

The 2021 Congress of the Swiss Sociological
Association (SSA)



Book of session proposals and call for abstracts

Organizers :

The University of Geneva and the Haute École de Travail Social de Genève
HES-SO,
with the participation of the Graduate Institute of International and
Development Studies

Introducing the congress

Social Justice in Times of Uncertainty takes as a starting point the health pandemic that erupted in 2020, which led societies across the world to cope with disruptions in the provisioning of goods and services, means of livelihood, and fundamental freedom – not least, that of movement. The crisis also revealed global and local inequalities, translated into who has the right to live or not, and raised new questions around (in)justice in the contemporary world. In light of the turmoil experienced, as a globalized society and within our communities, this congress emphasizes the relevance of social and environmental justice in the making of a fair society, asking the question: in times of uncertainty, what does it mean to live a good life in a just society?

For the first time, the Congress of the Swiss Sociological Association will be hosted in Geneva, through a partnership between the University of Geneva and the Haute Ecole de Travail Social de Genève (HETS GE/HES-SO), and with the participation of the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies

Dear Colleagues,

We are pleased to announce that four keynotes will participate in the 2021 Congress titled ***Social Justice in Times of Uncertainty*** :

Amita Baviskar, Professor of Environmental Studies and Sociology & Anthropology at Ashoka University and Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi.

Ota de Leonardis, retired Professor of Sociology of Culture at the Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Milano-Bicocca.

Michèle Lamont, Professor of Sociology and of African and African American Studies and the Robert I. Goldman Professor of European Studies at Harvard University.

Peter Wagner, Research Professor of Social Sciences at the Catalan Institute for Research and Advanced Studies (ICREA) and at the University of Barcelona as well as temporarily project director at Ural Federal University in Yekaterinburg.

We have accepted 19 semi-plenary sessions (including three books presentations, one round table and two film screening & discussions) and 43 paper sessions. Most proposals are in English, some in French and German (we kept the original language of each submitted proposal). We feel that Switzerland is well represented with propositions from Universities and Universities of Applied Sciences and with some international guests. We warmly thank all the contributors!

We invite now paper proposals to the sessions collected in this book.

To submit an abstract proposal (max 500 words, without references) to a paper session, please use the email of the organizers of the session indicated at the bottom of the proposal and send a word document with your abstract and contact details (name, email, address and institutional affiliation).

Deadline for abstract submissions: 29th January 2021.

Your abstract proposal will be evaluated by the organizers of the paper session. You will receive the acceptance letters and finalized program in March 2021. Online registrations to the congress will start at this date.

Once again given the organizational challenges posed by the current pandemic, we must prepare for the possibility of adapting the modalities for this conference. If the situation still requires so, respect for distances will be ensured, as well as wearing masks during any events where this is not the case.

Moreover, a hybrid, semi-virtual solution may be needed to enable as many people as possible to participate in and enrich the congress in the best possible conditions.

For more information, please see our website www.sociocongress2021.ch

The organizing team

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Economic sociology

Inequalities and the Progressive Era	7
Impacts of Finance & Financing of Impacts.....	8
On so many levels. Multi-scalar perceptions of social justice in a pandemic era.....	9

Gender studies

Gender relations in times of crisis: Risks and opportunities for a more just society.....	10
---	----

Health and medicine sociology

Personalized medicine and big data: what are the social issues raised by these medical and technological advances?	11
Social Justice in Times of Uncertainty: perspectives from health and medical sociology	13
Healthcare use, access and inequalities in Switzerland and Europe: innovative methodological and theoretical approaches	14
Health, uncertainty and responsibility	15
Social in/justice through data-driven healthcare technologies: empirical findings of early career researchers	16

Interpretive sociologies

Uncertainty and the il/legitimacy of knowledge and dissent. Interpretive perspectives on Corona measures	17
--	----

Life course

Die normative Orientierung an “der guten Familie” in Zeiten der Unsicherheit: Die Bedeutung von Familienleitbildern in der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe.....	19
Access to social ties and health after retirement age: the issue of inequalities.....	20
The social & gender implications of extending working lives	21

Migration and minorities

Inequalities among young in time of uncertainty	22
<i>En français</i> : Quêtes incertaines de moments et d’espaces de bonne vie : expériences croisées de femmes et familles immigrantes, de bénévoles et professionnel.le.s de la santé et du social.....	23
<i>In English</i> : Uncertain quests for times and places of good life: experiences of immigrant women, families, as well as volunteers and health/social care professionals.....	24
Agency of forced migrants: Dealing with uncertainty in hostile migration contexts.....	25

Social problems

Who deserves what? Social policy and deservingness in times of crisis	26
Überwachen, Profilieren, Intervenieren. Zur Regulierung «sozialer Marginalitäten» in Zeiten der Ungewissheit.	27

Sociology of arts and culture

Arts and Culture in Times of Crisis	29
---	----

Sociology of education

Les enjeux de justice sociale en formation professionnelle.....	31
---	----

<i>Auf Deutsch:</i> Regionale Differenzen in den Bildungsangeboten, Zulassungsbedingungen und Bildungsverläufen in der Schweiz: Ursprünge, Governance und Folgen	33
---	----

<i>En français :</i> Différences régionales en matière d'offres de formation, de conditions d'admission et de parcours de formation en Suisse : sources, gouvernance et impacts	35
--	----

Sociology of morality

<i>En français :</i> Morale et hybridation (version en français).....	36
---	----

<i>In English:</i> Morality and hybridity (English version).....	36
--	----

Other research networks

Across research networks

Arculating food, place and social justice in the context of global health and environmental uncertainties.....	38
---	----

Assistance sous contrainte

La parole des publics dans les dispositifs de protection des mineurs et des majeurs (XIX ^e -XX ^e siècles)	39
--	----

Gender and Social policies

Family, Work and Social policies: A gender lens on social (in)justice	40
---	----

Nationales Forschungsprogramm NFP 76 - Fürsorge und Zwang; Schweizerischer Nationalfonds

Spannungsfelder und Ungewissheiten im Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutz. Aktuelle empirische Studien zum System des Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutzes in der Schweiz.....	41
--	----

Sociology of consumption

Sustainability and social justice	43
---	----

Sociology of organizations

Anchoring International Organizations in the Study of Organizational Sociology.....	44
---	----

Sociology of sport

Social Justice and Inequities in Sport and Physical Activity in Times of Uncertainty.....	45
---	----

Other topics

La « bonne vie » des chercheurs.euses en sciences humaines et sociales	46
--	----

Discovering Precarity, Reinventing Justice? Covid-19 in the Realm of Work	47
---	----

Engaging pluralist perspectives in civic interventions: neopragmatism and social research	48
---	----

Social inequalities and orders of justification in the health care system.....	49
--	----

Gesellschaftliche Ungerechtigkeiten verstehen: Welchen Beitrag leistet Armutsforschung?	50
---	----

Privation de liberté en temps de pandémie et justice sociale	51
--	----

Bénévolat en temps de crise : (re)configurations des engagements.....	52
Childhood: politics and moral economies in times of global crises	53
Conducting qualitative research in times of uncertainties: Methodological and ethical considerations	54
<i>En français</i> : Penser le travail et les vieillesse : au croisement des sociologies	55
<i>In English</i> : Working with old age: at the crossroads of sociological theories	56
Waste and modern societies	57
Les chemins numériques d'accès aux droits et prestations sociales à l'aune de la justice sociale.	58
Building platforms: management, organization and (in)justice.....	59
Blog presentation	
CO-VIES20 – Vivre (dé)confiné-e-s, penser en commun	60
Supports	62

Economic sociology
Inequalities and the Progressive Era

Guillaume Vallet, University of Grenoble Alpes

Book presentation

The American Progressive Era (1890-1920) is a key period in the history of American capitalism. Indeed, this period takes place in the context of the post-civil war and prolongs the 'Gilded Age', which corresponds to the industrial 'take-off' of the United States. The American Progressive Era was characterized by deep ambivalence, between economic and social progress on the one hand, and growing inequalities of different natures on the other. Concretely, this is a period dominated by monopolies, the development of financial capitalism, but also by the first concrete economic and social advances (market regulation, social laws, etc.). Likewise, the idea of progress aimed at developing the emancipation of individuals to build the American nation and democracy is coupled with a still marked segregation with regard to women or the black population. In the name of the collective progress of American society, sexism, racism and eugenics in particular are not always clearly condemned. Consequently, in this particular context, several reformist thoughts emerge, notably by academics in the social sciences. Academics like R.T. Ely (in Economics) and A. Small (in Sociology), for example, sought to use a multidisciplinary approach to define and implement new types of economic and social policies, especially involving state intervention. In other words, they believed that the construction of a 'reasonable' capitalism was possible, 'reasonable' meaning for them the possibility of a third way between liberal capitalism and communism. But it is also important to understand that this progressive era fits itself into a particular phase of capitalism, marked by the second industrial revolution in many countries of the 'old continent', but also by the development of imperialism, colonialism and exacerbated nationalism. Consequently, other countries in the world are undergoing profound economic and social transformations which give birth to innovative thoughts, but also sometimes conservative on the issue of inequalities of various natures: economic, social, political, gender, ethnic.

The session will focus on the presentation of the book dedicated to this issue, entitled *Inequalities and the Progressive Era. Breakthroughs and Legacies* (Published in June 2020) [Edward Elgar Publishing]. Resting on an innovative approach, the book gather international researchers from different social sciences on the topics. Moreover, this session welcomes contributions from researchers aiming to deal with an issue related to the topics. Papers could be either theoretical or empirical, focusing on a specific theme or scholars of the period. Likewise, since the Progressive Era is characterized by the inception of the institutionalization of the social sciences in the United States, papers coping with this issue would be highly appreciated.

