



UNIVERSITÉ DE FRIBOURG
UNIVERSITÄT FREIBURG

Doctoral program *PROWEL*:
Social Problems and Welfare
c/o prowel@unifr.ch, University of Fribourg
Division of Sociology, Social Policy, Social Work
Rte des Bonnesfontaines 11, 1700 Fribourg

PROWEL Workshop, May 28-29, 2026

Venue: Centre Loewenberg
Postfach 48/Löwenberg 45B
3280 Murten
<https://company.sbb.ch/de/angebote/erleben/centre-loewenberg.html>

Beginn: Thursday May 28. at 08.45

End: Friday, May 29. at 15.25

Participants

Doctoral researchers:

- Dampz Magdalena
- Edwards Claire
- Gnos Nora
- Heining Maja Janina
- Hell Friederike
- Schmoutz Barbara
- Simonis Tanja
- Singer Anina
- Stocker Milan
- Turuani Debora
- Uphoff Anne
- Wang Michele

Experts:

- Prof., Dr. Javornik Jana
- Prof., Dr. Sinclair Stephen

Participating organizing Scientific Board members:

- Prof., Dr. Hadjar, Andreas, UniFr
- Prof., Dr. Kronig, Winfried, UniFr
- Prof., Dr. Naumann, Ingela, UniFr
- Dr. Simoes Loureiro, Kevin UniFr
- Prof., Dr. Zurbriggen, Carmen, UniFr

PROWEL-PROGRAM

Thursday, May 28, 2026

08.45-09.00	Introduction, presentation of all participants	Simoes Loureiro Kevin
09.00-10.30	From research to reach: Impact, knowledge translation, and the academic-policy-making nexus	Javornik Jana
10.30-10.45	Coffee break	
10.45-11.35	Hiring to accommodate	Edwards Claire
11.35-12.25	Transition processes and experiences	Tanja Simonis
12.25-13.30	Lunch break	
13.30-14.20	Qualitative/quantitative analysis	Friederike Hell
14.20-15.10	Third paper presentation	Milan Stocker
15.10-15.25	Coffee break	
15.25-16.15	Research plan and proposal	Maja Janina Heining
16.15-17.05	Research update	Nora Gnos
17.05-17.45	Break	
17.45-18.15	Apéro	
18.15-20.00	Dinner	

Friday, May 29, 2026

07.00-08.00	Breakfast	
08.00-09.30	Mission-based Policy-making in a Permacrisis	Sinclair Stephen
09.30-10.20	Educational inclusion study	Magdalena Dampz
10.20-10.35	Coffee break	
10.35-11.25	ACT and social work methodology	Anne Uphoff
11.25-12.15	Research plan and realist evaluation	Debora Turuani
12.15-13.30	Lunch break	
13.30-14.20	Methodology and first results	Barbara Schmoutz
14.20-15.10	Quantitative or qualitative paper	Anina Singer
15.10-15.25	Closing remarks	Simoes Loureiro Kevin

External experts

Prof. Dr. Sinclair Stephen

Mission-based Policy-making in a Permacrisis

Overview

‘The crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born; in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear’ (Antonio Gramsci).

National welfare systems and policies were established in the 20th century primarily to address ‘Old Social Risks’, such as unemployment and care needs. In recent decades a range ‘New Social Risks’ has emerged, such as precarious employment and more dynamic and diverse household forms. The pace of change has accelerated exponentially, posing fundamental challenges to established social welfare systems and existing support structures. This workshop will discuss the contemporary risk landscape and reflect on one mode of response which has been proposed to counter and address current Grand Challenges, i.e. complex, large-scale, long term existential threats.

The workshop will introduce and critically reflect upon the concept of ‘permacrisis’. Participants will consider the applicability and value of this idea to understand the contemporary economic, political and technological environment and their implications for social policies. Participants will debate what makes a development a risk and consider when risks might constitute a crisis. Case studies of the conditions leading to societal collapse, and crucial inflexion points beyond which recovery is no longer possible will be debated. The workshop will examine whether the movement towards mission-based policy making is appropriate and adequate to respond to current dynamic, complex changes and avert risks.

