learning processes.

In all three research spaces, we will collect and evaluate data on the three empirical questions outlined above. In doing so, we are interested in both the systematic differences between these regions, as well as in comparable superordinate patterns. In particular, we expect to identify the following systematic differences:

- Interdependencies between local anchors and territories: In the case of Stockholm, we expect established local enterprises and publicly financed research institutions to try to control the creative processes in local anchors. While this may (to a certain extent) guarantee that creativity will benefit the regional creation of value, this also entails that the extent of creativity will be channelled in a more pronounced manner. In the case of Detroit, there is a greater risk that external, well-established actors will be quick to absorb novel ideas. At the same time, we can expect a greater variety of local follow-up activities, whereas their consolidation is likely to be of a more precarious nature.
- Dealing with uncertainties: While in Stockholm mechanisms of the Swedish welfare state function rather well, we expect the more liberal reluctance to take welfare state measures to be more influential in the case of Detroit. For Stockholm, we therefore assume that pronounced uncertainties will mainly arise from “institutional misfits” (Ibert/Schmidt 2012), while we expect to observe highly individualistic resilience strategies in the case of Detroit.

Research Department 2: Institutional Change and Regional Public Goods

1 Department Profile

This research department studies collective goods with regard to institutional arrangements and forms of governance. These analyses occur within a context characterised by the interplay of centralised decision-making in a multilevel state system on the one hand and a decentralised political action on the other hand. Notably, the provision, utilisation and governance of so-called public goods all require a specific set of rules beyond pure market mechanisms. In the context of the present worldwide renaissance of research on public goods, IRS research interests are particularly directed at three superordinate dimensions hitherto neglected by academic literature: The spatial dimensions of public goods, the interdependencies of various kinds of (public) goods and the social construction of these goods.

First, the geographies of public goods are multifaceted and cannot, therefore, be reduced to their physical or political-administrative essence (Moss 2012). Instead, they are influenced by particular socio-economic, historic, symbolic and cultural contexts. For instance, this becomes evident in cases where spatial identities strongly influence collective action in connection to energy landscapes. Second, public goods rarely occur in isolation. Most notably, the interdependence between private and public goods is of key relevance to spatial development (Davy, in press). For instance, power lines are club goods distributing electricity gained from a conversion of energy sources, which in turn display features of genuine public goods (e.g. sunlight, wind), private goods (e.g. coal, mineral oil, biomass) or common pool resources (e.g. water) (Gailing et al. 2013). Hybrid couplings of different types of goods and their transformation pose a particular challenge for the regulation of the energy industry. Third, it is necessary to adopt a dual perspective on socially constructed and socially constructing public goods. On the one hand, public goods are defined by social interpretations, preferences and power constellations: On the other hand, however, the physical and spatial characteristics of public goods actively influence the ways in which these public goods will be utilised and controlled. With its overall research agenda, the IRS adopts a differentiated approach towards public goods and the corresponding institutional arrangements and forms of governance that goes beyond the oversimplifying categorisations suggested by the neoclassical theory of public goods.

In regards to its empirical, as well as its theoretical and conceptual work, the department has continuously extended and refined its research on public goods and corresponding spatial dimensions since 2003. Ever since the research programme 2012-2014 was launched, the department expanded its research focus on water infrastructures and cultural landscape by including energy issues. This gave rise to a number of questions: To what extent, and with what benefit, can we define certain energy sources, energy infrastructures and energy landscapes as public goods (Moss et al. 2013)? How are we to examine their spatial dimensions on the basis of various debates led by spatial researchers (ibid.)? And, how is the German energy transition being designed in spatial terms between the two poles of centralisation and decentralisation (Gailing et al. 2013)? With its new lead project, the department has made a decision to sharpen its profile in spatial energy research by putting an emphasis on

exploring the emergence of new energy spaces. From a conceptual point of view, the department continues to explore new strands of institutional research, e.g. on discursive institutionalism (Schmidt 2008), and, thus, contributes to its advancement (especially from a spatial science perspective). Since 2012, however, the main focus of research has been on exploring three “blind spots” of institutional and governance research on public goods, which are labelled “power”, “materiality”, and “people”. The description of the lead project below will further exemplify how, and with what intention, the department aims to interrelate these three perspectives with the “energy” policy field.

With its social scientific research on the emergence, constitution and impact of new energy spaces, the research department makes a contribution to the IRS’s unique profile by illustrating the spatiality of social action through the example of the energy transition. It explores the emergence of new fields of action (e.g. bioenergy regions) and their relationships to established, fossil-fuel-based energy regions on the one hand, and to governmental institutional spaces on the other hand. In this manner, the research department aims to gain insights into the interdependencies among these spatial dimensions. In conceptual terms, the departmental research is situated in the field of tension between action theories and constructivism. For instance, it has made contributions to the conceptual pairing of “governance and institutional change” as well as “crisis and resilience”. For one thing, the project helps to broaden the perspective of governance and institutional research by adding the aspects of power and (socio-) materiality. For another thing, it addresses the issue of ecological crisis and explores the reactions by politicians and civil society actors in the course of the energy transition.

2 Lead Project: New Spaces of the Energy Transition between Power, Materiality and People

Project Team

Head: Dr. T. Moss (content project lead; European Studies/History), A. Röhring (organisational project management; Economics)

A. Bues (Political Science), Dr. L. Gailing (Planning Science),
Prof. Dr. K. Kern (Political Science), N.N. (PhD candidate)

Project Term: 01/2015 bis 12/2018

Keywords: Energy Transition, Energy Spaces, Power Relations, Socio-Materiality, Key Figures

2.1 Description of the Problem

The German energy transition has brought about changes in regards to spatial structures and the ways they are utilised. As emphasised by the German Advisory Council on Global Change (WBGU 2011), the spatial organisation of so-called “energy transitions” initiated by policy-makers, administrations, economic players and civil society actors poses a major challenge to be addressed by societies as a whole, not only in Germany but also in many other states around the globe. With regard to the energy transition, the lead project of the IRS Research Department 2 directs the focus to aspects of new energy spaces, which appears particularly promising from both a political and research point of view. The concept of new energy spaces does not only refer to the changing physical, spatial references connected to more decentralised power generation systems and the corresponding distribution network structures. Instead, it also points to the constitution of new scopes of action for energy policies (e.g. bioenergy regions), the formation and development of new energy landscapes and, moreover, the shifting relations between energy policies and energy industries. Thus far, however, there exists only insufficient and fragmentary scientific evidence on these new energy spaces and the key corresponding questions: What are their key defining features? How exactly do they emerge and how are they organised? What kinds of interests do they convey, and how exactly do they work (Bouzarovski 2009; Beckmann et al. 2013; Gailing/Leibenath 2013)? In particular, it appears promising as a complement to the research on new energy spaces and their potential to promote the energy transition with a critical look at the associated ambivalences, conflicts of interest and power struggles in this policy field.

The lead project explores new energy spaces as both manifestations and vehicles of the energy transition from the starting point of three theory-based perspectives: power, materiality and people. In doing so, it draws on the results gained from the lead project 2012-2014 and the cross-departmental project “Key Figures as Driving Forces of Spatial Development” (2013), which provided insights about theoretical conceptualisations of power and domination, socio-spatial materialities and key actors (perspective “people”) and their suitability for analysing the energy transition from a spatial sciences perspectives. Over the course of the new lead project, this knowledge will then be operationalised for complementary empirical studies on new energy space in Germany and, moreover, in one North American and one Scandinavian example. This research will be based upon a specific analytical framework that needs to be developed first. The “power”-perspective points to the epistemological interest in governmentality and de- or re-politicisation as phenomena that point to changing power relations between politicians, economic players and civil society actors and the roles they play in the emergence of new energy spaces. In terms of “materiality”, the department’s researchers are interested in the socio-material configurations of energy spaces, e.g. the complex interplay of electricity grids, areas suitable as sites for wind farms (“Windeignungsgebiete”), investors, landscape images, regional plans for designing a wind farm, etc. – and their implications for the spatial governance of the energy transition. Finally, the “people” perspective points to the roles of key actors in new energy spaces as “policy entrepreneurs” or “change agents”. For example, leading local politicians may initiate transnational learning processes or regional energy managers may open up new development potentialities and courses of action related to renewable energies.

2.2 Questions

Against this background and epistemological interest, the lead project is interested in the three main perspectives mentioned above (power, materiality and people), all of which relate to the emergence and constitution of new energy spaces and are part of the transformations of the energy system.

1. Power Relations and Power Constellations

- In what ways do new energy spaces generally give rise to shifting power relations and constellations?
- How do new conflicts about wind energy alter the power relations within local and regional constellations of stakeholders – and what role do processes of de- and re-politicisation play here (Analysis Module 1)?
- How does the competition between old and new energy spaces affect and alter power constellations and what kind of governmentalities become manifest (Analysis Module 2)?

2. Socio-Material Configurations

- With what kinds of socio-spatial materialities are new energy spaces generally shaped, and how?
- What kinds of changes in the socio-material “assemblages” of urban neighbourhoods can we detect as a result of energy related restoration (Analysis Module 3)?

3. Key Actors, Path Creations

- What role do key actors generally play in the reconfiguration of energy spaces?
- How do “policy entrepreneurs” help create and consolidate new development paths on a regional level as part of the construction of new energy spaces (Analysis Module 4)?
- What role do local “change agents” play in disturbing the spatial structures of traditional energy systems with the aid of energy policy-related experimental spaces (Analysis Module 5)?

Eventually, a concluding reflection module will examine the question of what contribution the gained insights can make to further develop research on the institutions and governance of public goods. Moreover, it will reflect on the perspective of research on public goods and its usefulness for advancing the analyses of energy systems in transition.

2.3 Theoretical Approach

The project builds on the in-depth analysis of theoretical approaches of “power” and “materiality” in the context of the lead project 2012-2014. With regard to the “people” perspective, it also draws on the preliminary work conducted as part of the cross-departmental project “Key Figures as Driving Forces of Spatial Development”. To answer the research questions mentioned above, appropriate individual approaches were selected from the cross-departmental project literature.

On Power: Within the broad spectrum of research on power theories, we apply two theoretical approaches that basically depart from a Foucauldian understanding (2000), according to which power is neither possessed nor exerted by a social entity. Instead, it finds its expression in contingent power relations embedded in social fields. The concept of governmentality is focused on exploring the interconnection of techniques of governing and self-governance (Foucault 2000; Lemke 2008). This approach to power is applied in the Analysis Module 2 to examine the governance and self-control of actors in the course of the energy transition in selected energy spaces (both old and new). The concept of de- and re-politicisation will then be used as a second theoretical approach to examine power relations (Hay 2007; Flinders/Buller 2014). In doing so, we will make a distinction between state de-politicisation, as a decrease of governmental decision making power to the benefit of other decision makers; societal de-politicisation, as a decline of the public field of action to the benefit of the private sector; and discursive de-politicisation, as a social construction of needs for action without any alternative. Analysis Module 1 employs this approach to shed light on processes of de-politicisation in the context of the expansion of wind farms, as well as on processes of re-politicisation resulting from protests against wind farms, and ultimately tries to gain an understanding of the local energy policies emerging from these developments and conflicts.

On Materiality: The energy transition will be analysed with regard to its socio-materiality. This will be achieved with the aid of a selection of theoretical approaches, which will then be coupled in order to gain an understanding of the interrelation between social and material aspects. First, the analysis will be based upon Assemblages Research: This ANT-based approach departs from a “radical relationality” of heterogeneous elements in socio-technical configurations and, moreover, also ascribes a creative potential to non-human actors (e.g. solar collectors) (Latour 2005; McFarlane 2011). It will be applied in Analysis Module 3. Second, one dissertation project will employ the neo-Marxist “urban political ecology” approach (Heynen et al. 2006) to analyse the socio-materiality of urban energy supply from critical and justice perspectives. Third, Analysis Module 2 will refer to the discourse on theoretical approaches of socio-materiality. In particular, there will be a focus on more recent studies on dispositives, which according to Foucault can be referred to as heterogeneous entities with strategic functions and established power structures (Agamben 2008).