Please submit your proposal to Guillaume Vallet : guillaume.vallet@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Impacts of Finance & Financing of Impacts

Lena Ajdacic University of Lausanne, Felix Bühlmann University of Lausanne; Fabien Foureault University of Lausanne, Noé Kabouche, University of Neuchatel & Sciences Po, Paris; François Schoenberger University of Lausanne.

Since the 1970s, financialization of economic life has turned finance, financial behaviors and financial mechanisms into omnipresent companions of our everyday life. Financialization is defined by Krippner (2005) as a “pattern of accumulation in which profits accrue primarily through financial channels rather than through trade and commodity production”. This evolution goes along with a massive spread of investment activities into social life, involving citizens in financial schemes (Boussard, 2017; Carruthers & Arriovich, 2010) and granting financial institutions a growing influence in domains such as politics, culture or health alike. In this workshop, we would like to discuss the concept of financialization and the impact finance has on governments, firms and individuals.

On the one hand, we shall examine the impacts of financial activities on our societies (Arrighi, 1994; Tregenna, 2009; Godechot, 2012; Lazarus, 2020). What influence does finance have on politics and policy making, for instance in the domains of taxation, housing or welfare? How does financialization transform business, corporate governance and organization of the economic processes (Davis, 2009; Baker & Smith, 1998)? How does financialization influence the distribution of wealth, risks and income? How does finance affect social justice and social equality (Lin & Tobias Neely, 2020)? From the aftermaths of financial crises on households to the inequalities of remuneration within financial institutions, we are interested how finance impacts our lives.

On the other hand, we would like to examine the concept of impact, but backwards, by focusing on a movement of finance that aims at investing in positive social impacts. Sustainable finance denotes practices that link social and environmental justice to financial activities, through authority of state and regulation (Chiapello, 2015; Knoll, 2015, 2019), as well as through action of NGOs (Soule, 2009) or private initiatives, with responsible investments (Sparkes & Cowton, 2004). Today, the actors of this sector claim that the financial sector has a major role to play in the main social challenges of our time, advocating for the spread of social and ecological investments, for instance known as microfinance, ESG investing or impact investing (Barman, 2015; Gregory, 2016; Höchstädter & Scheck, 2015).

For this workshop we welcome contributions from all theoretical and methodological approaches. Our aim is to create a dialogue between research papers that focus on one or both aspects of this proposal. This discussion shall enable us to think about the place and the role of finance in the current issues related to social justice in Switzerland and beyond.

Please submit your proposal to Noé Kabouche, noe.kabouche@unine.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

On so many levels. Multi-scalar perceptions of social justice in a pandemic era

Stéphane Moulin, Université de Montréal

Since the early 1990s, numerous studies have gradually given rise to a new field: that of organizational justice. These studies have developed our knowledge of workers' perceptions of fairness with regard to the treatment they receive from and within their organization. From this perspective, social justice in the workplace is analyzed through four dimensions: procedural, distributive, interpersonal and informational. Perceptions of fairness can be aggregated (overall justice) or disaggregated (multifoci justice model and target similarity perspectives) which makes it possible to distinguish between supervisory justice, peer or coworker justice, customer justice or perceptions towards unions during collective bargaining. These studies shed light on how shared perceptions of fairness form within organization (justice climate), how the perception of fairness is experienced by a third party (third-party justice) and how actions taken by companies are perceived (corporate social responsibility).

One limitation of these approaches to social justice has become clearer in light of the Covid-19 pandemic: an organization-centered approach does not make it possible to problematize the perceptions of social justice at a more macro level. The coronavirus epidemic has highlighted the crucial role of the public authorities, the only one capable of managing the way out of the crisis but whose public services and staff had been undermined by the neoliberal reforms of recent years. In a time of uncertainty, public perceptions of social justice focus on cross-organizational issues such as minimum labor standards, social insurances, gender equity, structural racism, legal framework of teleworking or exposure to health risks. Yet, comparative studies show substantial international differences in social protection, labour standards, work-related cultures, ethos or values or sensitivity to inequalities and fairness.

Multi-scalar approaches of perceptions of justice tend to show how the norms and principles that govern the perceptions of social justice differ between nations as well as between sectors of the same nation and between organizations in the same sector. How macro-level perceptions of justice are associated with the perceptions of organizational justice? What can we learn from the international and inter-sectorial comparisons of perceptions of social justice during the Covid-19 pandemic? This panel invites multi-scalar perspectives on perceptions of social justice.

Please submit your proposal to Stéphane Moulin, stephane.moulin@umontreal.ca

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Gender relations in times of crisis: Risks and opportunities for a more just society

Brigitte Liebig, Institute for Sociology, University of Basel

Far-reaching societal challenges, such as those associated with armed conflicts, climate change, ecological disasters, financial crises or the current global corona pandemic, often do have consequences for our social order. As a determining part of this order, gender relations are confronted with the manifold effects of these crises in all areas of social life. The social consequences of crises often differ between the genders in terms of work, family, education, public access and sexuality. The perception, representation and management of crises in particular reveals how social, economic and gender inequalities are dealt with.

Times of social insecurity potentially go along with the emergence of new social inequalities and injustices as well as the risk of a return to traditional work and power relations, and a “re-traditionalisation” of ways of life, gender constructions and identities. However, crises potentially also offer the opportunity for a renegotiation of the established gender order, for the innovation of former routines and rationalities - thus they provide new options for individual action as well as social and political reforms.

The manifold and sometimes contradictory social implications and consequences of social crises for gender relations, relationships and constructions are the focus of this paper session: It will examine past and present crises from various theoretical and empirical perspectives, including intersectional, queer feminist, post-colonial approaches:

- What role do gender relations and constructions play in times of crises? How do men and women cope with crises?
- Which implications do crises have for gender-related work and power relations, for work- and family-related life courses and social (in)justice?
- What significance do crises have for the social value of work (e.g. care work) and the social roles associated with it?
- What are the challenges and opportunities of broaching the gender dimension and other socially constructed differences in the course of a crisis, its public/medial perception and its management?
- How can gender studies contribute towards ensuring that lessons are learned from the current crises in order to enable a "good life" for everybody?

Please submit your proposal to Brigitte Liebig, brigitte.liebig@fhnw.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Personalized medicine and big data: what are the social issues raised by these medical and technological advances?

Monica Aceti, University of Basel; Maria Caiata Zufferey, Professor, SUPSI - *Scuola universitaria professionale della Svizzera italiana*

Considered the "medicine of the future", personalized medicine (Guchet, 2016) has made significant advances, particularly in precision oncology thanks to the advent of high-throughput sequencing. The acceleration of diagnostics, as well as "tailor-made" therapies, have improved the treatment of hereditary cancers. These advances have also raised hope for curing chronic, mental and/or orphan diseases. Nonetheless, they also invoke a number of fears (Aceti et al., 2020). In order to understand these tensions, three themes seem to be of major interest from a sociological perspective.

Firstly, predictive medicine is not focused on symptoms but on predispositions to develop a disease. In this sense, it is applied to anticipate, monitor or accompany pathogenic risks. While it is promising because it offers previously unimaginable care opportunities, it also raises questions concerning the health injunctions that may accompany it (Caiata Zufferey, 2015). Analyzing the effects of predictive and probabilistic health care is, thus, a crucial issue, especially since it raises the problem of the unequal disposition of different social strata to comply with preventive practices and to benefit from them afterwards.

Second, personalized health integrates individual data (such as diet, physical activity, mobility) with health data. It is a growing field that relies more on preventive behaviors than on curative instruments. In this approach, patients are actors of their health and will collect and manage their personal health data in a proactive way, often participating in online databases. The collection of these data raises issues related to big data, to their management and to the various uses of them, whether these uses are scientific, commercial, recreational or abusive.

Thirdly, from a broader point of view, this "revolutionary" medicine is based on genome editing techniques and more recently on the "molecular scissors" of the geneticists Charpentier and Doudna (Nobel Prize in Chemistry 2020). Over and above the potential benefits, the possibility to modify our genome raises questions about our intangible genetic heritage, either human or non-human. The innocuity of these modifications, which are transmissible to human offspring, is currently not assured and calls for caution.

Based on these considerations, we welcome proposals for contributions addressing the issues of social equality and inequities related to personalized medicine. Additional themes are the social consequences of scientific, genetic and technological advances oriented towards health prediction and disease prevention.

The following list of topics (non-exhaustive) would be welcome:

- Predictive medicine and health moralization
- (Un-)certainties generated by genetic knowledge
- Protection of personal health data and confidentiality
- Unequal access to gene therapies
- Perverse effects of unrealistic promises of healing
- Genetic traceability
- Deviations of genetic uses

References

Aceti M., Tsantoulis P., Chappuis P., Hurst-Majno S., Burton-Jeangros C., « Imaginaires associés aux avancées de la génétique et « médecine du futur » : le monde merveilleux de l'homo geneticus ? Une analyse par forums citoyens, *Revue Áltera, Revista de Antropologia*, João Pessoa, v. 1, n. 10, p. 90-128, jan./jun. 2020, <https://periodicos.ufpb.br/index.php/altera/article/view/48448>

Caiata-Zufferey, M. (2015). Genetically at-risk status and individual agency. A qualitative study on asymptomatic women living with genetic risk of breast/ovarian cancer. *Social Science & Medicine*, 132, 141-148.

Guchet X. (2016). *La médecine personnalisée. Un essai philosophique*. Les Belles Lettres, Paris.