The workshop combines a lecture with interactive discussion exercises to interrogate these issues. The full text of the workshop and relevant sources will be available to participants.

References

Cairney, P., Russell, S. and St Denny, E. (2016) ‘The “Scottish Approach” to Policy and Policymaking: what Issues are Territorial and what are Universal?’, *Policy & Politics*, 44 (3).

Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence & Wishart. Giddens, A. (1999) *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*. London: Routledge.

Mazzucato, M. (2018) ‘Mission-oriented Innovation Policies: Challenges And Opportunities’, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 27 (5).

Morrison, K.D. (2006) ‘Failure and How to Avoid It’, *Nature*, 440, 6th April.

National Advisory Council on Poverty (2025) *We Can Do Better: It Is Not A Safety Net If The Holes Are This Big - the 2025 report* - <https://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/programs/poverty-reduction/national-advisory-council/reports/2025-annual.html>

Russell, S. (2021) ‘Living With Artificial Intelligence’, *BBC Reith Lectures* - <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/m001216k/episodes/player>

Shariatmadari, (2022) ‘Word of the Year 2022: A Year of Permacrisis’ *Collins Language Lovers blog* - <https://blog.collinsdictionary.com/language-lovers/a-year-of-permacrisis/>

Sinclair, S. (2023) ‘What Does the COVID Pandemic Reveal about ‘Strategic’ Government and Welfare Policy?’ *Social Policy Blog*, 17th February -<https://socialpolicyblog.co.uk/2023/02/17/what-does-the-covid-19-pandemic-reveal-about-strategic-government-and-welfare-policy/>

Taylor-Gooby, P. (2004) ‘New Risks and Social Change’, in Taylor-Gooby, P. (ed.) *New Risks, New Welfare: The Transformation of the European Welfare State* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Topper, T. (2025) 'Trump 2 and the Dawn of the Era of Strategic Chaos', *Modern Diplomacy*, 1st March - <https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2025/03/01/trump-2-and-the-dawn-of-the-era-of-strategic-chaos/>

Turnbull, N. (2022) 'Permacrisis: What it Means and Why it's Word of the Year for 2022', *The Conversation*, 11th November.

UK Government (2025) *AI Opportunities Action Plan* -<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-opportunities-action-plan/ai-opportunities-action-plan>

Zuleeg, F. et al (2021) *Europe in the Age of Permacrisis*. European Policy Centre, 11th March - <https://www.epc.eu/en/Publications/Europe-in-the-age-of-permacrisis~3c8a0c>

Prof. Dr. Javornik Jana

From research to reach: Impact, knowledge translation, and the academic-policymaking nexus

Overview

Research impact and knowledge transfer are increasingly expected, yet rarely taught. How does rigorous academic work become knowledge that informs, shapes, or challenges policy and practice? Where does research fit, and where does it not?

This session introduces PhD researchers to the practical and political dimension of research impact. It is designed to help participants think beyond publication and consider how work might contribute to society, policy, and practice, without losing its integrity in the process.

Bringing first-hand insight into how scientific evidence is interpreted, negotiated, and used within policymaking environments, the session offers an honest exploration of what research impact means in practice: who it is for, what counts as knowledge in policy spaces, what it means to be 'policy-relevant', and how power shapes whose evidence gets heard.

The session combines conceptual framing with practical tools. It examines whether and how policymakers use (and misuse) research; the political economy of evidence (including what happens when inconvenient findings are ignored); the ethical limits of engagement (protecting research integrity while remaining relevant); and questions of power, gender/intersectionality. Throughout, the workshop discusses tension between rigour and relevance, advocacy and neutrality, voice and institutional constraint, and unintended consequences.

Preparation | No prior knowledge required. Before attending, skim the reading list and listen to at least one episode of *The Business of Policymaking* (details below).

Materials | Slide deck (key concepts), handout on translating research for policy and practice audiences, impact pathway template.

Expected outcomes

By the end of the session participants will be able to:

- Understand key concepts of research impact, knowledge translation, and knowledge mobilisation
- Identify pathways through which social policy research influences decision-making
- Understand accessible, policy-relevant formats
- Recognise the roles of non-academic partners, timing, and context in shaping impact
- Develop a basic strategy for enhancing the influence of their research.