On People: Analysis Modules 4 and 5 both apply approaches that seek to explore key actors as main representatives and catalysts of governance structures. In doing so, they put particular emphasis on the role of “policy entrepreneurs” and “change agents” in the context of path creation-processes within new energy spaces (Rogers 2003). According to Kingdon (2011), “policy entrepreneurs” play an important role in policy processes in that they know how to identify and seize “policy windows”. Moreover, they have the capacity to connect politics and policies. They can thus connect new views on problems with a novel proposal for a solution, which can then be integrated into the policy process with the aid of new coalitions. In processes of path creation (Garud et al. 2010), this theoretical notion of individuals as key actors appears productive for the constitution of energy spaces as well as the perspective on agents of change who open up new scopes of action by abandoning certain paths. This is interesting for the lead project for the following reason: While the energy system is by and large influenced by material and institutional path dependencies, the ubiquity of renewable energies on a regional level also creates scope for new path creation brought about by regional actors.

2.4 Methodology

Following the strongly theoretical and conceptual alignment of the previous lead project on the energy transition, the research programme 2015-2018 puts an emphasis on empirical comparative case studies. More precisely, it foresees that five analysis modules on new energy spaces will be conducted. Each analysis module employs a theoretical approach that is distinct from the previous lead project, to explore the spatial character of its empirical research object. In doing so, special emphasis is placed on power relations, socio-materiality and/or key actors. Apart from facilitating suitable linkages of theoretical approaches and empirical cases, the case selection allows for exploring a wide range of new energy spaces: Examples include the emergence of new spaces of action around renewable energies, tensions between old and new energy regions and urban spaces used as laboratories for energy policies. The areas examined are mainly located in Germany, which are complemented by the select extension of international cases. For all analysis modules, the data collection will be case-specific and conducted mostly on the basis of qualitative methods. The selection of collection methods is guided by the theoretical basis and epistemological interest of each Analysis Module.

- With the aid of document analyses, we will collect qualitative data on the structures and institutions of energy industries, energy-related policy goals, discourses and process sequences.
- Semi-standardised, narrative interviews will provide a better understanding of the relevant players and their attitudes towards case-specific issues, challenges and subjectivizations.
- These methods will be complemented by a participant observation of meetings held by relevant players, as well as by conducting focus group discussions (to gain a more precise understanding of both differing interests and coalitions of interest).
- Finally, secondary analyses will use quantitative data, e.g. on the amounts of energy, material flows, land use requirements and costs.

Data analysis and interpretation will occur in light of the respectively selected theoretical approaches. While Analysis Modules 4 and 5 place an emphasis on the role of key actors and, notably, their impact and innovativeness, Modules 1 and 2 focus on gaining new insights into power relations as well as shifts of power in conflict-ridden negotiation processes on new energy spaces. Analysis Module 3 examines the complex networks of socio-material configurations on a rather small spatial scale.

In particular, Analysis Module 1 “Power Constellations in Contested Spaces of Wind Energy Planning” (A. Bues), utilises the concepts of de- and re-politicisation to explain tensions between formal institutional spaces and informal spaces of action. This is achieved via a comparative case study that contrasts the state of Brandenburg (Germany) with the Canadian province of Ontario. Analysis Module 2 “Spatial Governmentalities of Competing Energy Dispositives” (L. Gailing), analyses the field of tension between old and new energy spaces from a perspective of spatially specific techniques of governance and subjectivization. This is achieved on the basis of case studies which are conducted in a region with a traditional, fossil-fuel-based generation of electricity, on the one hand, and a big city with information technology-based solution approaches and innovative participation models, on the other hand. Analysis

Module 3, “The Socio-Materiality of the Energy Transition in Urban Neighbourhoods” (N.N.), explores two cases of energy-related restorations of residential areas located in the Berlin-Brandenburg region as processes of “disassembling” and “reassembling” socio-material configurations. Departing from the evaluation of project reports and results gained from accompanying research, Analysis Module 4 “Key Actors and Path Creations for Stabilising New Energy Spaces” (A. Röhring), selects bioenergy regions and 100ee Regions as new energy spaces, and compares these regions in terms of what role key actors play for path creation. Finally, Analysis Module 5, “Local Experiments and the Role of Key Actors of Urban Energy Transitions” (K. Kern), examines experimental spaces of the energy transition. In doing so, it focuses on the Copenhagen-Malmö metropolitan area as a pioneer region, with a particular analytical emphasis on transnational learning processes.

These Analysis Modules are framed by three further modules, all of which have a cross-sectional character. In conceptual terms, as well as in terms of spatial theory, one theoretical module is consistently underpinned by the guiding concept of “new energy spaces” (in charge: T. Moss). As part of an in-depth module, intra-institutional cooperation is mainly cultivated on the subject area of key figures. This is mainly to enrich Analysis Modules 4 and 5 in conceptual terms and, moreover, to feed insights from their empirical application in the energy policy-field back into the cross-departmental project (in charge: A. Röhring). The extension module is directed to complementary forms of cooperation with external research partners (in charge: T. Moss): This includes activities within the Leibniz Research Alliance “Energy Transition”, the International Network on Urban Low Carbon Transitions, the Integrated Research Institute THESys¹ (which is part of the Humboldt-Universität of Berlin’s involvement in the German excellence initiative) and two ARL working groups on planning theories and, moreover, spatial policies and the energy transition.

1 Transformation of Human-Environment Systems

Research Department 3: Dynamics of Communication, Knowledge and Spatial Development

1 Department Profile

In conceptual terms, the Research Department “Dynamics of Communication, Knowledge and Space” explores spatial transformation processes and in terms of theory is committed to social constructivism. Accordingly, it conceives these transformations as spatial (re)constructions (Christmann 2013), i.e. man-made spatial attributions of meaning, conduct and material structurations, all of which are now themselves modified by humans. The Research Department strives to understand how, and under what conditions – e.g., under conditions perceived as a crisis – these (sometimes innovative) changes emerge and are enforced. One issue of major importance for the department’s research profile relates to the question of how spatial (re)constructions occur in communications and, moreover, to what extent specific forms of communication may influence the emergence and practical implementation of modified spatial constructions. Apart from linguistics, the concepts of communication and communicative action also inherently comprise symbolic action, including physical designs. The department’s comprehensive conceptual work is hence based on a communicative constructivism perspective (cf. Knoblauch 2013, Keller 2013, Christmann 2013) that aims to link its communication-oriented perspective to other theoretical approaches on a case-to-case basis. To name concrete fields of application for the research, concepts of participatory governance and deliberative procedures may be used to discover the ways civil society actors contribute to discussions and become involved – and how their spatial visions guide them to participate in shaping and designing “their” space. Other examples include the adoption of approaches on innovation to find out how players come up with innovations, or the use of actor-network theories to analyse the ways in which, in times of climate change, cities and regions come to terms with: a) the fact that physical-material actants make their presence felt in the form of heat waves, b) the fact that these actants can interfere with socio-spatial processes and c) the ways the players address or include these actants when it comes to developing measures of spatial adaptation or resilience.

Typically, measures of spatial (re)construction bring together actors from various societal fields, with quite differing spatial attributions of meaning and behaviours. For this reason, we are particularly interested in (conflictual) communicative negotiation processes as part of heterogeneous constellations of actors, in a context of both direct and indirect medial communications. This also includes an analysis of public discourses – especially since discourse analyses not only enable us to better understand the emergence of altered or novel attributions of meaning, but also help us to understand the ways they can be translated into concrete action with the aid of devices and, as a result, gain relevance in socio-spatial terms. In this context, specific attention is paid to complex social relational structures (including social networks), with a particular focus on the tension between bottom-up and top-down actors and their differing endowments of power and resources. A focus of the analyses of social relational structures is also placed on key figures in order to understand how they contribute to the establishment of prerogatives of interpretation and boost certain

processes of action, and also how others perceive key actors and their activities. As a consequence, our research work does not remain confined to micro-analyses of communication in complex social relational networks; it is embedded in a context of macrostructures where power-related cultural, socio-economic and physical-material contextual conditions play a decisive role. Above all, our analyses take into account the historically contingent framework conditions and the cultural knowledge systems within which spatial (re)constructions occur.

Spatial development processes in cities and regions are the department's concrete fields of research. As already mentioned, particular emphasis is put on two different topic areas: Spaces facing socio-structural problems and spaces affected by climate change. In both cases, actors are confronted with tremendous challenges and are, therefore, requested to come up with (novel) approaches to solving these problems. In other terms, these issues are of a high social relevance. In previous research programmes, analyses of spaces facing socio-structural problems mainly focused on cities, and especially "big-city districts with special development needs" (cf. Christmann 2013). While not altogether disregarding urban spaces, municipalities in structurally weak rural areas will now gain centre stage in the present research programme. Just like for previous analyses, stakeholders like "spatial pioneers" (who conquer spaces with a negative image to create something new) will play an important role in the forthcoming research. The same applies to "social entrepreneurs", who employ entrepreneurial means in a purposeful way to boost social innovations and, in doing so, help to promote spatial development processes. Moreover, actors from other social fields who decide to address the challenges of spatial development in a creative way are relevant for our research too. Thus far, spaces in times of climate change have been mainly analysed with respect to the question of how urban societies construct the global issue of climate change at the local level. In this context, research works have often been particularly interested in concrete perceptions of vulnerability, as well as processes resilience (Christmann et al. 2014a). Within the context of climate change, future research will also take into account the regionally differing cultures in regards to perceptions of nature. Above all, however, the research will focus on the increasing crises of climate change, not least in the form of recurring and severe extreme weather events. What kind of consequences do these events have, how do societies try to come to terms with them and what modes of governance are applied to this end?

As already indicated, our research does not only aim to provide basic research contributions to both theory formation and empirical research. Instead, we also intend to address questions of high social relevance. We explore both the preconditions and consequences of coordinated action within heterogeneous constellations of actors to answer questions about the foundations for successful processes of spatial governance in contexts of action that are construed as challenging and, partly, crisis-prone. More concretely, the department's research works can offer insights into some fields of application (such as socially innovative action and the formation of resilience strategies) that can prove relevant for social actors involved in spatial development. In particular, our analyses aim to identify development potentialities of structurally weak rural areas and provide knowledge on how social actors may support corresponding processes in useful ways.

In a nutshell, the lead project's contribution to the unique characteristic of the IRS consists in exploring the *processual* dimensions of socio-spatial action. To this end, it

purposefully draws on various theories (both constructivist and action theories), concepts of innovation and knowledge and governance approaches, as well as concepts of crises and possible ways of how to deal with them. The department's research also comes up with answers to the following megatrends that are now being discussed as long-term societal trends: The challenges and opportunities connected to demographic change, framework conditions for innovative action and the relevance of social networks for social action. For the medium term, the IRS has adopted these issues as research foci.

2 Lead Project: Innovations in Rural Municipalities. Conditions, Actors and Processes of Creative Community Development

Project Team

Head: Prof. Dr. G. Christmann (Sociology)

T. Heimann (Cultural Sciences), M.A, Dr. des. A. Noack (Sociology),
Dr. R. Richter (Sociology), N.N. (Doctoral Candidate), N.N. (Doctoral Candidate)

Project Term: 01/2015 to 12/2018

Keywords: Community Development; Rural Regions; Innovations; (Regional) Contextual Conditions; Actors (esp. Key Figures); Processes of Communication, Participation, and Conflict

2.1 Description of the Problem

The subject of the project are municipalities located in structurally weak rural regions in which political, administrative, economic and/or civil society actors have set out to look for creative ways to address their problems and advance development in their communities through innovative projects. This focus gives rise to the question of what kind of (regional) contextual conditions favour such creative processes and innovations. Who are the actors (and especially: key figures) involved in this? And, in what kind of social processes do these innovations in rural development tend to become manifest?

The project aims to address two research goals: First, it intends to contribute to innovation research. Today, there is still a demand for empirical research on stakeholders, framework conditions, processes and the trajectories of innovations (particularly so with regard to municipalities located in structurally weak rural areas) – especially in view of the fact that these issues have hardly been associated with innovations so far (cf. Beetz 2004, Ehalt 2000, Henkel 2004). Second, with their emphasis on exploring rural development, the researchers involved in the project have made a fundamental decision to focus on the task of studying rural areas. Compared to cities, rural areas have remained largely underexplored in Western Europe so far, especially when it comes to looking at transformation processes in general, and innovations in particular.