Please submit your proposal to Monica Aceti, monica.aceti@unibas.ch and Maria Caiata, maria.caiata@supsi.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Social Justice in Times of Uncertainty: perspectives from health and medical sociology

Stéphane Cullati and Raphaël Hammer, #PopHealthLab, University of Fribourg

For the RN-SHM <https://www.sgs-sss.ch/en/research-networks/health-and-medicine-sociology>

Call of the Research Network Sociology of Health and Medicine (RN-SHM)

In contemporary societies, uncertainty is part of the lives of individuals, regardless of where and when they live. Societies, communities, and other social institutions are meant to reduce the uncertainty of lives by offering protection, education, work, and especially health and access to healthcare. Uncertainty can be a driver for the life course, a motivation to surpass oneself, a source of change or an obstacle to initiative but, also, a factor of ill health. Growing up in unstable families (divorce, property taken away, violence, poverty, etc.) can direct children on socially disadvantaged life course pathways, and ultimately to poorer health. Uncertainty at work cause psychosocial stress to employees and workers. Uncertainty about future pensions received at retirement can increase anxiety and worries. And, recently, the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic has plunged our societies into great uncertainties, both in the short term at the sanitarian level and in the medium and long term at the social and economic levels.

Just and egalitarian societies can mitigate the negative impact of uncertainties on the lives and health of individuals. Recent trends in contemporary societies showed both increase of living standards and security, but also increase of social and health inequalities, which have been accentuated by the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. Is the impact temporary or structural? Are inequalities at the micro, meso and macro level cumulating? The health care system itself and the medical and health personnel have also been under pressure, pointing to vulnerability of hospitals.

Moreover, suddenly arrived, the COVID-19 pandemic has been concurrently studied by the scientific community and managed by public health authorities while in the media spotlights. The convergence of this viral epidemic with an “infodemic”, or “digital epidemic”, is not trivial. Media and social media are saturated with information, potentially reassuring, but also contradictory and generating uncertainty. Controversies that have aroused in the public debate about wearing a mask and potential treatments for example have also emphasised scientific uncertainty and the importance of lay population trust in expert authorities.

This call invites abstracts addressing one or more of the above-mentioned issues. Empirical abstract can be qualitative, quantitative or both. Theoretical abstracts and reviews are welcome too. We also welcome contributions outside this issue but link with the usual topics and research domains of sociology of health and medicine. Abstract are welcome in English but can be submitted in German and French.

Please submit your proposal to Stéphane Cullati, stephane.cullati@unifr.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Healthcare use, access and inequalities in Switzerland and Europe: innovative methodological and theoretical approaches

Vladimir Jolidon, Vincent De Prez ; Dr Stéphane Cullati

Research has revealed substantial differences in the healthcare use and access of different groups in Switzerland and across European countries, particularly of disadvantaged groups. This phenomenon has been observed through a broad range of healthcare services, including preventive health services. The persistence of differential utilisation and “social gradients” in healthcare use and access highlights the need for innovative methods and theories to help reveal the underlying mechanisms of such disparities.

For example, cross-national comparisons have helped shed light on how particular societal and system arrangements shape healthcare access. National approaches have also made important contributions with longitudinal studies and trend analysis. Health and medical sociologists have increasingly emphasised the need to contextualise health inequalities, accounting for the effect of policies and institutions, for examples from the perspective of “institutional theory” or the “diffusion of innovation theory”. They have stressed the importance of macro-level contexts in shaping the distribution of resources which matter to individuals’ health, and such approach may also apply to healthcare use and access. In other words, the persistence of disparities in healthcare access may be attributed to individual resources such as educational level, income, social capital, health literacy and labour conditions at a micro-level, and how resources are (re)distributed in a population by institutions such as welfare social policies, healthcare system arrangements, labour markets, or education systems, at a macro level. These may affect individuals’ potential for access to, utilisation of, and adherence towards health services, practices or guidelines. Further research is needed to better understand the dynamics that affect the population and specific groups in their healthcare access. Further theoretical developments supported by empirical evidence to deepen our understanding of the “social determinants of healthcare access” and the multiple factors at play are also needed.

This session invites both theoretical and empirical studies, quantitative and/or qualitative, that research topics of healthcare use, access and inequalities in Switzerland and Europe, from a national or cross-national perspective, and a micro and/or macro approach.

Research questions:

- Which mechanisms (re)produce inequalities in access to and use of healthcare services (including preventive health)? What are the logics behind the barriers to healthcare access faced by disadvantaged groups?
- What drives people towards the over-consumption of healthcare services?
- Which system and social mechanisms, including policy and institutional contexts, contribute to shaping inequalities in healthcare access and use, and how? Which micro- and macro-level factors are at play?
- How does the reproduction of social inequalities into health inequalities relate to the institutional context and (in)effective health promotion policies?

Please submit your proposal to Vladimir Jolidon, vladimir.jolidon@unige.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Health and medicine sociology
Health, uncertainty and responsibility

Irina Radu, Raphaël Hammer and Solène Gouilhers

Zurich University of Applied Sciences (ZHAW), School of Health Professions

Risk has been depicted as one of the core features of our contemporary societies, reflecting the growing use of science in understanding and governing uncertain events (Giddens 1990). The language of risk has become pervasive in medicine and public health policies (Armstrong 1995). Alongside with risk, uncertainty is an important characteristic of social regulation of health. For example, uncertainty, as a concept in its own right, is slow to be implemented in health policies. Indeed, it is largely avoided, as direct and simple messaging is preferred to admitting that one is not quite sure what the proper measures in a particular situation might be (Sarkki et al. 2014). This has important consequences on individuals' risk perceptions and behaviours and it places the focus on individual responsibility and accountability for ones' health. A frequently used example is the risk associated with alcohol consumption and smoking during pregnancy (Bell, McNaughton, and Salmon 2009; Lowe and Lee 2010). Another recent example are the policies adopted by some countries during the first and second waves of the COVID-19 pandemic, which stressed the individuals' responsibility to adopt behaviours that lower their risk of contracting and spreading the virus, an option not equally open to all citizens.

Beside the issue of how uncertainty shapes health policies and how health policies integrate uncertainty and its consequences, this call for papers also welcomes contributions addressing how lay people manage health amidst uncertainty in everyday life. Zinn (2008) suggested that individuals cope with risk and uncertainty using a variety of strategies, including hope, faith or trust. Handling uncertainty is more complex than merely internalising expert advice. It cannot be separated from the values and emotions involved, and the moralisation of health in the context of the "new public health" and the individualisation of risk management (Petersen and Lupton 1996). While individuals are expected to take responsibility for reducing risks, they usually make decisions under uncertainty in connection with the constraints and multiple other dimensions of their existence, as in the case of the genetically at-risk status (Caiata-Zuffery 2015).

In this session, we would like to invite empirical or theoretical contributions exploring the complex links between risk, uncertainty and responsibility in health management. Such contributions could explore broader issues such as the moral consequences of risk policies at the level of lay people's experiences, health policies or healthcare organisations, as well as their implications for access to health and equity in health.

Please submit your proposal (in in English, German and French) to Irina Radu,

irina.radu@zhaw.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Social in/justice through data-driven healthcare technologies: empirical findings of early career researchers

Martina von Arx University of Geneva; Laetitia Della Bianca and Pralong Mélody
University of Lausanne

Healthcare technologies relying on continuous data collection and algorithmic evaluation are gaining importance and have been pushed further by the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in 2020. These digital tools are often promoted as inclusive and empowering for their users. Yet, while creating more social justice for some, they might produce other blind spots of social injustice for others. The present session invites early career scholars to present their empirical findings regarding the development and/or use of healthcare technologies (such as mobile health apps, telemedical tools, monitoring technologies, algorithmic treatments, etc.) within different matrices of power. Our aim is to gather understandings of the roles played by various actors within different networks of specific data-driven healthcare technologies.

This paper session especially seeks to address the inclusionary and exclusionary effects of data-driven healthcare technologies. It questions to what extent such technologies blur traditional boundaries of healthcare and uncertainty in medical decision-making. Moreover, this session aims at disentangling whether related activities remain geographically and temporally bound. We, therefore, invite papers that address one or several of the following questions:

- How are algorithms interfering with the expertise of healthcare professionals and patients? Where and when does the so promoted anytime and anywhere healthcare take place?
- How do data-driven healthcare technologies reconfigure health inequalities?
- Are privacy concerns a privilege of the healthy?
- To which extent do algorithmic technologies allow for more precise and fair medical decisions?
- How do people adapt to or resist healthcare technologies?
- Which health-related issues do these technologies address and which are ignored?
- Who has access to these technologies and the data they produce, and to whom is such access denied?
- Which places are configured as 'well-suited' for the use of such technologies, and which ones are excluded?
- How do these technologies reconfigure and redistribute the medical work within traditional and less traditional healthcare settings?
- What role do concepts such as justice and rights play in the design of data-driven healthcare technologies?

We especially welcome contributions that draw on Science and Technology Studies, Feminist Technoscience Studies, Critical Data Studies, Sociology of Health and Medicine, and use an intersectional lens to question the role that gender, race, disability, migration, and class may play in such practices.