A note on approach | This workshop is deliberately non-prescriptive. It offers space to think critically, ask difficult questions, and develop a reflexive relationship with what it means to produce evidence for change. Candid questions and challenged assumptions welcome (and expected).

Exercise 1 | The elevator pitch

Translate your thesis for a policymaker audience.

Scenario: You step into a lift with the local or national authority officer, practitioner, or third-sector partner currently working on legislation your research speaks directly to. You do not know each other. This is your one-off chance. You have 90 seconds – roughly the ride from Level 10 to the ground floor.

How do you pitch your results so that they hand you their card and ask for a follow-up?

Exercise 2 | Impact pathway mapping

Using a simple framework, participants sketch a potential impact pathway for their own research:

1. Who needs to know this? - audiences beyond academia
2. What do they need from it? - actionable, accessible, timely
3. How might it reach them? - channels, intermediaries, formats
4. What might get in the way? - gatekeepers, politics, power relations

Suggested Reading & Listening

You are not expected to engage with everything. Read in order of relevance to your own work; skim what time does not allow.

Podcast

The Business of Policymaking | available on all major platforms (SoundCloud, Apple, Spotify, [Captivate – transcripts](#) available). Start with the trailer, then choose the episode closest to your research context – for international policy, try Potočník, Adema, or Petan; for national policy, Scott; for local policy, Hayes; for third-sector practice, Jackson. The full series is worth it if interested in the policymakers' perspectives.

References

Weiss, C.H. 1979. 'The Many Meanings of Research Utilization,' *Public Administration Review*, 39(5), 426-431: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3109916> (a foundational and still essential read, providing multiple models of how research enters policy process and how evidence does not speak for itself)

Stone, D. 2002. 'Using Knowledge: The dilemmas of "Bridging Research and Policy."' *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 32(3), 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305792022000007454> (examines the structural and political tensions at the researcher-policymaker interface, including the roles of intermediaries. Particularly relevant for comparative and cross-national contexts)

Oliver, K., Innvar, S., Lorenc, T. *et al.* 2014. A systematic review of barriers to and facilitators of the use of evidence by policymakers. *BMC Health Serv Res*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-14-2> (empirically grounded review of why evidence often does not translate, actionable for everyone thinking about policy engagement and pairs well with the elevator pitch and impact pathway)

Parkhurst, J. 2016. *The Politics of Evidence: From evidence-based policy to the good governance of evidence* (1st ed.). Routledge. Open Access <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315675008> (introduces the concept of technical and issue bias in evidence use and discusses how evidence is selectively used, misused, and politically governed – a standard reference on the politics of evidence)

McDonough, J.E. 2001. 'Using and Misusing Anecdote in Policy Making,' *Health Affairs*, 20(1), 207-212: <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hlthaff.20.1.207>

Jordan, K. and Carrigan, M. (2018). The impact agenda has led to social media being used in a role it may not be equipped to perform, *LSE Blog Series*: <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2018/05/31/the-impact-agenda-has-led-to-social-media-being-used-in-a-role-it-may-not-be-equipped-to-perform/> (*the role of digital media as the vehicle of research impact*)

Javornik J, Yerkes MA, Jansen E. 2019. 'Ask rather than assume: the capability approach in the practitioner setting'. In: Yerkes MA, Javornik J, Kurowska A, eds. *Social Policy and the Capability Approach: Concepts, Measurements and Application*. Bristol University Press; pp. 107-124: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/social-policy-and-the-capability-approach/ask-rather-than-assume-the-capability-approach-in-the-practitioner-setting/DA28E98B0EDF9C2B3FF3D81F306E227B> (*shifts perspective from academic research to practice by consulting the social policy actors as knowledge-holders - a counterweight to top-down models of knowledge transfer*)

The Conversation – international academics on research impact: <https://theconversation.com/uk/search?q=research+impact>

VIRTUAL NETWORKING – I'd love to hear from you

E | Jana.Javornik@inz.si & Jana.Javornik1@proton.me

BlueSky @janasvenska.bsky.social (in eremition)