This project hence addresses an issue of high social relevance. In structurally weak rural regions severely affected by demographic change, social actors with regional development objectives are faced with enormous challenges. This is especially true because these regions are typically caught in a downward spiral, with structural deficiencies such as below-average economic productivity, poor career perspectives, insufficient supply of technical and social infrastructures and services and a lack of social and associative life, together result in an outflow of citizens. In turn, this increasing lack of potential workforce will contribute to a further deterioration of economic opportunities (cf. Weber 2006, Beetz 2007, Manthorpe/Livsey 2009). For both local actors and policy makers, this raises a practical question: Under what conditions, and in what ways, is it possible to call a halt to (or even reverse) such downward spirals in order to help structurally weak rural regions find a way out of the crisis? Some actors seem to be aware of the fact that innovative approaches are required to break away from established routines and dare to try something new (cf. Faber/Oswalt 2013, Mayer/Baumgartner 2014, Christmann 2012, 2014b). At the same time, structurally weak rural regions usually have a reputation for being somewhat resistant to innovation (cf. Coronado et al. 2008, Rodríguez-Pose 1999).²

In some places, we can nevertheless witness projects whose leaders experiment with new ideas and practices in a creative way. They either refer to their approach as innovative themselves, or third parties label them as such. The lead project aims to explore such innovative projects. Notably, the attribution of the label “innovative” will not be done by the researchers, but will instead be made by the societal actors themselves. From our side, we understand and observe these ascriptions and the connected forms of action as constructions of the first order, contrived by everyday actors. In addition, however, the stakeholders’ projects must contain factors that indicate a rejection of previous routines.

2.2 Questions

The key research questions can be subdivided into two problem areas. A first bloc aims at exploring the contextual conditions of municipalities and the particular constellations of actors. A second bloc analyses the social processes and trajectories of innovative community development projects.

1. Contextual Conditions, Constellations of Actors, Actors

- How can we describe regionally specific cultural contexts of municipalities and, closely related to this, community development projects in terms of history, as well as political, economic and social structures? Have any of these conditions served as catalysts for the innovative project?
- Who are the major players and key figures shaping the innovation process, and what makes them adopt this role? Who are the actors involved in this innovation process?
- Where do these actors come from, both in spatial (locals, newcomers) and social terms (social fields, institutional embeddedness, milieus)?
- What relevant social networks exist within and beyond the communities? What is the relationship between the other networks and the key figures of the innovation process?

² It would be wrong to say that rural regions cannot serve as a breeding ground for innovations. With the exception of agricultural innovations (cf., e.g. Gershon/Umalı 1993), history shows that rural spaces have always been used as laboratories or retreats for developing creativity. Very often, however, urban dwellers (groups or colonies of artists, creative minds or citizens with an alternative lifestyle) were the ones to withdraw to the countryside to try new things.

2. Social Processes and Trajectories

- What kind of strategies for action do the key actors pursue to implement their innovative projects? Are these efforts thwarted by any third parties?
- How do the players involved coordinate their activities? What kind of governance arrangements have they established?
- In what ways are the innovative projects being negotiated in terms of communication? What role do forms of communication play for these projects? How do communications on projects take place – and why are they referred to as “innovative”? In what way do conflicts and conflict management play a role?
- How have innovative projects emerged in each selected rural community, and how have they further developed against the background of what factors (both supportive and inhibitive)? What are the similarities and differences of the selected cases?

2.3 Theoretical Approach

As a basic point of departure (and with a particular focus on rural areas), we will select those theorems that have proven instructive until today from classic community studies in the fields of social anthropology, sociology, political sciences and research on developing countries (cf. e.g. Vidich/Bensman 1958, Ilien/Jeggle 1978, Gershon/Umali 1993, Löw 2001, Ehalt 2000). Occasionally, community studies have yielded statements on structural conditions of rural communities, i.e. on power relations and social networks, as well as on economic, political and social structures and small local elites. In contrast, studies on developing countries have mainly focused on transformation processes and innovative development aid projects. In these cases, there is a need to go through the existing literature to identify relevant concepts and determine their theoretical-conceptual potential for analysing innovations in rural areas.

In cases where newcomers play an important role in the research field, it may be useful to use concepts on strangers (e.g. Schütz 1944, Elias/Scotson 2002), especially when it comes to the newcomers' ability to question local traditional patterns of knowledge or routines in order to approach things in novel ways. In this context, it is also important to find out why these special properties of strangers often also give rise to social exclusion.

Moreover, network approaches conceptually addressing factors such as knowledge, identity, participation and communication – as for instance the “Communities of Place” studies (cf. especially Lave/Wenger 1991, Wenger/McDermott/Snyder 2002, Hildreth/Kimble 2004) – are of relevance, too. They have to be linked to additional approaches that are capable of describing both the key importance of individual network actors and the emergence of new things, as is the case with Burt's approach on “structural holes” and “information brokers” (Burt 2004, 2005). The latter concept is used to describe figures that are capable of building bridges between previously unconnected (parts of) networks by means of conveying essential pieces of information or solutions to problems.

Two approaches, namely communicative constructivism (Knoblauch 2013) and the constructivist approach to social innovations (Rammert 2010) will help us develop the concept of innovative action and innovation. Additionally, we will also take into account concepts of innovation and conflict (especially: Neuloh 1977).

2.4 Methodology

Data collection will be based on a focused ethnographic approach, which will combine the following methods:

- Document analyses will be used as a means to reconstruct (regional) contextual conditions of communities and, where possible, documented project progress.
- Problem-centred interviews with major players (or key figures) will be held, with the objective of collecting data on several issues: Spatial and social origins, strategies for action, patterns of knowledge, ego-centred networks (cf. Noack/Schmidt 2013) and their relevance for key players and their course of action, reconstruction of the field of action (by posing questions on other actors, antagonists, governance arrangements, other networks, communication and processes of participation and conflict) and reconstruction of project progress (including assessments on beneficial and impeding factors).
- Participatory observations of selected meetings held by groups of actors or networks will be conducted, in order to analyse *actually* observable forms of direct communication, instead of merely relying on information provided by third parties. Such an approach will include investigations into styles of communication, typical communication themes and forms of knowledge, participatory processes and current forms of conflict management.
- Standardised surveys of all actors and citizens of the community will also be conducted. This will provide information for the assessment the factors of contextual conditions, actor constellations, social networks (cf. Murdoch 2000, Petermann 2002), coordination of action, communication, participation and conflict.

We will employ grounded theory methods and, in some particular cases, also knowledge-sociological hermeneutics for the analysis of the qualitative data. This will be followed by a statistical evaluation of the collected data in a standardised manner.

The case selection will occur on the basis of the following criteria: We will look for six rural communities with a similar population size. While the community development projects there will have already been put into practice, they will still be in their consolidation phase. These projects are referred to internally as “innovative” or are designated “innovative” by others (“innovation semantics”)³ and have a participation-oriented approach. For outsiders, these projects display elements that mark a break with previous behaviour or seem to combine established courses of action in new ways (“innovation pragmatism”). The communities of the sample are a part of differing regional contexts, e.g. they are situated in different states, and are faced with different funding conditions for their innovative projects. Additionally, they are different in that actors from various social contexts have initiated these projects, such as civil society spatial pioneers, social entrepreneurs with a rather entrepreneurial attitude, mayors, regional managers and ministry officials (“innovation grammars”).

³ The concepts of innovation semantics, innovation pragmatism and innovation grammars were first introduced by Rammert (2010), and are supposed to provide analytical dimensions for studying societal innovations, regardless of whether these are of a technical, economic or social manner. In accordance with “semantics” as an analytical dimension, we examine whether or not actors explicitly speak of “innovations” in connection with novel practices. Analyses on the pragmatic nature of innovations direct their attention to concrete practices and processes of innovative action, whereas studies on grammar reflect upon the external factors determining innovation processes.

Additionally, the pool of potentially relevant projects includes: Trouble-shooter-projects initiated by a Brandenburg social entrepreneur; XperRegio projects initiated by a social entrepreneur in Lower Bavaria; nationwide bioenergy village projects (initiated by either civil society actors or mayors); local action groups in the context of EU funding programmes (EAFRD in connection with Leader) and projects suggested by federal ministries of agriculture, etc.

Given the fact that communities are embedded in differing contextual conditions and are also characterised by diverging constellations of actors, the final comparative analysis of cases will mainly concentrate on comparing the social processes and development of projects for similarities and differences.

Research Department 4: Regeneration of Cities and Towns

Preliminary Remark: This draft is subject to modifications by the new head of department, who still remains to be selected.

1 Department Profile

The Research Department “Regeneration of Cities and Towns” deals with development dynamics and approaches to action in cities facing structural change. In most cases, these cities are affected by demographic shrinkage, socio-economic structural weaknesses and profound shifts in the alignment of urban development measures. De-industrialisation often entails strong decreases in both employment and population and, more indirectly, municipal financial weakness. What follows is that this may lead to a decoupling of these cities from broader national or international development dynamics. The two previous research programmes studied such urban downward developments as socio-spatial processes of peripheralisation (Bernt/Liebmann 2013, Kühn/Weck 2012, Kühn 2014).

The research programme 2015-2018 will explore approaches of planning policies directed at urban development measures, as well as the economic and social regeneration of urban neighbourhoods, cities and urban regions. “Regeneration” is defined as a successful renewal process in a context of structural change, which includes structural and physical dimensions, as well as demographic and socio-economic. Apart from urban renewal, new immigration processes and economic investments have shown to be key factors for urban regeneration. In international research, the revitalization of previously shrinking cities has become a highly topical issue. Scholars have tried to grasp this phenomenon by employing various concepts, including: “re-urbanisation”, “urban renaissance”, “urban resurgence”, or “phoenix cities”. The focus of the department’s political and planning approaches is on dealing with the complex problems associated with structural change. In this context, the department’s researchers adopt a multi-level perspective to analyse the interlocking of actor constellations within and between spatial levels, with particular emphasis placed on the interrelationship between cities and public policies.

Additionally, questions related to urban development policies in the context of urban renewal also play a major role for the department’s work. Thanks to the “Federal Transfer Office on Urban Redevelopment in the New Federal States” (“Bundestransferstelle Stadtumbau Ost”), which was founded on behalf of the federal government more than ten years ago, it has been possible to successfully establish a specific competence centre for knowledge transfer and knowledge-based policy counselling. Owing to the close linkage between basic and application-oriented research, the department is especially committed to the Leibniz Association’s motto “theoria cum praxi”.

Action-oriented approaches towards planning policies and urban governance provide the theoretical and conceptual foundation for the department’s research. The planning policy approach (Albrechts 2003; Haus/Heinelt 2004) understands spatial planning as a political process and thus places particular emphasis on the relationship

between urban policy and administration. The urban governance approach (DiGaetano/Strom 2003) examines networks operating at the interface between: a) public and private actors and b) different state levels involved in urban policies. As a means to analyse power relations in governance processes, the department also uses theoretical approaches such as “community power” (Lukes 2005; Mossberger/Stoker 2001) and “multilevel governance” (Peters/Pierre 2001). The research department makes a contribution to the IRS’s unique characteristic in that it explores both the spatial and processual character of social action through the example of urban regeneration policies. In regards to the spatial dimension of the research, which is so crucial for the IRS, this department mainly focuses on spaces of *action*. More precisely, it studies the actions of actors involved in politics and planning in the field of tension between territorial, scalar and functional spatial references. In this manner, the department intends to make a contribution to further promoting action theories of social-scientific spatial research. In doing so, we hope to gain a better understanding of urban development processes and the rise and fall of particular cities and urban districts.