Please submit your proposal to Martina von Arx, martina.vonarx@unige.ch, Laetitia Della Bianca, laetitia.dellabianca@unil.ch and Melody Pralong, melody.pralong@unil.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Uncertainty and the il/legitimacy of knowledge and dissent. Interpretive perspectives on Corona measures

Florian Elliker, University of St.Gallen; Eva Nadai, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland; Christoph Maeder, Zurich University of Teacher Education

The Covid 19-pandemic has shaken societies around the globe and left them struggling for adequate responses. Containment measures encompass a wide range of actions, from frequent hand-washing to the shutdown of economic and social life. For liberal Western societies they constitute unprecedented personal and economic constraints, which call for strong legitimations. Not surprisingly, medical expertise plays a crucial role in public debate. Yet, it seems that neither such abstract scientific knowledge nor mere government directives suffice to institutionalize behavioral changes in everyday life that contradict deeply ingrained certainties. Likewise, the drastic economic constraints and the measures to mitigate their consequences raise questions of legitimacy and social justice: does it serve the common good to stunt the economy? Who deserves what kind of state support? Thus, most of the Corona measures – indeed, the reality of the pandemic itself – are highly contested. This paper session is devoted to the analysis of conflicting interpretations of the pandemic and of the institutionalization and legitimation of Corona measures and addresses three broad topics:

- (1) Most measures against the pandemic are introduced by regulative institutionalization, which is preceded and accompanied by normative justifications. To which values do these legitimations refer (e.g. health as the highest good, solidarity with ‘risk groups’); how is ‘responsible’ juxtaposed to egotistic ‘irresponsible’ behavior; what kind of symbols, pictures, graphs and figures of argumentation are used to both stress the urgency and appropriateness of measures and their (moral) legitimacy (e.g. in the Federal “Protect yourself and others”-campaign)?
- (2) The medical knowledge shaping our understanding of the pandemic is “translated” for the public and the authorities responsible for measures. However, lay people cannot verify the accuracy of the bewildering flood of provisional and contradictory scientific information circulating in the media; the bewilderment exacerbated by an image of science as truth-producing endeavor that eliminates equivocality. It is therefore a matter of trust and belief to accept or deny the picture of the pandemic presented by the experts. Conflicting positions raise the question of how the lines are drawn between ‘rational’ argumentation and ‘irrational’ dissent. Which body of knowledge is regarded as a legitimate or illegitimate foundation of criticism in dominant discourse? On what kind of knowledge do radical Corona skeptics base their view of the pandemic? How do the various actors conceive of, use and address science?
- (3) As a disruptive and rare type of event, the pandemic and the counter-measures to contain it contribute to a more general sense of uncertainty, resulting from a range of diverse developments such as “flexible” labor market policies, a partial dismantling of welfare, cultural diversification and global warming threatening the current social order. These developments question established knowledge and identities that guide individual and collective sense-making and social action. The resulting sense of uncertainty is accompanied by a rise in assertions of *certainty*. Often upheld against scientific scepticism, these can be interpreted as efforts to maintain subjective realities and symbolic universes and to make sense of an increasingly complex social order. The pandemic thus raises the question of how actors engage in reality maintenance in times of uncertainty. What kind of everyday epistemologies underpin ‘definitive’ interpretations of the world? How are these claims embedded in or resonate with specific everyday life-worlds?

The session is designated to theoretical and empirical papers that consider these topics from an interpretive or qualitative perspective. Besides discursive and ethnographic analyses, studies of visual communication are particularly welcome.

Abstracts should be submitted in English and should not be longer than one page. Papers can be presented in French, German or English.

Please submit your proposal to Florian Elliker, florian.elliker@unig.ch; Eva Nadai, eva.nadai@fhnw.ch and Christoph Maeder, christoph.maeder@phzh.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Die normative Orientierung an “der guten Familie” in Zeiten der Unsicherheit: Die Bedeutung von Familienleitbildern in der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe.

Eveline Ammann Dula and Andrea Abraham

Bern University of applied sciences

Die normative Orientierung an “der guten Familie” ist nicht nur in Zeiten der Unsicherheit relevant. Bisherige Studien weisen darauf hin, dass in der Schweizer Geschichte normative Vorstellungen von Familie bedeutend waren für Fremdplatzierungen und Zwangsmassnahmen von Kindern und Jugendlichen. Dies ist ersichtlich darin, dass Faktoren die Wahrscheinlichkeit erhöhten, Opfer solcher Massnahmen zu werden wie beispielsweise Mittellosigkeit/Armut, ein als unkonventionell erachteter Lebensstil der Eltern (sogenannt liederlicher Lebenswandel oder voreheliche Schwangerschaft der Mutter), Bildungsferne der Eltern oder die Verwitwung eines Elternteils (vgl. Huonker 2014; Muschetti 2016). Diese Begründungen verweisen auf die Relevanz des sozio-ökonomischen Status, sowie der Orientierung am bürgerlichen Familienideal, auf Grund dessen betroffene Kinder und Jugendliche massive Ungerechtigkeit erfuhren, beispielsweise in Form einer Fremdplatzierungen. Die Akzeptanz gegenüber einer Vielfalt möglicher Familienkonstellationen und -vorstellungen ist seit den 1980er Jahren gestiegen (Böllert 2015). Trotz dieser gesellschaftlichen (Teil-)Anerkennung der unterschiedlichen Familienformen lässt sich jedoch noch immer eine normative Hierarchisierung feststellen, die mit unterschiedlichen Vor- resp. Nachteilen für die Familienmitglieder einhergeht (Richter 2016). Das Familienleitbild der bürgerlichen Kleinfamilie entfaltet nach wie vor eine Wirkmächtigkeit auf individueller, gesellschaftlicher sowie politischer Ebene und wird als Referenzfolie für “die gute Familie” herangezogen. Es stellt sich die Frage, inwiefern in Zeiten der Unsicherheit sich der Einfluss diesem Familienleitbilds verändert.

Hier setzt dieses Panel an und lädt ein, Beiträge zu folgenden Fragestellungen einzureichen:

- Wie haben sich Familienleitbilder und deren Einfluss im Verlauf der Zeit verändert? Welche Familienleitbilder sind heute für die Kinder- und Jugendhilfe (insbesondere im Bereich Kinderschutz) relevant?
- Inwiefern verändert sich in Zeiten der Unsicherheit die Bedeutung von normativen Familienbildern im Kontext der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe? Was bedeutet dies für ein gutes Leben in einer gerechten Gesellschaft?
- Welchen Einfluss haben Familienleitbilder für intergenerationale Transmissionsprozesse zwischen Eltern und ihren Kindern?
- Inwiefern stehen heutige Familienideale in Zusammenhang mit intersektionalen Verschränkungen sozialer Ungleichheitsformen?
- Wie können intersektionale Verschränkungen sozialer Ungleichheitsformen methodisch in die Analyse von Familienideale einbezogen werden?
- Welche methodischen Herausforderungen stellen sich für die Erforschung der Auswirkung normativer Familienleitbilder im Kontext der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe?

Access to social ties and health after retirement age: the issue of inequalities

Marie Baeriswyl and Michel Oris

Centre for the Interdisciplinary Study of Gerontology and Vulnerability, Swiss
National Centre of Competences in Research LIVES, University of Geneva

The COVID pandemic has led to contradictory social expectations about older adults (in particular people aged 65 and over). Indeed, in the past decades, the encouragement of an active aging as an important component of individual and collective well-being has become crucial in scientific and political discourses on aging, promoting a positive image of older age. However, not only the health crisis has suddenly limited the social participation of older adults, but the crisis has also made from their vulnerability a central issue: their frailty was (and remain) at the heart of the strategies dealing with the pandemic and was made highly visible in the media. At the individual level, this situation revealed a heterogeneous population. Two extremes characterize this diversity: on the one side, there are older adults being in excellent health, who during the pandemic were in fear that they could not participate in social life anymore and expressed openly their disagreement with the stigma of their age group as vulnerable population; on the other side, other older adults experienced the pandemic in fear of the disease, accepting the imposed social isolation whether they liked it or not.

Retired people have been affected to a lesser extent by the economic vulnerabilities linked to health crisis. However, the issue of inequalities is still crucial in this population, between the variety of realities they live. Indeed, social participation and relationships, as well as health and care, are significant resources during the life course that are not equally distributed in terms of socioeconomic position, gender, age or ethnicity. The risks of isolation, disease or lack of access to care do not affect all social categories in the same way.

This session aims to discuss the living conditions after retirement age addressing in particular the issue of the inequalities of access to health, formal and informal care, social participation or relationships. Contributions that address the complex links between health and social integration in the perspective of inequalities are particularly welcome, likewise contributions addressing the intersectionality of the various forms of social stratification (gender, age, ethnicity, socioeconomic position). By this, we want to gain insight into the heterogeneity characterizing the population of older adults and the possible unequal mechanisms that shape this diversity. We also want to question processes of accumulated disadvantages across the life course that can lead to highly vulnerable and precarious situations in older age.

Please submit your proposal to Marie Baeriswyl, marie.baeriswyl@unige.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

The social & gender implications of extending working lives

Nicky Le Feuvre,

Université de Lausanne & PNR LIVES ; Nathalie Rougier, Isabelle Zinn

Largely promoted by international bodies such as the OECD , policy initiatives for extending working lives (EWL) are now widespread, despite the negative implications raised by a number of international research projects (e.g. COST Action IS1409 Gender & Health Impacts of Policies Extending Working Life & NORFACE – DIAL project DAISIE). In line with the overall objectives of the Congress, this Workshop aims to address the “social justice” implications of this normative vision of extending working lives, particularly from a gender equality perspective.

Speakers will be invited to consider the policy mechanisms underpinning the drive to extend working lives / delayed retirement, the practical experiences of older workers and their families (including their working conditions, health issues and work-life balance challenges), and the implications of extending working lives from a gender equality / vulnerability perspective.

Please submit your proposal to Nicky Le Feuvre, nicky.lefeuvre@unil.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Inequalities among young in time of uncertainty

Eduardo Guichard, Milena Chimienti, Claudio Bolzman HES-SO, Haute école de travail social de Gèneve(HETS-GE) ; And Jean-Marie Le Goff, University of Lausanne ;

The objective of this session is to discuss how did young people with a migratory background live and react in context of uncertainty comparing their situation with those without a migratory background in different European countries. Speakers will be invited to consider the inequalities and vulnerabilities which are specific to the individuals belonging to the so-called second generation youth and to compare their processes of accumulation of advantages with those of young adults of native-Swiss origin.

Our general hypothesis is that the migratory background is a 'starting point' from which the life courses of youth diverge. The session will discuss the following question: How did young people live and react to context of uncertainty? What are the differences among young in their transition to adulthood comparing the case of those with and without a migratory background? This paper session will bring together scholars on second generation from Switzerland, France, Germany and the Netherlands.

We welcome empirical comparative studies on young adults with and without a migratory background. We are especially interested in studies reflecting on the pandemic context and its effects on the life-course of young adults.

Submit your abstract specifying the research question, data, methods and findings.