Research Department 5: Department for Historical Research/Scientific Collections for the History of Building and Planning in the GDR

1 Department Profile

The Department for Historical Research explores urbanisation paths and planning cultures of the 20th century with a particular focus on contemporary history after 1945. With regard to its disciplinary orientation, the department's research is positioned at the intersection between urban history and the history of planning. As such, it intends to contribute to a better understanding of modern spatial development processes as a signature of the 20th century. For several years now, the department has moved beyond a mere focus on concepts of urban and regional planning: Instead, it also explores public administrative actions and the underlying drafts for the future, interventions by civil society actors, as well as appropriations of spaces – all of which are regarded in the context of a socio-historical concept of planning (van Laak 2008). Special attention is given to the role of architects and planners as “experts” and, moreover, to the interaction between state actors, party politicians and civil society actors. Biographical analyses – which are one of the department's main areas of interest (Engler 2014) – and studies on the wilful appropriations of urban open spaces in the East and West have both shown that post-1945 urbanisation and urban development processes can no longer be understood by referring to schematic patterns of interpretation. Instead, they were the outcome of tense and exciting negotiations that explored the specific power strategies and resistant actions of various groups of the urban population.

In its previous research programme, the department worked out a research framework for an analysis of 20th century urbanisation (Bernhardt/Engler 2014). This framework enables researchers to take a critical position towards recent debates in history and social sciences (Bernhardt 2012), for instance debates on “Planetary Urbanization” (Brenner/Schmid 2011) or “Re-urbanisation” (Brake/Herfert 2012). Moreover, the framework also proved really helpful for identifying historical variants of urbanisation, as well as for locating individual urbanisation strategies, urbanisation concepts and local or regional example cases of overarching development trends. In this context, the projects scrutinise paradigmatic historical processes of spatial development. Most recently, they explored the role of regional authorities as centres of power within the GDR's system of government and, moreover, analysed the creation and design of inner-city open spaces in the West and East. This research also exposed the decisive role of “automobility” for shifting urbanisation strategies and inner-city spatial development after 1945 – an issue tackled in more detail by the lead project outlined below.

The research programme 2015-18 is the first attempt to expand the department's internationalisation strategy to include a reconstruction of transnational knowledge circulation and an empirical analysis of inner-city open spaces and their configuration in both Eastern and Western Europe. In this manner, the department lives up to its claim to comprehend urbanisation pathways and both German planning cultures (GDR and FRG) as part of a broader international context and interpret them as two

individual cases within a multiplicity of European development paths (cf. Lenger 2013).

The department's specific contribution to the IRS unique characteristic, i.e. the exploration of the spatial, historical and processual character of social action, consists in the study of key processes of the recent European history of urbanisation, which is regarded as a key component of a "history of the present". Its analyses of knowledge circulation in national and international networks of planners, address the dynamics of change occurring in spaces of communication, which are of key relevance to the IRS. Furthermore, special attention is given to the dimensions of spaces of action, especially on the basis of an analysis of the organisation and appropriation of urban open spaces. In doing so, the department's researchers place particular emphasis on the scalar dimensions of planning and social action. The department adopts a comparative approach of social research, for example looking at government and public action and the ways they become manifest within capitalist and socialist spaces of communication that existed prior to 1989. On this basis, it explores the many different ways spaces are constructed, all of which are made evident through historical analyses. Notably, such approaches can also help us to put established categories of spatial social research to the test.

The fact that the Scientific Collections for the History of Building and Planning in the GDR are an integral part of Research Department 5 facilitates a unique interweaving of research and archive, and, hence, the department uses innovative formats to promote and display this characteristic profile at the forefront. Aside from the long-standing conference series "Workshop Talks on the History of Planning in the GDR", the research programme 2015-18 mainly exemplifies this characteristic profile with its lead project and, additionally, by preparing a scientifically sound exhibition on the recent history of German architecture. By launching an online portal, the department also intends to find its way into the "digital humanities". Activities related to the acquisition of pre-mortem and post-mortem bequests, as well, as, more generally, the collection of evidence, will be further intensified as a part of a strategy of "joint collecting".

2 Lead Project:

The "Car-Oriented City" as an Area of Conflict. Open Space Planning in Inner-City Areas as an Urbanisation Strategy in East and West Germany since 1945

Project Team

Head: PD Dr. C. Bernhardt (History)

E. Beyer (History/Slavic Studies), Dr. H. Engler (History), N.N., N.N. (Doctoral Candidate)

Project Term: 01/2015 to 12/2018

Keywords: Inner-City Development, Automobility, Open Space Planning, Networks

of Planners, Appropriation of Urban Spaces, Open Space Planning in Eastern and Western Europe

2.1 Description of the Problem

There is widespread consensus among researchers that the development of European cities after 1945 has been decisively shaped and modified by automobile traffic and its spatial demands, as well as by the patterns of mobility connected to their usage (Schmucki 2001). At the same time, however, researchers have failed to notice the strong inner contradictions inherent in this. In fact, the gradual erosion of the “car-oriented city” as the prevalent planning concept coincided with the adverse trend of increasing car traffic in cities. Revealing these and further contradictions in this problem area can be a key to reconstructing changes in the field of urban open space planning, which has had a considerable influence on the overall development of European cities over the last few decades. We can gain basic knowledge about the mid- and long-term shifts in strategies and concepts of urbanisation, as well as about conflicting claims for urban space, through the results emerging from research on planning, mobility and urban history that are scattered in several sub disciplinary fragments (Dienel 2006; v. Saldern 2006).

One of the hitherto unresolved contradictions is the fact that the “car-oriented city” as a guiding principle of planning has never really been uncontested – not even in its heyday during the 1950s. In fact, it found itself on the defensive at an earlier point in time than is usually assumed. Back then, as well as today, expansion and deconstruction projects have often occurred simultaneously, and in functional opposition, to one another. These processes may entail a loss, but also a recovery of multifunctionality in urban spaces. In some cases, this can result in a concentration of traffic volume in particular urban areas and thus may contribute to a reinforced polarisation of types of spaces and “urban spaces of contrast” (Dienel/Meier-Dallach 2004). Notably, the scalar dimensions of these processes are of particular relevance: For instance, inner-city transport hubs are places where local and supra-regional spatial functions and interactions are closely interlinked.

The project explores the ways in which the design of urban open spaces has become modified through preoccupation with automobility and explores the conflicts and contradictions occurring between the automobile and other ways of utilising public urban spaces, including short-distance public transport as a competing transport carrier. The department explores the history of planning and the appropriation of these urban spaces in the field of tension between humans and the automobile as one of the key signatures of 20th century history of urbanisation. In doing so, it directs its attention particularly towards the marked, yet previously little known diverging development paths of the “car-oriented city” and its appropriation in East and West Germany, its specific inner contradictions and its embeddedness in an international context.

The department’s understanding of the design of urban open spaces not only draws on approaches such as the history of planning or mobility. Instead, the design of urban spaces is situated in an area of tension between planning and appropriation and must therefore be understood as an arena of antagonistic interests in urban societies at large. In doing so, the priority is to better understand the simultaneous processes of a partial proliferation of automobility, on the one hand, and a long-term decline of the car-oriented city as a planning strategy and mission, on the other hand. The conflict-driving inner discrepancies and the resulting conflicts about the design of urban

open spaces are seen as a seismograph for the fundamental transformation processes affecting urban societies. The department's researchers scrutinise these processes by interlinking analyses from various disciplines (history, art history and the social sciences).

2.2 Questions

We will address three subject areas to gain a better understanding of: 1) patterns of planning, 2) forms of appropriation and 3) the variability of urban open space design in Eastern and Western Europe.

1. Planning of Urban Open Spaces under the Banner of the Car-Oriented City

- To what extent did ideas associated with the “car-oriented city” define post-1945 open space planning in the East and West? What varieties and inconsistencies can we identify in different (urban) political contexts, and what kind of historical turning points mark a gradual turning away from the “car-oriented city” as a mission statement?
- To what extent do “technocratic elites” (particularly engineers and planners) shape public discussions and planning decisions made jointly with municipal actors and stakeholders from the automotive sector?
- In what kind of overarching urbanisation strategies was the car-oriented planning of urban open spaces embedded – and what significance did they have for the history of urbanisation in the 20th century?

2. Changing Patterns of Appropriation and Communication in Urban Open Spaces

- What patterns of appropriation and communications did urban citizens employ in urban open spaces with, without or against the use of automobiles – and at what points did paradigmatic conflicts occur?
- What kind of traditional spatial elements (especially those considered historically valuable) were integrated into expansion and reduction projects – and what conclusions can we draw from this in respect to the interdependencies between the physical persistence of traffic infrastructures and the dynamics of urban cultural transitions?
- What similarities and differences can we detect with regard to the patterns of appropriation in East and West German urban open spaces – and in what kind of overarching spatial structures were they embedded (e.g. as places of state representation)?

3. Open Space Planning in the East and West in an International Context

- What differences and periodic shifts do the East and West German pathways of urban traffic and open space planning display in light of on-going developments in other Eastern and Western European countries?
- What relevance did the intra-German and the international circulation of planning concepts have for the renunciation of the car-oriented city as a mission statement, both in expert discourses and “on-site”? What different adaptations of this transfer of ideas can we detect?
- Can we discern significant differences or similarities in the patterns of the appropriation of open spaces in selected Western and Eastern European cities?

2.3 Theoretical Approach

Our research approach basically draws on three research contexts, all of which correspond with the questions outlined above: Recent approaches of socio-historical planning research (van Laak 2008; Etzemüller 2009) and network approaches – especially the French “Socio-Histoire of the Political” version (Rowell 2006, Kott/Droit 2006), are employed to explore aspects and questions related to the history of planning. Moreover, we use the “circulation and appropriation” approach (Hard/Misa 2008) to analyse the international circulation of planning concepts and their implementation in national contexts.

We use selected social science-based and historical approaches of urban and communications research, as well as visual history, to analyse questions about the appropriation of open spaces (von Saldern 2006; Havemann/Selle 2010; Paul 2012). In doing so, we mostly adopt a historical perspective on culture and everyday life. To explore the interrelationship between physical structures, the car as an artefact and cultural behavioural patterns, we also include aspects of actor-network theory approaches (Farias/Bender 2009; Färber 2014).

To analyse the parallels, contrasts and interweaving of open space planning in East and West Germany, as well as additional European cities, the project draws on transnational (urban) historical research approaches (Diefendorf/Ward 2014). Moreover, it employs path dependence theories (North 1990, Melosi 2005) to study the trajectories of planning policies in the East and West.

2.4 Methodology

The method used for the collection of data is derived from the questions and theoretical approaches outlined above. In this context, we primarily make use of the following evaluation methods, which are used by urban researchers focused on the history of planning and culture:

- Source and Document Analysis: Hermeneutic interpretations of sources and document analyses are employed as classic qualitative methods of historical research during various steps of the project (e.g. during the examination of planning documents, administrative procedures or public debates).
- Methods related to architectural history and iconography are applied as part of evaluating the collection of cases on expansion and reduction projects, and will also be part of the planned Case Study 4.
- Methods of spatial analysis of both social history and visual history will be applied as part of the investigations on the appropriation of urban spaces (Paul 2012).
- Case Study 2 will make use of state-of-the-art historical network analyses (Düring/Stark 2011) to explore transnational networks of planners and engineers.
- In accordance with the standards of oral history research, we will conduct guided expert-interviews to reconstruct the informal dimensions of historical planning processes in the GDR, as well as utilising biographies of architects and planners.

Prior to describing the selected case studies in more detail below, we will conceptualise and profile them. For Case Study 1, we will conduct a policy analysis from a historical perspective to shine a light on the institutional framework

of traffic and open space planning in both German states. Case Study 2 will investigate the formal and informal networks of planners in both German states as well as at the international level, with examples that were identified as central planning instances during the previous project (especially BDA⁴ and UIA⁵). This will be done in order to understand their function in regards to shifts in mission statements and their communication. Likewise, Case Study 3 builds on the previous project to analyse historical appropriation processes of open spaces through the example of two to four paradigmatic public places. As a first step, the analysis of expansion and reduction projects in Working Phase 1 and Case Study 4 will roughly compile a larger sample in accordance with typological criteria extracted from the history of architecture. A selection of no more than four to six examples will then be explored in more detail.

As done in Phase 3, the project team will conduct the analysis of comparative examples in Eastern and Western Europe in a study of major lines of development in the history of planning, but in equal measure, also as a study of selected cases of open space planning in four to six cities. In so doing, the researchers will combine the abovementioned methods with the methods of comparative historical studies and path analysis (Kaelble 1999, Bernhardt/Engler 2014).

3 Projects of the Scientific Collections for the History of Building and Planning in the GDR

Project Team

Head: Dr. K. Drewes (History)
A. Obeth (History), A. Pienkny (Archivist)

3.1 Profile/Objectives

The profile of the Scientific Collections for the History of Building and Planning in the GDR is characterised by a unique diversity of sources that provide access to various historical approaches, including the history of architecture and planning, as well as social history or the history of sciences. The estates of prominent architects, documents on urban planning competitions and large stocks of maps and photographs are included in the collection on the history of architecture. Recently, there has been a significant expansion of the collection due to the acquisition of further valuable documents related to prominent GDR architects. Moreover, the extensive research documents taken over from the IRS's predecessor (the GDR's Academy of Building and its Institute for Urban Development and Architecture) provide a wealth of material relating to a broad range of socio-spatial issues on urban and political history and the history of sciences in the East German context.

Since the department was founded in 2012, the Scientific Collections have undergone a dynamic development. Today, the time has come to strategically reflect upon the sharp increase of interest shown by both researchers and the general public, the increasing acquisition of valuable estates and on-going trends of digitalisation, so as to further develop these processes in a well-balanced way. With regard to the re-

4 Association of German Architects

5 Union internationale des Architects

search programme 2015-2018, the Scientific Collections have formulated four strategic goals that will be presented to an advisory board on a regular basis. This board will reflect critically upon these goals and their implementation. The four goals include:

- To strengthen the existing collection strategy that actively supports and in some specific cases pointedly inspires research and in turn profits from research, in the interest of a better interweaving of research and archive.
- To expand the online portal and further activities to help increase the collections' national and international visibility and, moreover, to contribute to the development of new formats for research and knowledge management.
- To advance existing forms of cooperation towards a strategic network of Leibniz archives and other archives to support and promote a joint collection policy with a purposefully honed collection strategy.
- To continuously professionalise and improve the execution of permanent tasks, such as user support, development of archives and public relations.

3.2 Strategic Projects

In terms of priority projects, we aim to implement these goals over time with the aid of the projects mentioned in the sections below.

3.2.1 Interweaving of Archive and Research

The scientific collections are part of an IRS research department, and there therefore exists a special opportunity for intense cooperation and mutual support of the archive and research, both in-house and externally. To this end, we will develop a number of special formats, which will be realised on the basis of the following components and working steps:

- For the purpose of providing service to IRS-based research, support will be provided for the lead project and additional projects conducted by the Research Department 5, as well as for other IRS departments. For instance, we will provide documents on the expansion and contraction of urban open spaces and other investigated areas during the first half of 2015. In 2016, we will then jointly conduct network analyses with the lead project of Research Department 5. Likewise, our services provided for associated dissertation projects serve to promote the inter-linkage with research. Moreover, we will regularly compile and circulate "profiles" on topics that have shown to be particularly suitable for dissertation and master theses. They will help to disseminate information on individual archive resources and research questions that have proven relevant. Whenever possible, our research projects will also supply the department with generated sources (e.g. interviews) subsequent to their evaluation.
- In January 2016 and January 2018, we intend to conduct workshops to have conversations about the planning history of the GDR. We will use them as a hub for researchers and contemporary witnesses to make contact, as well as for the acquisition of estates, interviews and other material. Beyond classic archival advice, external researchers can also establish contact with individual researchers – a privilege that is appreciated as one of the unique qualities of the IRS Research Department 5 and its Scientific Collections.

- The new format of an academically well-grounded exhibition will be used, with a sample of the biography of Egon Hartmann, a prominent architect and urban planner, which is hoped, can be an instrument to acquire collections. Scheduled to open in 2016, we intend to realise this exhibition in cooperation with an external partner and with the support of third party funded research.

3.2.2 Increasing National and International Visibility

Recently, the archive's visibility has increased significantly, both in academia and in regard to the broader public. Beyond its continuous activities in this context (see below: permanent tasks), the archive team pursues two strategic projects that aim to establish an online portal and to promote targeted internationalisation:

- In 2015, it is planned that the online portal will be activated and expanded one step at a time to target various groups. On the one hand, this will include the presentation of scientifically tested information sources for a broader interested public (press, pupils, etc.) about prominent architects, famous places and landmarks of the GDR's history of architecture. On the other hand, digitalised databases and instruments for online searches will be increasingly offered to researchers. Moreover, a targeted linking and supply of information into national and international catalogue systems will help to enhance the archive's visibility. The creation of new formats is additionally under consideration, such as a moderated blog. We will also submit at least three applications for external funding, in the interest of further expanding the sources available online, and as a means to further develop and digitalise our collections.
- Step-by-step, we intend to expand the Scientific Collection's international visibility. To this end, we will begin by rendering key information and finding aids (online presence, brochures, extracts from the inventory lists) in English also and, most importantly, we will make our photography collections available to international researchers. From 2016 onwards, the archive will increase its activities abroad (e.g. international conferences). Moreover, it is planned to expand, and further institutionalise cooperation with the existing network of partner institutions and to increase activities related to attracting third party funding.
- Given the fact that the joint presentation of archive collections and related research projects has recently been met with particular interest by both the press and the broader public, we have decided to maintain and further develop this format in a systematic manner.

3.2.3 Strategic Networking and Specialised Collection Strategy

For many years now the IRS Scientific Collections have actively participated in organisations such as the working group "Leibniz Association Archives" and the Federation of German Architectural Collections to establish close networks with several important German archives and museums. Additionally, they have established project-related collaborations with partners like Deutsches Museum in Munich, TU Berlin's Architectural Collection and other major organisations. Beyond these projects (whose foci have thus far been on development and digitalisation), the Scientific Collections team now aims to further develop the existing approaches of its specialised collection strategy.

- We will continue to pursue existing collaborations in the working group “Leibniz Association Archives”, which aims to develop a national strategy of “joint collecting”, mainly to promote the field of German architectural collections. To this end, we will start by assessing approaches and experiences of specialised collaborative attempts to attract funding to obtain pre-mortem and post-mortem estates. Using the forum of the German architectural collections, we will present a concept for collaborative collecting in the field of architectural collections in 2015.
- At about the same time, we intend to expand our collaborations with the municipal and state archives in Berlin-Brandenburg to ensure a concerted collection strategy and to allow for concrete agreement in regards to the collection strategy.

3.2.4 Permanent Tasks

In addition to user support and development, effective public relations work has been added as another major responsibility of the archive. The task is now to master the associated challenges in an efficient and flexible manner.

- The number of users has increased significantly recently. As a result, services need to be adapted in ways that allow for more possibilities to conduct independent enquiries, rather than having to seek out the archive staff’s assistance. To this end, priority has been given to rapidly increasing the availability of collections, which is much appreciated, especially by researchers. Moreover, it is planned to extend the preparation time of inventories to at least three years, a process that is additionally supported through the supervision of bachelor theses and trainees. Given the strong interest, we expect the number of users to reach 130 per year and, moreover, web page visits to increase significantly to at least 2000 clicks per year.
- As part of the increasingly high-level services, the attraction of funding to purchase pre-mortem and post-mortem estates will be intensified and regulated by setting priorities in a reflective manner. As a result of the archive’s growing prominence, and owing to the advanced age of many GDR architects, it is fair to assume that the number of estates acquired will increase to 3-5 per year in the coming years (with a volume of at least 15 running meters of documents per year). This will obviously also place higher demands on the space capacity.
- The new pillar of intensified public relations work will be systematised in three respects: Apart from the annual participation in individual overarching events (notably: Long Night of Sciences, Heritage Days) and press appearances (at least 3-5 reports in printed media, radio and TV), an increased demand will be created by users from the archive and university sector, and in particular from the local and regional public. We hope to satisfy this demand by way of offering guided tours and lectures.

National Collaborations and Networks with University and Non-University Researchers

Development of Cooperative Relations with Universities

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

- Content-related proximity to the issues tackled by IRS research makes universities attractive as research partners. In particular, this applies to fully-fledged geographical departments and institutes of spatial, urban and regional planning, along with institutes of sociology and political science.
- Joint appointment processes with universities allow us to gain highly qualified researchers to take on leading positions at the IRS.
- Both the IRS Director and the heads of departments are connected to universities (either by way of joint appointments, extraordinary professorships or as private lecturers). This constitutes an important aspect for the successful implementation of the IRS strategy to promote the advancement of young researchers in Germany, especially since the conferring of doctoral and post-doctoral (“Habilitation”) qualifications are the exclusive privilege of universities.

While this strategic alignment has been developed from an internal IRS perspective, it is also superimposed upon and substantiated by two external reference systems: the Leibniz Association’s Senate and the Joint Science Conference (GWK⁶). In its guidelines for the preparation of evaluation documents, the Leibniz Association’s Senate also elucidates its expectations regarding collaborations between its member institutions and universities:

- Active participation in the following qualification processes: the provision of university degrees required to qualify for doctorate programs, doctorate degrees, post-doctoral qualifications (Habilitation) and junior professorships (positively evaluated).
- Participation in the following coordinated programmes: Graduate Schools, Research Schools, Collaborative Research Centres and excellence clusters.

In its annual monitoring of the Pact for Research and Innovation II, the GWK specifies these expectations asking for a) new appointments of professors from abroad through joint appointments and b) the involvement in German Research Foundation’s (DFG) programmes (in particular: DFG Collaborative Research Centres, DFG Priority Programmes, DFG Research Centres, DFG Research Training Groups and DFG Research Units).

The IRS, in its efforts to develop and design these collaborations, intends to choose the best university partners based upon factors such as a university’s content-related proximity to the subject areas of IRS research, excellence in research achievements and national and international reputation.

Developing Cooperative Relations within the Framework of the Leibniz Association

6 Gemeinsame Wissenschaftskonferenz

Leibniz Research Alliances

In the spring of 2013, the Leibniz Association's Executive Board placed the issue of "Leibniz Research Alliances" on the agenda of all its member institutions. With this novel format, the Leibniz Association focuses mainly on the following strategic goals:

- To support the establishment of trans-regional thematic focuses within the Leibniz Association;
- Trans-disciplinary formation and structuring of research fields;
- Problem-oriented and temporary pooling of Leibniz institutes' competences;
- Advancing the national and international visibility of research conducted within the Leibniz Association and
- Initiation, co-organisation and utilisation of public funding initiatives.

In its position paper on perspectives of the German system of higher education and research (published in German in July 2013), the German Council of Science and Humanities recommended continuing the strategic process launched with the establishment of the Leibniz Research Alliances and the Leibniz Networks. In doing so, the goal is to establish topic-based alliances as an essential feature of the Leibniz Association.

Thus far (as of summer 2014), the Leibniz Association's Executive Board has approved the foundation of eleven Leibniz Research Alliances, with terms between five and 15 years. In 2013, the IRS Director and heads of the research departments took a leading role in the development of research concepts, structure and process organisation, along with the initiation and moderation of preparatory meetings for three Leibniz Research Alliances:

- Crises in a Globalised World (Director; Heads of Research Departments 1 and 3),
- Historical Authenticity (Head of Research Department 5)
- Energy Transition (Head of Research Department 2).

Leibniz Research Alliance "Crises in a Globalised World"

Problem Description and Questions

Human societies have always experienced economic, political, social and ecological crises phenomena and their accumulation: They do not represent a novel phenomenon typical of the 21st century. What is striking about crises in a globalised world, however, is their systemic and transnational character. They must be understood in a context of global networking of several technologies (transport, communication and information) and are characterised by various forms of international cooperation. Today, different kinds of crises develop in parallel and in complex interdependency, and as such all have to be dealt with at the same time. In such a context, activities to solve one crisis may well result in an exacerbation of another crisis.

The Leibniz Research Alliance “Crises in a Globalised World” empirically explores four globally significant crisis phenomena:

- Financial market and debt crises;
- Global food crises;
- Environmental crises and
- Crises of political systems.

For the purpose of both theoretical and empirical research, we will start by paying special attention to the following analytical dimensions: 1) Crisis interdependencies/the systemic character of crises; 2) Dynamics of crises; 3) Modes of crisis management and governance and 4) We will also consider the constructivist dimension of crises, from a social sciences and humanities point of view.