Please submit your proposal to Eduardo Guichard, eduardo.guichard@hesge.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

En français : Quêtes incertaines de moments et d'espaces de bonne vie : expériences croisées de femmes et familles immigrantes, de bénévoles et professionnel.le.s de la santé et du social

Patricia Perrenoud and Elise Rapp

Haute Ecole de Santé du Canton de Vaud (HESAV), School of health

Dans les régions francophones et anglophones du Nord de l'Europe et de l'Amérique, la bonne vie est fréquemment posée en des termes de liberté, d'autonomie, de responsabilité et de réalisation de soi. Cette vision individualiste, néolibérale, est interrogée depuis plusieurs décennies en sciences humaines et sociales, car elle ne tient compte ni des inégalités sociales, ni des visions plus collectives de la vie et du développement humain. Cette session propose d'explorer les expériences de femmes et de familles immigrantes habitant ces régions et d'interroger tant ce qui facilite que ce qui interfère avec l'accès à des instants et des espaces de bonne vie. Sur différents terrains de recherche, l'idée d'une bonne vie n'apparaît en effet pas comme un état stable, un objectif qui pourrait s'atteindre par différentes stratégies, mais plutôt comme un résultat temporaire, parfois fugace, émergeant de différentes conditions matérielles ou sociales et de la rencontre avec d'autres, femmes et familles immigrantes, bénévoles ou professionnel.le.s de la santé et du social. Comprenant des interventions émanant de chercheur.e.s en sciences sociales et d'acteurs et actrices du milieu associatif, la session illustrera comment les statuts de séjour, l'accès au logement ou à l'emploi, la relation aux outils numériques ou le maintien des liens familiaux, contribuent à l'expérience d'une plus ou moins bonne vie de femmes et familles immigrantes.

Au-delà de grandes catégories telles celles du logement ou de l'emploi, la session propose également un abord microsocial d'une quête plus ou moins explicite, plus ou moins facilitée, d'une bonne vie, en analysant des éléments concrets partagés par des femmes, des familles, ainsi que des bénévoles et des professionnel.le.s de la santé et du social. Différents discours, expériences et pratiques, qui questionnent les visions culturelles occidentales de l'autonomie, contredisant en particulier l'utilisation de cette notion en tant qu'indicateur de l'expérience d'une bonne vie ou de la réalisation d'un accompagnement professionnel et bénévole efficace. Enfin, entre trajectoires de vie, capacités, rencontres fortuites et pratiques émergentes, la session questionne les quêtes de moments de bonne vie en marge de la standardisation des procédures des soins de santé et de l'aide sociale, et en considérant la superdiversité des femmes et des familles immigrantes.

Pour cette session, nous recherchons des propositions de présentations qui sont soit issues de recherches, soit issues d'analyses d'une pratique associative ou professionnelle. Des travaux qui décrivent les expériences de femmes et familles immigrantes, à partir de leurs voix ou de celles de leurs interlocuteurs.trices bénévoles ou professionnel.le.s. La participation d'associations de femmes et familles immigrantes est également souhaitée. Nous sommes en particulier intéressé.e.s par des présentations qui partant d'exemples concrets, à un niveau microsocial, permettent de discuter les espaces et les moments de bonne ou moins bonne vie et les conditions de leur construction à un niveau plus politique - méso- et macrosocial.

Veillez soumettre vos propositions à Patricia Perrenoud Patricia.Perrenoud@hesav.ch et Elise Rapp Elise.Rapp@hesav.ch

Délai de soumission : 29 janvier 2021

Longueur des résumés : max. ~500 mots

In English: Uncertain quests for times and places of good life: experiences of immigrant women, families, as well as volunteers and health/social care professionals

Patricia Perrenoud and Elise Rapp

Haute Ecole de Santé du Canton de Vaud (HESAV), School of health

Réseau de recherche: Migration and minor In French and English-speaking regions of Northern Europe and America, a good life is frequently associated with the ideas of freedom, autonomy, responsibility and self-realisation. This individualistic and neo-liberal stance has been questioned for several decades in the social sciences, as it does not account for social inequalities nor acknowledges collective representations of life and human development. This session proposes to explore the experiences of immigrant women and families living in these regions and to question both what facilitates and what interferes with access to times and places of good life. Research fieldworks and social action initiatives unveil that a good life does not equate to a stable state, which could be achieved through an array of strategies. Rather, it is often a temporary state, emerging from material or social conditions; from being there in the company of other social actors. The session will include presentations by social scientists and by actors from the associative sector. It will discuss how circumstances such as residence status, access to housing or employment, to digital tools for the maintenance of family ties, contribute to or undermine immigrant women's and families' experience of a good life.

Beside broad categories such as housing or employment, the session also examines easier and harder paths to times and places of good life from a microsocial stance, by analysing concrete situations shared by women, families, as well as volunteers and health/social care professionals. Different discourses, experiences and practices, which question western cultural visions of autonomy, contradicting in particular the use of this notion as an indicator for the experience of a good life or for the realisation of an effective professional and voluntary support. Finally, between life trajectories, capabilities, chance encounters and emerging practices, the session discusses the quest for times of good life beyond the standardisation of health and social care; and acknowledges the superdiversity of immigrant women and families.

For this session, we are looking for presentation proposals that are stemming either from research or from an analyse of associative or professional practice. Papers that describe the experiences of immigrant women and families, circulating their voices or those of their volunteer and professional interlocutors. The participation of associations of immigrant women and families is also welcome. We are particularly interested in presentations which, starting from concrete examples at a microsocial level, allow for discussions about the construction of times and places of better or worse life at a more political, meso and macro-social level.

Please submit your proposal to Patricia Perrenoud, Patricia.Perrenoud@hesav.ch and Elise Rapp Elise.Rapp@hesav.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Agency of forced migrants: Dealing with uncertainty in hostile migration contexts

Ibrahim Soysüren and Nedelcu Mihaela

University of Neuchâtel

More and more restrictive policies are put in place against movements of people who are forced to leave their countries. In this regard, the European Union and European countries are particularly active.

However, despite increasingly sophisticated technological-supported border control, these restrictive policies and measures did not stop forced migrants to cross borders. People still manage to enter Europe and ask for asylum in the countries of their choice even though the European Dublin System defines criteria of countries where they should apply for asylum. If they are deported from another country in Europe, elsewhere or to their country of origin, some forced migrants come back and introduce again their asylum application. Others successfully fight against their deportation or they continue living as undocumented migrants in the countries from where they are supposed to be deported. Some others “prefer” to stay in another European country. Many of these migrants live for months and years in liminal spaces (Sutton et al. 2011), such as neighbourhoods, camps, or squats, where they wait to move forward or for future solutions.

Existing scholarship shows that in such hostile contexts and conditions, forced migrants struggle to find solutions during different phases of their migration journeys: to cross borders, stay or move in a (new) host country, claim asylum and get it, integrate in a new society, learn a new language, study, find a job, fight against racism or discrimination, and so on. With the support of informal networks, migration rights organizations, ethnic communities, civil society grassroots initiatives, as well as digital technologies, they still manage to mobilize resources and develop different forms of agency – i.e. the “capacity to make a change” (Giddens 1984).

This session invites to reflect on agency processes and mechanisms in the case of forced migrants dealing with various forms of uncertainty: with regard to (im)mobility situations, legal status, economic precariousness, transnational families, home and host countries socio-political contexts, etc. Therefore, we welcome papers based on theoretical insights and empirical studies and aiming to explore different aspects of forced migrants’ agency in European countries and at various stages of migration processes.

Please submit your proposal to Ibrahim Soysüren, ibrahim.soysuren@unine.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Who deserves what? Social policy and deservingness in times of crisis

Eva Nada, HES-SO, Haute école de travail social de Genève (HEST-GE); Emilie Rosenstein, Université de Genève ; Bochsler Yann, University of Applied Sciences Northwestern Switzerland (FHNW); Oliver Hümbelin Haute école spécialisée bernoise (BFH); Peter Streckeisen, Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften (ZHAW).

Social policies reflect our societies' commitment towards social justice. The history of welfare states underlines how this commitment is closely related to moments of crisis. On the one hand, crises can result in budget cuts, reducing welfare spending or making the access to social benefits more selective. On the other hand, crises can exacerbate aspirations and claims for social justice, solidarity and act as a catalyst of social progress.

Moments of crisis are thus a key opportunity to question social policies and their normative content as they shed light on the age-old issue: who deserves what? The management of the COVID-19 crisis in Switzerland illustrates this clearly. Within a few weeks, billions of francs were deployed to support small business owners, while temporary layoff benefits covered more than a third of the Swiss workforce in April 2020. However, at the same time, we discovered thousands of vulnerable people, queuing for hours to receive food charity because they had no access to social benefits.

These examples reveal the importance of deservingness criteria in achieving - or not - political consensus on the measures to be taken to face the crisis. Furthermore, the outcome of this normative debate affects certain target groups very differently, depending on their citizen status or their access to the labor market. The question of eligibility also involves issues regarding individual responsibility and productive work. The current crisis challenges more broadly the role of social policies to perform and maintain social cohesion and to decide whom, as a society, we choose to help, and why?

The research network Social Problems invites contributions that explore these logics of deservingness in different social policies and discuss their influence on how social problems are framed, in times of crisis and beyond. Deservingness may be analyzed at four levels:

1. Definition of social policies: How the criteria of deservingness are framed? Who are the actors determining the definition of problems? How the definition of the problem contributes to the framing of social policy and its beneficiaries?
2. Implementation at front-line level: Social policies are implemented by institutions, charities and social workers at the front-line level. Through this process, official discourses and deservingness criteria are reinterpreted. What is the impact of the crisis at the front-line level? To what extent does it change the delivery of social benefits and services?
3. Perception among welfare recipients: Social policies have very tangible consequences on individuals targeted by a given policy. How do recipients interpret and re-appropriate the policies? To what extent their moral economy, i.e. what they find (un)fair, is affected by the current crisis?
4. Perception among the general population: Public opinion about social policy and welfare recipients is of paramount importance. Does the crisis affect the prevailing representations and criteria of deservingness?