In this context, several questions are of vital importance: How do crises emerge and how do they proceed? How can we best understand different types of crisis interdependencies? At what point in time do we first take notice of crises, and how do we articulate them? And finally, what kinds of (international) forms of governance have presented solution approaches to these crises, and what are their main characteristic features?

The Leibniz Research Alliance “Crises in a Globalised World” was established in the summer of 2013. Since then, 22 Leibniz member institutions from the following three sections have joined the alliance: Humanities and Educational Research (Section A); Economics, Social Sciences and Spatial Research (Section B) and Environmental Sciences (Section E). This alliance aims to provide knowledge through interdisciplinary working groups, so as to better understand and explain crisis mechanisms in all their complexity. Furthermore, we hope to come up with suggestions for socially reasonable ways to deal with crises. In doing so, we aim to illustrate under what conditions and by what forms of actions it is possible to contain and tackle crises in a constructive manner, so as to reduce the crises or to make them better.

Sub-Projects

Theories and Semantics of Crises

The sub-project “Theories and Semantics of Crises” consists of a working group that does not conduct any empirical research projects itself. Instead, it devotes itself to developing meta-themes of the Research Alliance, and as such assumes an interface function between all other sub- projects. The IRS is represented in the working group by Prof. Dr. Heiderose Kilper (who also acts as the working group’s spokesperson) and Prof. Dr. Gabriela Christmann. The working group supports all other sub-projects by stimulating a dialogue between them (in the context of four workshops), as well as by integrating their individual work.

In the first working phase, the research work will concentrate on a substantive scrutiny of the concept of crisis and, moreover, on the elaboration of an annotated bibliography on concepts and theories of crisis (3rd quarter 2014 to 1st quarter 2015). The results will then be made available to the other working groups and sub-projects in April 2015. In the second working phase, the project will draw on conceptual ideas

developed during the first working phase, as well as on empirical insights provided by the other sub-projects and working groups. On this basis, the project will use a heuristic technique to analyse and better understand crises in a globalised world (2nd quarter 2015 to 2nd quarter 2016). This phase will end with the completion of one or two publications (in this case: overview articles) that serve to document and the results gained throughout the project. The third phase will then build on this heuristic foundation to develop a conceptually based and empirically sound typology of crises by incorporating and utilising empirical findings from other sub-projects (3rd quarter 2016 to 3rd quarter 2017). This process will also yield one or two publications. The organisation and realisation of an international conference on the “Semantics of the Concept of Crisis and its Development throughout the 20th and 21st Century” (2nd quarter 2017) will serve as another milestone, as will the preparation of an edited volume or a special issue that provides an overview of the sub-project’s main findings (fourth phase, in the course of 2018).

The research alliance on crises submitted an application for funding in the context of the Leibniz Association’s “Senate Strategic Committee” (SAS⁷) and its funding line “Strategic Networks”. Provided that this application will be approved, these funds would allow the working group to implement a number of key projects and milestones (e.g. workshops, international symposium).

Expert Crises/Crisis Experts

This working group deals with the role of experts in times of crisis and is composed of researchers from the natural, as well as social, sciences and the humanities. On behalf of the IRS, Prof. Dr. Oliver Ibert is involved in the working group. Together with Dr. Anna-Veronika Wendland of the Herder Institute in Marburg, Ibert serves as the working group’s co-speaker. Experts are defined as highly specialised knowledge holders who are involved in an advisory capacity in crisis-affected systems.

The first term “expert crises” indicates that we can understand experts as part of the problem that escalates in critical situations. An escalation of a crisis always implies that expert advice has failed to avert the aggravation of problems; Experts did not anticipate the crisis and/or have not attached enough importance to preventive measures. For instance, this may be due to the fact that experts have underestimated the scope of symptoms or that they have failed to share their insights with the relevant decision makers in an effective manner. The second term “crisis experts” points to a second function of experts, i.e. their task of managing and overcoming crises. Experts give advice to decision makers on how to get the escalation of critical problems under control again. Moreover, they are asked to develop scenarios for the post-crisis period.

Just like the previously sketched working group on theories and semantics of crises, this working group has a cross-sectional function for the research alliance’s thematically oriented sub-projects and working groups. Apart from offering consulting and qualification for empirical research on sectoral crises (financial market and debt crises, world food crises, environmental crises and crises of political systems), it also seeks to conduct its own empirical research financed through third party funds. Moreover, the working group also reflects the role of a number of Leibniz-based researchers, who act as advisors to decision makers in crisis situations. The working

7 Senatsausschuss Strategische Vorhaben

group aims to develop recommendations to provide an orientation for these Leibniz-based researchers, based upon knowledge of the preconditions of crisis intervention, as well as various forms of expertise and their respective prospects for success.

Environmental Crises

The sub-project “Environmental Crises” starts with an outline of the crisis concept in connection with environmental issues. In this connection, the key and singular topic will be climate change. The theoretical and empirical aspects of the research project will integrate perspectives taken from human ecology, social constructivism and economics. The working group is composed of natural and social scientists, as well as economists. Prof. Dr. Gabriela Christmann and Thorsten Heimann represent the IRS. To be specific, the working group’s task is to explore the biophysical dimensions of our natural environment and their interdependencies with the social and economic spheres. At the same time, a social-scientific interest exists in analysing the way society deals with these interdependencies. In particular, the working group is interested in how biophysical dimensions of environmental crises become a social reality. How do different (sub-)societies deal with and perceive the crises, and how are they dealt with in the context of governance processes? The questions posed by the working group and its individual projects are closely aligned with the questions raised by the Leibniz Research Alliance “Crises in a Globalised World”.

In this connection, the IRS will develop a DFG project proposal on the issue of “Governance Processes, Conflict Processing and Dynamics of Crisis in the Context of Climate Change” between the 4th quarter of 2014 and the 1st quarter of 2015. In 2015, the IRS will also be involved in the acquisition of funds for a joint project entitled “Climate Change as Environmental Crisis – Complexity and Uncertainty of Consequences as a Challenge for Crisis Prevention” (partners involved include: IÖR, IRS, ZEW, DIW, RWI, TROPOS and PIK). Another important initiative is the organisation and realisation of an international workshop with high-ranking German and EU representatives engaged in climate policy.

Leibniz Research Alliance “Energy Transition” (LVE)

Problem Description and Questions

Today, the German energy system is facing its most profound upheaval in its history: Against the background of Germany’s nuclear power phase-out and the formulation of ambitious goals of climate control, it is planned to dramatically increase the share of renewable energy and to raise energy efficiency sharply. These objectives require massive reforms and an abundance of innovations, e.g. as regards to energy grids and the production and utilisation of different forms of energy. At the same time, these goals cannot be achieved solely by means of technical innovations: Instead, forms of governance, new business models, the adaptation of legal regulations and social innovations play an equally important role. The German research landscape is still lagging behind in this regard, especially in political, social and economic aspects. Until now, researchers have barely dealt with questions about the acceptance of new technologies, potentialities for increasing network stability on the demand side, international compatibility, pressing financing matters, socio-political support and the participation of affected citizens.

The Leibniz Research Alliance “Energy Transition” (LVE) was established in the summer of 2013. It brings together competencies from 22 Leibniz institutions from four sections: Humanities and Educational Research (Section A); Economics, Social Sciences, Spatial Research (Section B); Mathematics, Natural Sciences and Engineering (Section D) and Environmental Sciences (Section E). Within the alliance, the institutes interlink complementary issues of energy research addressed by the Leibniz Association. One special characteristic of LVE is its thematic and methodological interconnection of social and technical aspects as part of the problem-oriented research projects. Another is its comprehensive perspective on electricity, heat energy and traffic as energy-relevant sectors. The emphasis is placed on new forms of governance, business models and social innovations related to participation and ownership in the context of new energy infrastructures. Questions about the acceptance of customised production, transport and storage capacities are of particular interest here. The LVE’s research programme is directed towards the following three areas of tension related to the energy transition:

- Centralised and de-centralised systems,
- Social vs. private interests and
- Global vs. local effects.

We consider these areas of tension from different research angles, which correspond to the Leibniz member institutes’ five fields of competences: 1) Urban and regional development, e.g. IRS; 2) land use and usage competition; 3) regulation, education and acceptance; 4) social, economic and ecological effects and 5) material and technical innovations. The LVE pursues the goal of generating and working on research projects across disciplinary boundaries so as to gain insights into the research- and policy-related challenges and opportunities of the German energy transition.

Sub-Projects

Networking Project ReNEW – Research Network on Energy Transitions: Bridging Disciplines to Address Core Challenges to Germany’s Energiewende

In the context of the Leibniz Association’s “Senate Strategic Committee” (SAS) and its funding line “Strategic Networks”, the LVE submitted an application for funding in May 2014 with its networking project “ReNEW – Research Network on Energy Transitions: Bridging Disciplines to Address Core Challenges to Germany’s Energiewende”. This initiative aims to systematise and further develop the research of all 22 LVE member institutes and, on this basis, ensure a transfer of knowledge into science and politics. Dr. Timothy Moss serves as the principal investigator for the area of “social vs. private interests”. Should the proposal be approved, one postdoc research fellow will be employed part-time at the IRS to deal with this issue. The project is scheduled to last from January 2015 to December 2018.

Special Issue in *Energy Policy*

As a means to hone the LVE's profile and to position it within the international scientific community dealing with energy transitions, it is planned to develop a special issue in a renowned professional journal (preferably *Energy Policy*). In doing so, Dr. Timothy Moss will act both as a provider of ideas and (co-)editor. On the basis of contributions from some ten Leibniz Institutes, this special issue is expected to allow the global public to gain a deeper and more comprehensive insight into current challenges related to the energy transition in Germany. The IRS will be actively involved through the submission of a contribution by Dr. Ludger Gailing and Dr. Timothy Moss under the working title "Local Energy Systems: The New Commons?" In its selection of contributions, the LVE will pay particular attention to diversity of competences, in terms of both content and disciplinary alignment. Potential contributions were already presented and discussed at an internal LVE workshop in June 2014. As a next step, globally acknowledged researchers will be invited to an international conference to inspect the elaborated LVE contributions with respect to their academic quality, social relevance and coherence. The special issue is due to be submitted in early 2016.

Further Project Ideas

Several joint applications for external funding are envisaged as part of the LVE. For 2015, the spatial science institutes involved (i.e. the IRS) have planned to submit at least one application on the relationship between spaces, governance and power in the context of the energy transition. This proposal is most likely to be submitted to either the BMBF or to the Leibniz Association in the context of the Leibniz competition 2016. IÖR and IRS aim to submit a joint DFG proposal with the working title "Reconstitution of Spaces in the Course of the Energy Transition". This project will deal with the question of how the energy transition entails a modification, constitution and reassessment of spaces (examples include the energy transition-induced emergence of new spaces of action in the vicinity of bioenergy regions, or the overlap of "new" and "old" energy regions. For the IRS, Dr. Ludger Gailing has taken the lead in preparing this DFG proposal. Additionally, further LVE applications are currently being taken into consideration, especially in cooperation with two smart grid projects pursued by associated "Living Labs".

Leibniz Research Alliance "Historical Authenticity"

Problem Description and Questions

For all modern societies, dealing with their own past constitutes a crucial component of their cultural self-awareness. On an unprecedented scale, our present strategies of coping with our past aim for historical authenticity. This is accompanied by an intensive search for something supposedly "genuine" and the endeavour to preserve the "true" and "original". In practical terms, this becomes manifest in the preservation of historical traces and buildings; in the development of school books and maps and in the establishment of monuments, museums and memorial places, as well as in contributions to debates about cultural memory and the shaping function of language. The interdisciplinary and cross-sectional research on this phenomenon and the associated attempts for an authorisation of the past by means of authentication are at the heart of the Leibniz Research Alliance "Historical Authenticity", which was found-

ed in January 2013. The alliance is comprised of 17 Leibniz Institutes from three sections –1) Humanities and Educational Research (Section A); 2) Economics, Social Sciences and Spatial Research (Section B) and 3) Life Sciences (Section C) – and four external partners.

The alliance realises a novel form of cooperation among institutes of historical basic research, research museums and institutions of educational sciences, and thus covers a wide range of topics from cultural science to social, technical and life sciences. On the basis of four topic areas, the alliance thus generates cross-disciplinary guiding questions, research approaches and project proposals, all of which are employed to explore the role of perceptions and lines of argumentation on the issue of authenticity and its impact in both historical and contemporary societal debates. The aim of these efforts is to promote a reflected and critical discussion of perceptions and instrumentalisation of “the original” and “genuine” in museums, world cultural heritage sites, urban development policies, general political debates and further discourses.

The joint and overarching analytical dimensions include: conflicts over authenticity, changing strategies and procedures of authentication, authenticity and the media, the relationship between subjective and objective authenticity and historical authenticity in a transnational perspective. The research alliance employs four thematic fields, listed below, in order to explore these dimensions in terms of content and organisation:

- Historical authenticity in the history of ideas and in historical semantics,
- Identification and communication of authenticity in museums,
- Historical authenticity: spaces of tradition and
- Historical authenticity as a political-cultural argument.

On behalf of the IRS, PD Dr. Christoph Bernhardt is involved in the thematic area of “Historical Authenticity: Spaces of Tradition”, whose main objects of investigation are “Urban Landscapes as Spaces of Tradition”.

Sub-Projects

Historical Authenticity: Spaces of Tradition

This thematic area is dealt with by a working group of the same name that meets at regular intervals to discuss basic questions related to the negotiation of historical authenticity in discourses and procedures of urban and landscape development, as well as the ways in which they are reflected in historical cartography. As one of the project’s principal investigators, PD Dr. Christoph Bernhardt plays a significant role in designing this thematic area, the task of which is to formulate overarching research questions, organise conferences and to continuously develop and adjust project ideas and applications for external funding. Along these lines, the working group reviewed and analysed research literature from early 2013 to mid-2014, and created a website and a framework concept related to terminology, key questions and project proposals. Moreover, a review of the current state of research in various disciplines involved in urban studies was conducted as a part of a conference on the “Authentication of Urban Landscapes”, which was held in Potsdam on 20-21 June 2014. It is envisaged that the findings will be published.

Until now, the working group has dealt with the ascription of authenticity as a process of social construction in discourses on urban landscapes, sites of industrial cultural heritage and memorial sites, as well as in representations of the media (e.g. maps). On this basis, it has developed a joint central perspective. Subject to the successful acquisition of external funding, the programme will include an international exchange programme for guest researchers and doctoral candidates for the next three years and the organisation of conferences and workshops, as well as start-up funding for the generation of project applications.

This programme will be further substantiated by and implemented within the context of the entire alliance. While the entire alliance and the working group “Historical Spaces of Tradition” will receive basic funding from the participating institutes, the sub-projects outlined below will depend on the acquisition of further external funding. To this end, the research alliance submitted an application for funding in the context of the Leibniz Association’s “Senate Strategic Committee” (SAS) and its funding line “Strategic Networks” in May 2014.

Historical Authenticity in an Interdisciplinary Perspective (externally funded project)

This sub-project, headed by PD Dr. Christoph Bernhardt, calls attention to various disciplines in the field of urban and spatial research that deal with problems of authenticity and authentication, such as historic preservation, urban and regional planning, landscape planning and architectural and urban history. Current research approaches will be scrutinised with regard to the particular relevance they attach to the recourse to authenticity – and to what extent they tend to deconstruct it. In doing so, we hope to identify and question fundamental hypotheses, main controversies and established research positions, e.g. on the perspective adopted by historical preservations, the alignment and impact of UNESCO World Heritage Site procedures and the “traditionalist turn” in European urban development around 1975. Given the fact that research on the authenticity of individual material building stocks has been considerably developed as compared to authenticity-related issues at various levels (district, city, urban region and landscape), the project will devote particular attention to the later perspective.

Historical Authentication Processes of Urban Architectural Heritage: The Example of Dessau since 1945 (externally funded project)

This project, conceptualised by Dr. Andreas Butter, will explore historical authentication processes at different times and “historical layers”, including its controversial negotiation in urban discourses, through the example of the Central German city of Dessau during the period from 1945 to the present. These research activities will help to reveal paths of historical authentication and the stages of public visualisation, valorisation and canonisation in the form of a “construction site”, which has passed through specific building stock e.g. classical modernism in Dessau. In this context, we will also take a closer look at the corresponding audit and authentication strategies, to cases of discursive de-valorisation and even removal of discredited building stock. Dessau can be regarded as an especially revealing example in that the highs and lows of German history of the 20th century have manifested themselves in this city’s structures and its architectural heritage in a particularly marked way. Following the city centre’s destruction due to war and, again, after the almost complete closing

down of industrial companies after 1990, the city had to cope with two political systems and difficult economic framework conditions, and as such was searching for a reference frame for its self-perception and public image. It can be demonstrated that authentication strategies and authenticity conflicts play a special role in these search processes and the urban society's self-assurance and search for orientation.

International Research Collaborations and Networking

The IRS sees itself as an interdisciplinary and cosmopolitan research institution that is well established and widely recognized both nationally and internationally as an excellent player in social science-based spatial research. As such, its research achievements are relevant for political as well administrative, civil society and business spheres. The institute is dedicated to socially significant issues that are of relevance for both national and international social science-based spatial research.

A Review of the Implementation of the Internationalisation Strategy within the Context of the Research Programme 2012-2014

Building on this self-perception, an internationalisation strategy was formulated and successfully implemented (in the first stage) as part of the research programme 2012-2014. By providing financial resources and personnel support (“International Officer”), the conditions for greater international visibility of the institute have been created:

The provision of a budget for internationalisation allowed for the initiation of several measures from which IRS researchers and international guest researchers, in equal measure, could benefit. In this connection, it must be emphasised that the “IRS Fellowship Programme” has enabled intensive international exchange among expert colleagues – be it in the form of IRS researcher stays abroad, or in the form of guest stays of accomplished international colleagues at the IRS. Apart from creating a scientific added value for the institute, this exchange has also proven valuable in terms of its networking effect within the scientific community and its contribution to safeguarding strategic partnerships.

By establishing the position of an “International Officer”, it became possible to coordinate the institute’s international activities in an effective and professional manner, especially in relation to information management, research funding support, proposal writing and the support of guest researchers. This interface between IRS, cooperation partners, and the funders of international research, networking and mobility projects helped to ease the burden on IRS researchers, and therefore the additional personnel proved to be beneficial. The participation of the new IRS International Officer in top-level training and networking programmes (e.g. EU mentoring offered by the “European Liaison Office of the German Research Organisations” (KoWi), was noteworthy as only eight teams of mentors and mentees had the chance to profit from this programme from all of Germany and, therefore, testifies to their ambitiousness. For the IRS, this also provides access to up-to-date information as well as to experts of international research funding.

Projects in the Context of the Research Programme 2015-2018

The now imminent second implementation phase of the IRS internationalisation strategy is focused on consolidating the institute’s international visibility. To this end, the IRS has come up with the following projects:

In the research programme 2015-2018, international comparative studies of spatial processes will play a prominent role. Methodological approaches such as qualitative

comparative research techniques and comparative case studies will dominate the lead project research covering the extended research area of Germany and Europe and/or North America. Four out of the five research departments (RD 1, 2, 4, and 5) also plan to conduct case studies abroad.

For the IRS, cross-border collaboration and the close exchange of specialist knowledge are natural. In particular, the IRS maintains strategic partnerships with the focus regions of Northern and Western Europe, Poland and North America. Relations with the respective institutions were successfully established and/or consolidated over the course of the first implementation phase (2012-2014). In order to further strengthen these partnerships and to initiate concrete research projects, the IRS will sign formal cooperation agreements with the following partners over the next few years:

- Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan (Poland)
- Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy (CIRCLE) at Lund University (Sweden)
- University of Manchester (United Kingdom)
- University of Leicester (United Kingdom)
- University of Toronto (Canada)

The joint participation in the Marie Skłodowska-Curie calls for proposals constitutes a further component of reinforced cooperation. Under the lead of the IRS Research Department 3, the IRS will submit an application for an “Innovative Training Network” (ITN), to advance the institute’s structured doctoral training.

For IRS researchers, the maintenance and development of international networks is a matter of course. Of particular relevance are international associations such as the “Association of American Geographers” (AAG), “Royal Geographical Society” (RGS) and “Regional Studies Association” (RSA), especially since they offer multiple options for participation (e.g. annual symposia) and networking (e.g. involvement in specialised groups). In order to establish contacts for cooperation projects, and as a means to establish and maintain joint publications, consolidation is also envisaged for the research departments’ involvement in additional thematically specialised networks. In this connection, the following networks are of particular relevance for the IRS: the “European Colloquium on Culture, Creativity and Economy” (RD 1), “International Network on Urban Low Carbon Transitions” (RD 2), “International Sociology Association” (RD 3), “Cities after Transitions” (RD 4) and “International Confederation of Architectural Museums” (RD 5).

One innovation envisaged in the context of the research programme 2015-2018 consists in the IRS’s strategic involvement in existing “COST Actions” (i.e. the networking activities of the “European Cooperation in Science and Technology”), especially since they are considered to be a breeding ground for successful consortia within EU research funding programmes.

It is an integral part of the IRS research strategy that the research of its lead project is supported by thematically complementary third-party funded projects. Over the course of its research programme 2015-2018, the IRS will apply for cooperative projects announced by the EU’s funding programme on research and innovation “Horizon 2020”, as well as for research projects supported by the European Structural

Funds (e.g. INTERREG). The IRS acknowledges the costs involved in drafting an application for funding in an international context: Applicants for EU-projects can, therefore, benefit financially from the internationalisation budget and receive support from the International Officer. As a means of quality assurance, and to enhance the probability of obtaining funding, the IRS applicants also collaborate with external partners such as the federal government's network of national contact points and the "European Liaison Office of the German Research Organisations".

In the impending research programme, the highest priority is also given to sharing the research results with specific target groups. To this end, the IRS researchers periodically present the results of their research projects to the international scientific community. This is achieved, on the one hand, by the successful placement of IRS topics at international conferences and, on the other hand, by publications in recognised peer-reviewed journals and special issues with a high degree of international visibility.

Promotion of Young Researchers

The “Guidelines for Working Conditions and Career Development for Doctoral and Postdoctoral Researchers at Institutes of the Leibniz Association” (March 2013) includes a statement according to which the Leibniz Association says it has the responsibility of supporting its young researchers. Accordingly, it aims to educate and prepare doctoral and postdoctoral scholars for careers in academia (universities, non-university research institutions and research museums), but also in industry, politics, the administrative sector and the media. In full alignment with this maxim, the IRS sees itself as a **place of learning** for young researchers. In its strategy to promote up-and-coming talent, the IRS aims to provide support for all young researchers and thereby help them to develop their individual professional and personal skills in an optimal way. Once they leave the IRS, they should be equipped with competences that allow them to maintain a competitive position in the labour market.

At the IRS, both doctoral and postdoctoral researchers belong to the group of “young scholars”. Both sets of researchers differ in terms of their age and formal qualifications, but also with regard to their professional career orientations. On principle, the future career paths of doctoral candidates at the IRS are regarded as open. While they may end up working in academia, this is not necessarily the case. In contrast to this, the support of postdoctoral researchers is directed towards strengthen their standing or position in the system of higher education and research, be it at a non-university research institutions or at a university. This requires a different set of support strategies.

During the term of the research programme 2012-2014, the IRS Director, the heads of the research departments and the Scientific Advisory Board joined forces to critically examine all elements of the IRS strategy to support young researchers. Notably, this critical review also included measures that received positive reviews within the scope of the external evaluation. In addition to those elements that were already introduced as a part of the research programme 2012-2014 (funding of research stays abroad; participation in competitions for excellent doctoral theses; printing cost subsidies staggered according to the overall grade of the thesis), the IRS has developed additional measures for the promotion of young scholars: for example, including a monthly PhD colloquium under the direction of advanced IRS researchers (who already completed their “Habilitation”), the organisation of two international PhD seminars per year, the systematic recruitment of doctoral candidates and postdoctoral researchers and proactively dealing with their future prospects subsequent to their time at the IRS.