We welcome theoretical, methodological and empirical contributions to these questions. Papers can be presented in French, German or English but abstracts are submitted in English.

Please submit your proposal to problems@sgs-sss.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Überwachen, Profilieren, Intervenieren. Zur Regulierung «sozialer Marginalitäten» in Zeiten der Ungewissheit.

Esteban Piñeiro, Nathalie Pasche and Nora Locher

Hochschule für Soziale Arbeit, Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz (FHNW)

Seit ihren Anfängen befasst sich die Soziologie mit Fragen sozialer Abweichung und Kontrolle, mit anomischen Tendenzen und Strategien einer Herstellung gesellschaftlicher Ordnung. Herausragende Bedeutung kommt hierbei Dispositiven, Taktiken oder Praktiken der Überwachung sozialer Risiken und gesellschaftlicher Probleme zu, mitunter auch der Profilierung gefährlicher oder gefährdeter Personen, auffälliger oder störender Gruppen, um deren Verhalten letztlich regulieren oder steuern zu können. An der Schwelle zum 21. Jahrhundert präsentiert sich uns ein widersprüchliches Bild zum Umgang mit sozialer Abweichung und Marginalität. Während mit dem Schlüsselkonzept der «Sicherheitsgesellschaft» (Legnaro 1997) die öffentliche Ordnungs- und Sicherheitsproduktion sich nicht mehr primär auf als anstössig oder sozial auffällig wahrgenommenes Verhalten zu konzentrieren scheint – sondern auf eine gouvernementale Verwaltung des empirisch Normalen (Foucault 2006; Singelstein/Stolle 2008) – stellen Analysen zu einer «Kultur der Kontrolle» (Garland 2001) mitunter auch eine punitive Wende fest, die weiterhin auf gefährliche Personen oder Risikopopulationen abzielt. Diese «Politik der Marginalität» (Wacquant 2009) bearbeitet soziale Ausgrenzung weniger um Marginalisierte zu integrieren. Betrieben wird vielmehr ein «selektives Risikomanagement» (Lutz/Ziegler 2005) oder eine «Exklusionsverwaltung» (Bommes/Scherr 2000), um primär einmal die Bevölkerung vor Sicherheitsrisiken oder die Gesellschaft vor Ordnungsstörungen zu schützen.

Soziologisch lassen sich soziale Marginalitäten als Effekt von Überwachung und Profilierung verstehen, von darauf bezogenen (wohlfahrt-)staatlichen Regulativen, privaten oder zivilgesellschaftlichen Interventionen. Dabei werden sozial marginalisierte Personen oder Gruppen in unterschiedlichen Kontexten problematisiert, sei es im öffentlichen Raum oder Zuhause, bei der Arbeit, in der Schule oder auf Ämtern. Personen und Gruppen, die ins Visier einer staatlichen, zivilgesellschaftlichen oder auch privaten Überwachung geraten, werden als «Aussenseiter» oder «Randständige» problematisiert, als «Randalierer» oder «Illegale» etikettiert. Nebst sogenannten «Drogensüchtigen» und «Alkoholiker*innen» finden sich darunter z. B. auch «Bettler*innen» oder «Obdachlose», weiter auch Personen mit «psychischen Krankheiten» oder «sozialen Verhaltensauffälligkeiten», mit «irregulärem Aufenthaltsstatus» oder jugendliche «Drop-outs».

Entwicklungen wie die Digitalisierung oder die 2020 ausgebrochene Covid-19-Pandemie eröffnen neue Möglichkeiten der Überwachung, deren Auswirkungen auf soziale Marginalisierte bisher noch wenig bekannt sind. Im Workshop sollen daher die unterschiedlichen Produktionsstätten gegenwärtiger sozialer Marginalitäten diskutiert werden, wobei die Vielfalt der involvierten Akteure*innen zu berücksichtigen ist. Denn Policing, Profiling oder Tracing und Formen des (präventiven) Regulierens oder Eingreifens finden sich nicht nur bei staatlichen Agenten der Sicherheits- und Ordnungsproduktion. Nebst Justiz und Polizei können auch Einrichtungen der Sozialverwaltung (Sozialhilfe, Arbeits- oder Jugendämter, KESB), der Gesundheitsversorgung (Krankenhäuser, Arztpraxen), Organisationen im Bildungsbereich (Schulen, Kindergärten) wie auch des Service Public (öffentlicher Verkehr, Stadtreinigung) eine zentrale Rolle spielen; Private (Sicherheitsfirmen, IT-Organisationen) und Unternehmen (Shopping Malls) ebenso wie auch Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft (KITAS, Beratungsstellen, Vereine, NGO's). Entsprechend vielfältig und fragmentiert tritt das Herstellen und Managen sozialer Marginalitäten in Erscheinung.

Der Workshop lotet die Vielfalt gegenwärtiger Überwachungs- und Profilierungsformen aus und analysiert diese hinsichtlich einer Herstellung und Regulierung sozialer Marginalität. Die eingereichten Beiträge können empirischer oder theoretischer Natur sein und unterschiedliche Forschungsmethoden verfolgen.

Bitte senden Sie Ihren Vorschlag an Esteban Piñeiro, esteban.pineiro@fhnw.ch

Einsendeschluss: 29. Januar 2021

Länge der Abstracts: maximal ~ 500 Wörter

Sociology of arts and culture
Arts and Culture in Times of Crisis

Research Committee Sociology of Arts and Culture (RC-SAC):

**Olivier Moeschler, University of Lausanne; Miriam Odoni, University of Neuchatel;
Loïc Riom, University of Geneva/Mines Paristech); Samuel Coavoux, Orange
Labs/SENSE); Valérie Rolle and Thibaut Menoux, University of Nantes; Guy
Schwegler, University of Lucerne**

The Covid-19 crisis has deeply affected the production, distribution, and consumption of culture. Early on in the unfolding of the crisis, governmental and other institutional reactions across the world might have prioritized conventional sectors of the economy more than the arts. However, it soon became clear that the situation of artists and cultural workers as well as their venues could not be neglected, especially in the face of the renewed intensification of the crisis or the “second wave” of autumn 2020. The cultural sector’s own immediate responses to the imposed restrictions, such as the shift towards digital strategies, also lead to new and perhaps unintended consequences on a larger scale, such as live concerts through social media, virtual museums, digital access to books or libraries, broadcasted concerts on balconies, etc. At the same time, not only did the various authorities and producers re-evaluate culture, but so did audiences. The inequalities, uncertainties and precariousness often already inherent to culture have multiplied and become even more visible.

During the SSA Conference 2021, the Research Committee Sociology of Arts and Culture (RC-SAC) would like to undertake discussions on the shifts currently taking place in the arts and the cultural sector as regards social justice, and particularly in uncertain times. Our main interest concerns the reshufflings of the cultural sector that stem from the Covid-19 crisis. Research that tackles the changes that arts and culture undergo in light of other crises (economic crisis, climate crisis, political crisis etc.) is also welcomed.

Four paper sessions will be organized, each around a distinct axis of culture: 1) production, 2) ongoing digitalization, 3) consumption, and 4) cultural policies.

- (1) The first axis addresses the changes that the uncertainties in times of crises provoke in the **production** of culture. How do artists, venues and intermediaries re-evaluate production? How do their approaches differ compared to before the sanitary crisis? What kinds of renegotiations are conducted at the different levels of production?
- (2) The second axis focusses on the expansion of streaming platforms in the context of the current – or other – crisis. What is the effect of **digital platforms** on cultural inequalities? How do these platforms change the way culture is produced and accessed? How does streaming impact artistic wages and more broadly the distribution of profits and power between the different actors? What are the effects of recommendation algorithms on the diversity of cultural products?
- (3) The **consumption** of cultural goods represents the third axis. The lockdown for example radically changed lifestyles in a matter of days. How does such a reorganization of habits affect individual tastes and consumption? What impact do crises have on the trends and inequalities already perceptible in cultural consumption ? What kinds of (new) audiences are shaped in times of crises?
- (4) Finally, the fourth axis, turns to **cultural policies**. For example, in 2020 the crisis brought forth new infrastructure and distribution channels for funding artistic projects (f.e. public emergency aids). Against this backdrop, how are questions of social justice and of equitable cultural policies debated and implemented? And from a socio-historic perspective, what changes of public support are we witnessing? Does it alter the definition of culture, and in what direction(s)?

We invite papers presenting empirical research dealing with any of these axes in all areas of culture — be it visual and fine arts, music, theatre, dance, literature, cinema and media or other forms of creative expression.

Please submit your proposal to culture@sgs-sss.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Les enjeux de justice sociale en formation professionnelle

Kerstin Duemmler and Barbara Duc

Swiss Federal Institute of Vocational Education and Training (SFIVET)

Le système de formation professionnelle dual, tel qu'il s'est notamment développé en Suisse, est souvent loué pour sa force intégrative des jeunes dans le monde du travail. Or, de nombreuses recherches en sociologie montrent que le système pose plusieurs questions en termes de justice sociale. Ces problématiques, mises en lumière par la crise liée à la pandémie de COVID-19, existent toutefois depuis longtemps. Ce workshop se veut une plateforme pour des recherches actuelles sur la formation professionnelle qui abordent des questions de justice sociale et d'inégalités, et ce à différents niveaux dont certains sont proposés ci-dessous.