The IRS conceives its support of doctoral and postdoctoral researchers as an integral part of its personnel and organisational development strategy. It understands this field of activity as the special responsibility of the IRS Director and the heads of the IRS research departments. For the duration of the research programme 2012-2014, it is fair to say that the promotion of young scholars was one of the most dynamic fields of personnel and organisational development.

1 Support for Doctoral Candidates

As a general rule, the completion of a PhD helps to increase the competitiveness of researchers in both the academic and non-academic labour markets. While a doctorate is a necessary precondition for those who wish to embark on an academic career, this does not mean it would compromise an individual's prospects outside of academia. As a consequence, the main focus of the IRS strategy to promote doctoral candidates is primarily directed towards offering interesting (both thematically and conceptually) qualification projects. Secondly, the candidates should be allowed to focus on their qualification work. Finally, the IRS strives to provide framework conditions that allow doctoral candidates to complete their doctoral thesis successfully within a period of time (orientation framework: three years) as successfully as possible. This strategy combines the following elements: Increasingly systematic recruitment of doctoral candidates, strategic organisation and development of working conditions for doctoral candidates at the IRS and a targeted provision of structured advanced training measures.

1.1 Systematic Recruitment of Doctoral Candidates

In the beginning of the research programme 2015-2018, it is planned to recruit doctoral candidates mainly on the basis of employment ads for "IRS PhD positions". This will help to place more emphasis on the applicants' intention to qualify for an academic career, making it a major job requirement. Accordingly, the application documents are to include proposals for their dissertation projects. In this way, we will win interesting project ideas related to research fields tackled by the IRS, which can then be developed further here in Erkner.

In the first quarter of 2015, each IRS research department will publish and fill a job vacancy (in each case: a part-time position for one doctoral candidate) as part of its lead project. In terms of the application for external funding, as much care as possible is taken to ensure that the individual working conditions (project duration, compatibility of project work and dissertation project) are conducive to the young scholars' academic interests. In this way, we hope to be able to recruit additional doctoral candidates using third-party funds. In the context of the previous research programme 2012-2014, this was already achieved with the sub-projects of the DFG project "Innovation in Planning: How do New Approaches Emerge in Spatial Planning?". The means for annex funding earmarked in the core budget will be flexible in the years to come so as to facilitate increased calls for funds during the final phase of a research programme.

All in all, this is supposed to ensure a package of measures that will allow doctoral candidates at the IRS to complete their structured doctoral period as one "cohort". As the qualification interests and processing status increasingly tend to converge, it becomes easier to develop qualification offers that are tailored more specifically to the needs of doctoral candidates.

1.2 Development of Working Conditions for Doctoral Candidates at the IRS

At the IRS, doctoral candidates are generally employed as part-time scientific employees (50% TVL13) in fixed-term project positions. These project positions are either financed by the core budget or by external funding. Other forms of funding, such as scholarships, have thus far played a marginal role. The collective agreement for the German federal states (TVL) offers the advantage of a comprehensive and regular integration in the social security system.

Working conditions for doctoral candidates are presented in an institutional agreement on the promotion and support of young scholars, which was approved by the IRS on 22 March 2006. It foresees that doctoral candidates should conclude a supervision agreement with the Director of the IRS on the basis of an elaborated proposal (including the central question of the dissertation thesis, empirical work programme and a realistic timetable) and the agreement of the university and the professors to supervise the dissertation project. The institutional agreement codifies the rights and duties of both sides (IRS and doctoral candidates). The qualification works shall be supported by the following conditions:

1. Flexible time frame with the option to alternate between intense working blocks and phases of leaves of absence;
2. Mentoring model with IRS senior researchers on a voluntary basis;
3. Free provision of the IRS's technical and organisational infrastructure and
4. Financial support (from the core budget or annex funding resources) in the final phase of the dissertation project; usually in the amount of a part-time position (50% TVL13) for a period of six months.

For their dissertation thesis, doctoral candidates at the IRS are entitled to apply for printing cost subsidies. There is no entitlement to funding. The amount of printing cost provided is dependent upon the overall grade of the completed thesis. In the context of the IRS internationalisation strategy, doctoral candidates have the opportunity to receive funding for research stays abroad. These funds may support the collection of data or support young researchers with written exams in another context, and can be utilised in close cooperation with internationally renowned cooperation partners. The funding may cover travel expenses, as well as additional costs arising from maintaining two households.

This formulation of framework conditions for doctoral candidates at the IRS is closely linked to the expectation that they will be able to complete their qualification work within a period of approximately three years subsequent to the signing of their supervision agreement.

1.3 Offerings of Structured Advanced Training

The support of doctoral candidates at the IRS is firmly embedded in a qualification concept, which consists of three modules:

- Doctoral Colloquium (Module 1)
In contrast to PhD colloquia conducted at universities, this module is not linked to lecture periods. Instead, it occurs monthly throughout the year. During the colloquium, doctoral candidates present the progress status of their dissertation project to discuss it with a group of fellow doctoral candidates. This allows

them to reflect on their individual research process and will also help them regularly address questions and typical problems related to working on their dissertation theses. Each year, one leading IRS researcher (with a completed “Habilitation”) is chosen to organise the doctoral colloquium (e.g. 2015: Prof. Dr. Heiderose Kilper).

- PhD-Seminar (Module 2)
Each year in the spring and autumn, the monthly doctoral colloquium is temporarily suspended in favour of the *PhD seminar*. This module was first introduced in 2013 as part of the, then newly established, IRS International Lectures on Society and Space. This implies that internationally renowned researchers, who will give a lecture at the IRS, offer a supplementary seminar for the institute’s doctoral candidates. Additionally, they offer to meet individual doctoral researchers for personal consultations – for instance to comment on a proposal or a chapter of the dissertation thesis. This format is supposed to familiarise the doctoral candidates with international discourses and help them establish contact with leading international researchers.

- Curriculum “Social Science-based Spatial Research” (Module 3)
Over a period of three years, we aim to establish a qualification programme, which shall take place three times a year (in springtime, during the two-day summer lectures and in autumn) and will address three competence areas:

Competence area “theories” (foundations of the philosophy of science, spatial theory, spatial planning theories, governance concepts, etc.).

Competence area “methods of spatial research” (expert interviews, network analysis, participant observation, standardised questionnaire surveys, etc.).

Competence area “transferable skills” (presentation techniques, writing workshops, publishing in peer-reviewed journals, time management, etc.). One focus is placed on texts and presentations in English.

Similar to the doctoral colloquium, the curriculum will also be organised by leading IRS researchers. Together with members of the IRS executive board and external experts, these senior researchers are also asked to hold a number of lectures.

2 Promotion of Postdoctoral Researchers

As indicated earlier, the completion of a doctorate will usually open up a range of opportunities both within and outside of academia. In contrast, the decision to embark on a postdoctoral qualification phase can result in the improvement of chances on the academic labour market but often at a cost of access to the labour market outside of academia. These risks mainly arise from the fact that the number of people applying for these positions will outnumber the number of senior positions available at the same time; the postdoctoral phase is the time when the main decisions are taken in non-academic labour markets, too. As a consequence, these labour markets usually barely value research qualifications obtained in the university sector and they may even prove counterproductive. Another key factor is that postdoctoral researchers are often in a stage of life when the question of whether or not to start a family is cru-

cial. Many structural problems in the academic labour market, like the prevalence of fixed-term working contracts and underfunded positions, therefore, severely affect postdoctoral researchers – a group with a highly pronounced need for career planning predictability, transparency, employment security and competitiveness.

2.1 Systematic Recruitment of Postdoctoral Researchers

The IRS supports the development of highly qualified postdoctoral researchers on their career path within the professional field of “science and research”. In this context, two career options are of relevance:

- The “classic” German academic career, which culminates in an appointment to a professorial university chair. This requires a disciplinary focus and is usually achieved by the successful completion of a “Habilitation”, or an equivalent achievement, as well as by corresponding experiences gained in academic teaching. This career option in the university context is firmly institutionalised.
- An academic career that culminates in the position of a “Leibniz Senior Researcher”. In contrast to the university professorship, Leibniz Senior Researchers are more strongly characterised by problem-oriented and interdisciplinary research achievements and, moreover, take a leading role in a non-university research institution. This career option in a non-university context is mostly unexplored territory, not only for the IRS.

Scientific excellence is the common area where these two career paths overlap. The IRS recruits postdoctoral researchers on the open labour market, as well as from the circle of particularly successful IRS doctoral candidates. IRS researchers with a successfully completed doctorate who have made a conscious decision to stay in the professional field of “science and research” are required to possess outstanding achievements: they are required to have finished their doctorate with *magna cum laude* and within a competitive period of time. Of course, they are also expected to possess a successful track record of publications and presentations. For the future, the IRS aims to further systematise its recruitment of promising postdoctoral researchers by taking a close look at on-going programmes of graduate schools related to the key topics tackled by the IRS.

2.2 Two-staged Support of Postdoctoral Researchers

In view of the fact that a decision in favour of embarking on the career path “science and research” should be well-considered, due to the specific opportunities and risks involved in that decision, the IRS has decided to support postdoctoral researchers through a two-staged process. While the first phase is intended to aid in orientation, the second phase serves as the actual period of postdoctoral support.

The Orientation Phase

The orientation phase is directed towards all IRS employees who either remain in employment or are newly hired by the IRS subsequent to the successful completion of their PhD. In this phase, intensive talks between the Director / head of department and the employee shall help to assess the researcher’s potential, as well as his or her inclination and suitability for one of the two career options (eligibility for professorship or Leibniz Senior Researcher). In doing so, it is important to reflect on the

permanent professional risks connected to both career paths. As a general rule, this phase should last one year subsequent to the completion of the doctorate, and should not exceed two years. The orientation phase will conclude with a clear decision (that enjoys the support of both parties) in favour of or against embarking a career path in the professional field of “science and research”. In the case of a positive decision, the candidate will be granted the status of an IRS Postdoctoral Researcher.

The Profiling Phase

The profiling phase is exclusively directed to those researchers who were awarded the status of an IRS Postdoctoral Researcher. It is intended for the acquisition of competences that are considered indispensable for their respectively chosen career path. At the (provisional) end of this phase, the candidate is either expected to have successfully completed the “Habilitation”, or should have acquired competences that distinguish them as a Leibniz Senior Researcher. As a general rule, the profiling phase should comprise four years altogether.

Postdoctoral researchers are regarded as fully trained researchers, whose further development towards becoming independent researchers will be supported in a focused way. Apart from creating freedom for independent research, this is also to be achieved by transferring the right amount of responsibility to the researcher to take care of strategic matters concerning the institute. Moreover, further training measures and coaching services will be offered in an individually targeted and problem-focused manner.

The following set of instruments serves to guarantee an individual implementation of postdoctoral support during the profiling phase:

- Support of so-called “Habilitanden” (i.e. postdoctoral candidates qualifying for a “Habilitation”) under the framework conditions defined in the institutional agreement made on 22 March 2006. Analogously to doctoral candidates, part-time employed “Habilitanden” also have the option to make use of a flexible time frame with the option of taking alternating phases of intensified work blocks and non-work. Moreover, they may apply for an exemption during the final phase and funding through institutional resources.
- As an incentive, the institute will grant a temporary increase of earnings to the salary group TVL14 until the end of the profiling phase.
- As part of its internationalisation strategy, the IRS can financially support research stays abroad.
- Exemption for academic teaching, especially when researchers are heading for an eligibility for professorship
- Transfer of responsibility for managing and coordinating the lead project research.
- Independent acquisition and management of third-party funded projects.
- Establishment of “S-Junior professorships” and their joint appointment together with one of the universities in the Berlin-Brandenburg region that has signed a cooperation agreement with the IRS.
- Independent acquisition and guidance of junior researcher groups.
- Transfer of responsibility for developing cooperative relationships with both national and international partners of the IRS.

Individual consultations between postdoctoral researchers and the Director / the heads of departments will serve to decide which (combination) of the abovementioned instruments shall be applied at which time of the profiling phase – and the same applies to additional training measures.