Une première problématique a trait à la question du choix des jeunes dans leur orientation. En effet, même si deux tiers des jeunes entrent en formation professionnelle en Suisse, ce n'est pas toujours par choix délibéré étant donné le lien étroit entre l'orientation en secondaire II et le parcours scolaire antérieur. La sélection durant l'école obligatoire, en particulier au moment du passage du primaire au secondaire I, influencée entre autres par l'origine sociale et le contexte migratoire, participe à la reproduction d'inégalités sociales. Cela est particulièrement visible au niveau de l'impact de la voie suivie en secondaire I sur les formations postobligatoires envisageables, ce qui influence durablement les futures conditions de travail et possibilités de carrière. De plus, les filières de formation postobligatoires sont fortement sexuées, ce qui est entre autres dû à la socialisation différenciée des filles et garçons dans les cadres familial et scolaire.

Une deuxième problématique est liée à l'intégration dans le système dual qui répond à des logiques similaires à celles du marché du travail. Les candidat-e-s à l'apprentissage doivent ainsi faire face à un véritable marché des places d'apprentissage et font l'expérience de la concurrence, et pour certain-e-s de la discrimination. Un certain nombre de jeunes connaissent donc des difficultés, voire des impossibilités, d'accès au système dual. De plus, les logiques de recrutement des entreprises participent à la reproduction d'inégalités en termes de genre et d'origine en privilégiant des compétences non académiques que les jeunes développent davantage dans le milieu familial qu'à l'école.

Une troisième problématique renvoie aux questions de réversibilité des choix de formation et de mobilité de carrière. Bien que les récentes réformes visent à davantage de perméabilité dans les voies de formation, notamment avec l'introduction de la maturité professionnelle, cette mobilité dépend des acquis d'apprentissage antérieurs qui sont distribués de manière inégale parmi les jeunes. Par ailleurs, la possibilité de faire une maturité professionnelle intégrée dépend aussi de la volonté des entreprises formatrices de laisser l'apprenti-e s'y engager en parallèle de son apprentissage.

Une dernière problématique concerne la période de formation elle-même. Une importante tension traverse le quotidien des apprenti-e-s, la tension entre la production et la formation. Celle-ci se retrouve dans leur statut, à la fois personne au travail et en formation. Cela soulève la question de la qualité de la formation reçue par l'apprenti-e au sein de l'entreprise formatrice, plus précisément le degré d'adéquation des conditions de formation à l'apprentissage d'un métier et non à l'usage d'une main d'œuvre bon marché.

Les personnes intéressées sont invitées à envoyer un titre et un abstract en français ou anglais (max. 500 mots) avec l'affiliation et les coordonnées des auteurs. Nous acceptons des propositions théoriques ou empiriques utilisant des méthodes qualitatives et/ou quantitatives et à tout niveau analytique (micro, méso, ou macro). L'abstract doit inclure la ou les questions de recherche, l'approche théorique, les méthodes utilisées en cas d'étude empirique ainsi que des résultats et des éléments de discussion.

**Veillez soumettre vos propositions à Kerstin Duemmler, kerstin.duemmler@iffp.swiss et
Barbara Duc, barbara.duc@iffp.swiss
Délai de soumission : 29 janvier 2021
Longueur des résumés : max. ~500 mots**

Auf Deutsch: Regionale Differenzen in den Bildungsangeboten, Zulassungsbedingungen und Bildungsverläufen in der Schweiz: Ursprünge, Governance und Folgen

Regula Julia Leemann und Irene Kriesi

Pädagogische Hochschule Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz (FHNW)

In den letzten Jahren sind die zwischen Regionen und Kantonen unterschiedlichen Bildungsangebote, Zulassungsbedingungen und Bildungsverläufe vermehrt thematisiert und problematisiert worden. Dies betrifft u.a. Differenzen im Angebot der «Frühkindlichen Bildung, Betreuung und Erziehung (FBBE)», Diskrepanzen in der Verteilung der Schüler*innen im nachobligatorischen Bereich auf die Allgemeinbildung und Berufsbildung, regional ungleiche Angebote im Bereich der höheren Berufsbildung oder unterschiedliche Zugangsbedingungen zu den kantonalen Hochschulen. Das Ziel dieses Workshops ist es, solche Phänomene regionaler Differenzen von Bildung in der Schweiz bezüglich drei Aspekten zu untersuchen: (1) den Ursprüngen und Ursachen, (2) der Governance, (3) den gesellschaftlichen und individuellen Folgen, besonders auch für die soziale Gerechtigkeit.

Der *erste Aspekt* betrifft im stark föderal organisierten Bildungssystem die politischen Regulierungen bezüglich Bildungsangeboten und Zulassungsbedingungen auf kantonaler Ebene sowie deren historische Wurzeln und Reformen. Im Weiteren sind soziokulturelle Differenzen in Bezug auf Wertigkeiten von unterschiedlichen Formen der Bildung oder von familienexterner Betreuung, aber auch wirtschaftliche Strukturen oder soziodemografischen Entwicklungen in den Regionen zu berücksichtigen. *Wie können aus einer sozialwissenschaftlich inspirierten Perspektive solche regionalen und kantonalen Differenzen im Angebot von Bildung und im Zugang erklärt werden?*

Der *zweite Aspekt* fragt nach der Steuerung der regional unterschiedlichen Bildungsangebote. Dazu sind die Zuständigkeiten, Handlungsspielräume, Zielsetzungen, Strategien und Rechtfertigungen der steuerungsrelevanten Akteure in den Blick zu nehmen. Welche sozialwissenschaftlichen Zugänge erlauben es, die Handlungskoordination zwischen den Akteuren in der 'Herstellung' der ungleichen Bildungsangebote und -zugänge zu verstehen? Welche bildungspolitischen und gesellschaftlichen Konflikte und Dispute können rekonstruiert werden?

Der *dritte Aspekt* interessiert sich für die Folgen regional differenter Bildungsmöglichkeiten. Insbesondere ist aus der Perspektive von Bildungsgerechtigkeit und damit auch sozialer Gerechtigkeit zu fragen, inwiefern diese Differenzen zu Ungleichheiten in den Bildungschancen und Bildungslaufbahnen in Abhängigkeit vom Wohnort führen und ggf. Bildungsungleichheiten nach sozialen Merkmalen in den untersuchten soziogeografischen Einheiten verstärken oder abschwächen. *Welche regionalen Bildungsstrukturen befördern Bildungslaufbahnen, die zu einem erfolgreichen Abschluss auf Sekundarstufe II oder Tertiärstufe führen? Welche Faktoren führen zu einer Vergrößerung von Bildungsungleichheiten nach Geschlecht oder Herkunft im interkantonalen Vergleich? Unter welchen Bedingungen verschärfen regionsspezifische Bildungsmöglichkeiten in Krisenphasen die Bildungsungleichheit bzw. schwächen diese ab?*

Formale Anforderungen:

Abstract und Vortrag können in deutscher, französischer oder englischer Sprache sein, wobei die Sprache des Abstracts auch Sprache des Vortrags ist. Das Abstract (Umfang max. 500 Wörter) umfasst:

Namen und Institutionen der Beitragenden, Titel, Thema, Zielsetzung und Fragestellung, Forschungs-/Erkenntnisstand, Theoretischer Rahmen, methodisches bzw. argumentatives Vorgehen, Ergebnisse bzw. Schlussfolgerungen, 3-4 Literaturangaben.

Bitte senden Sie Ihren Vorschlag (in WORD- und in PDF-Format) an Regula Leemann,

regula.leemann@fhnw.ch und Iren Kriesi, irene.kriesi@ehb.swiss

Einsendeschluss: 29. Januar 2021

Länge der Abstracts: maximal ~ 500 Wörter

En français : Différences régionales en matière d'offres de formation, de conditions d'admission et de parcours de formation en Suisse : sources, gouvernance et impacts

Regula Julia Leemann und Irene Kriesi

Pädagogische Hochschule Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz (FHNW)

Ces dernières années, les différences régionales ou cantonales en matière d'offres de formation, de conditions d'admission et de parcours de formation ont fait l'objet croissant de débats et d'analyse. Différentes problématiques ont retenu l'attention, dont l'hétérogénéité des offres concernant « l'éducation et l'accueil des jeunes enfants (EAJE) », les disparités de répartition des élèves entre formation générale et professionnelle dans les filières post-obligatoires, les déséquilibres régionaux des offres de formations professionnelles supérieures ou les diverses conditions d'admission aux hautes écoles cantonales. L'objectif de ce workshop est d'étudier les phénomènes de différences régionales dans la formation en Suisse à la lumière de trois aspects : (1) les sources et les causes, (2) la gouvernance et (3) les impacts sur l'individu et la société, en particulier pour la justice sociale.

Dans un système de formation fortement fédéralisé, le *premier aspect* s'intéresse aux réglementations politiques dans le champ des offres de formation et des conditions d'admission à l'échelle cantonale, à leurs racines historiques et aux réformes. Il englobe également les distinctions socioculturelles sous-tendant la valence des différentes formes de formation ou de l'accueil extra-familial, mais aussi les structures économiques et les évolutions sociodémographiques dans les différentes régions. *Quels éclairages une perspective inspirée des sciences sociales apporte-t-elle sur les disparités régionales et cantonales quant aux offres de formation et à leur accès ?*

Le *second aspect* examine le pilotage des diverses offres de formation dans les régions. On prendra ici en compte les compétences, marges d'action, objectifs, stratégies et justifications des acteurs et actrices du pilotage. *Quelles approches des sciences sociales permettent de comprendre la coordination de l'action des acteurs dans la 'production' des offres et des accès inégaux en matière de formation ? Quels conflits et controverses de la politique éducative et de la société peut-on reconstruire ?*

Le *troisième aspect* porte sur les impacts des disparités régionales dans les possibilités de formation. En se plaçant sous l'angle de la justice éducative, et par conséquent aussi de la justice sociale, on se demandera dans quelle mesure ces différences se traduisent par des inégalités de perspectives éducatives et de parcours de formation en fonction du lieu de résidence des jeunes et, le cas échéant, comment elles peuvent renforcer ou amortir les inégalités éducatives corrélées à des critères sociaux dans les entités sociogéographiques étudiées. *Quelles structures de formation régionales favorisent les parcours débouchant sur l'obtention d'un diplôme du degré secondaire II ou du degré tertiaire ? Quels facteurs accroissent les inégalités genrées ou sociales en matière de formation dans les différents cantons ? Dans quelles conditions les spécificités régionales déterminant les choix de formation renforcent-elles ou atténuent-elles les inégalités des chances en période de crise ?*

Modalités de soumission :

Le résumé et la communication peuvent être présentés en allemand, français ou anglais ; la langue choisie pour le résumé sera aussi celle de la communication. Le résumé (max. 500 mots) comprend :

Noms et institutions des communicant-e-s, titre, thème, objectif et questionnements, état de la recherche/des résultats, cadre théorique, démarche méthodologique et argumentative, résultats et/ou conclusions, 3-4 références bibliographiques.

Veillez soumettre vos propositions (au format Word et PDF) à an Regula Leemann, regula.leemann@fhnw.ch und Iren Kriesi, irene.kriesi@ehb.swiss

Délai de soumission : 29 janvier 2021

Longueur des résumés : max. ~500 mots

En français : Morale et hybridation (version en français)

Daniel Burnier, Université de Neuchâtel

Si la morale peut se concevoir comme un ensemble de discours et de pratiques visant le bien vivre, le bien agir des individus (Lopez, 2004, 2009) la sociologie de la morale prend pour objet d'étude, « la nature, les causes ou les conséquences des idées des gens concernant le bien et le juste » (Abend, 2008, notre traduction ; Hitlin & Vaisey, 2013). Cette session est une invitation à proposer des analyses sociologiques prenant pour objet d'étude des discours et/ou des pratiques morales abordant des réalités « hybrides » (au sens commun du terme, de réalités composées d'éléments disparates) existant dans les sociétés contemporaines. Ces réalités hybrides se retrouvent dans de nombreux domaines (Gwiazdzinski, 2016) comme la politique (partis se réclamant à la fois de la gauche et de la droite ; consultation publique mixte), l'économie (partenariats entre le privé et le public ; investissements cherchant à la fois un retour économique et un impact social/environnemental), l'urbanisme (écocités ; nature urbaine), l'éducation (formation transdisciplinaire), la science et les arts (projets coproduits entre artistes et scientifiques), le travail (frontières floues entre le temps de travail/loisirs, bureau/maison), les technologies de l'information et de la communication (réalité physique « augmentée » par des informations ; prothèses techniques), etc. Dans un monde en mutation rapide, les sources d'incertitudes ne manquent pas.

Cette session s'intéresse à l'une d'entre elles : l'hybridation des temps, des espaces, des pratiques, des idées, des identités, etc. et aux jugements moraux que ces processus suscitent, soit pour les défendre, soit pour les rejeter. Comment analyser les manières dont les individus et les institutions comprennent ces réalités hybrides et les moralisent ? Quels processus sociaux et historiques expliquent la valorisation de l'hybridation ou son rejet ? Comment ces jugements moraux sur l'hybridation viennent modifier les actions et les choix des individus ? Qu'est-ce que veut dire la « vie bonne » dans une société hybride ? Comme il existe un paradoxe à constater l'extension sans fin du domaine de l'éthique ou de la morale (nous utilisons ici les deux termes de manière interchangeable) et l'intérêt ambigu des sociologues contemporains pour cet objet, le but à moyen terme de cette session est de jeter les bases d'un nouveau réseau de recherche consacré à la sociologie de la morale au sein de la Société Suisse de Sociologie (SSS).

Veillez soumettre vos propositions à Daniel Burnier, Daniel.burnier@unine.ch

Délai de soumission : 29 janvier 2021

Longueur des résumés : max. ~500 mots

In English: Morality and hybridity (English version)

Daniel Burnier, Université de Neuchâtel

If morality can be conceived as a set of discourses and practices aimed at the good life, the good action of individuals (Lopez, 2004, 2009), the sociology of morality can be defined as "the sociological investigation of the nature, causes and consequences of people's ideas about the good and the right" (Abend, 2008; Hitlin & Vaisey, 2013). This session is an invitation to propose sociological analyses that study moral discourses and/or practices that address "hybrid" realities (in the common sense of the term, realities composed of disparate elements) existing in contemporary societies. These hybrid realities can be found in many fields (Gwiazdzinski, 2016) such as politics (parties claiming to be both left and right wing; mixed public consultation), economy (public-private partnerships; investments seeking both an economic return and a social/environmental impact), urban planning (eco-cities; urban nature), education (transdisciplinary training), science and arts (coproduced projects between artists and scientists), work (blurred boundaries between work/leisure time and office/home),

information and communication technologies (physical reality "augmented" by information; technical prostheses), etc. In a rapidly changing world, there is no shortage of sources of uncertainty.

This session focuses on one of these uncertainties: the hybridization of times, spaces, practices, ideas, identities, etc. and the moral judgments that these processes give rise to, either to defend them or to reject them. How can we analyze the ways in which individuals and institutions understand these hybrid realities and moralize them? What social and historical processes explain the valorization of hybridity or its rejection? How do these moral judgments about hybridity modify the actions and choices of individuals? What does a "good life" mean in a hybrid society? As there is a paradox in the endless extension of the field of ethics or morality (we use the two terms interchangeably here) and the ambiguous interest of contemporary sociologists in this subject, the medium-term goal of this session is to lay the foundations of a new research network devoted to the sociology of morality within the Swiss Sociological Society (SSS).

Please submit your proposal to Daniel Burnier, Daniel.burnier@unine.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Arculating food, place and social justice in the context of global health and environmental uncertainties

Edmée Ballif, University of Cambridge and University of Kent; Irene Becci Terrier; University of Lausanne; Alexandre Grandjean, University of Lausanne

The human relationship to food and nutrition is a highly complex one influenced by multiple social, ethical and symbolic factors. With the increased awareness of the ecological crisis and even more under the current health pandemic, issues about food production, trade and consumption have gained attention and renewed food justice mobilizations. Many current food trends promote locality and placeness as an answer to the double ethical issue of the struggle against environmental degradation and against social injustice, since they value human labor and refer often to equality, in particular gender equality. Simultaneously, some food movements meet criticism for relying on globalized food circuits, ignoring environmental and social issues in the global south and/or reproducing social, racial or gender inequalities. Moreover, the current pandemic made food scarcity more visible even in the richest cities, fueling larger debates on the redistribution of wealth and access to food. This panel proposes to explore how food trends and movements define social justice and articulate it with place (local vs. global scales). Examples could include organized food movements (like slow food or the promotion of “terroir”), promotional and patrimonial certification strategies (like organic labels, regional food labels), current trends in food production (like permaculture or biodynamics) or individual lifestyles (such as veganism or locavorism) and issues relating to food (in)security.

Indeed, how do food movements and trends articulate food, place and social justice in times of uncertainty? How do food discourses and practices promote different notions of locality and placeness? How are ethical issues in regard to food debated inside food movements and more generally in the public sphere? How do these discourses relate to structural, environmental or societal changes?

This panel will prioritize empirically-grounded contributions and is meant to allow sub-disciplines of social sciences to gather together from multiple perspectives (such as the sociology of health and medicine, of religions, of migrations or urban sociology).

Please submit your proposal to Edmée Ballif eb842@cam.ac.uk

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

La parole des publics dans les dispositifs de protection des mineurs et des majeurs (XIX^e-XX^e siècles)

Arnaud Frauenfelder HES-SO, Haute école de travail social de Genève (HETS-GE) ;
Cristina Ferreira, HES-SO, Haute Ecole de Santé du Canton de Vaud (HESAV) ; Joëlle
Droux Université de Genève ; Marco Cicchini Université de Genève

Dans le cadre du projet de congrès de la société suisse de sociologie 2021, ce workshop entend interroger le rôle que joue l'écoute des destinataires de la protection sociale sous contrainte à partir de perspectives sociohistoriques d'analyse de l'Etat et de la justice « par le bas », à la lueur de contextes historiques et institutionnels diversifiés.

L'atelier proposé est structuré autour de différentes interrogations. A quels régimes de sensibilité publique ou préoccupations répond cette volonté d'écouter les justiciables et les publics concernés ? Quels sont ces dispositifs d'écoute et qui sont les agents (institutionnels, professionnels) qui les mettent en œuvre ? Comment ces dispositifs sont-ils accueillis et saisis par les destinataires concernés ? Enfin, quels rôles jouent-ils dans l'administration des désordres familiaux, juvéniles et sociaux et de leur régulation sociale ?

Les communications proposées peuvent porter sur différentes thématiques associées à l'assistance sous contrainte. Ainsi du domaine tutélaire où auditionner les personnes majeures relève d'une obligation légale en Suisse depuis la fin du XVIII^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours. Cette exigence soulève des difficultés qu'il convient de mettre en lumière sur la longue durée, notamment à partir de mises à l'épreuve du rituel d'audience. Entre tribunal, domicile privé ou établissement institutionnel, comment s'opère le choix des lieux de l'audition et avec quelles conséquences ? Chez les magistrats, comment entendre des justiciables atteints de troubles psychiques, les faire participer aux procédures et rendre ainsi effectif leur « droit d'être entendu » ? Ou au contraire, comment évaluer l'inadmissibilité de leur audition en faisant intervenir l'expertise médico-légale ? Pour leur part, comment les personnes dont la prise de parole est sollicitée au sujet de pans pénibles de leur existence, investissent le moment de l'audience ?

Ces questionnements sont aussi pertinents pour la protection des mineurs, en relation avec l'histoire récente des politiques qui la concernent. Celle-ci fait l'objet depuis les années 1960 de dynamiques d'apparence contradictoire caractérisées par la montée en force des droits de l'enfant et par la judiciarisation croissante de la protection des mineurs. Cette dynamique favorise une prise possible par les publics concernés sur des institutions soucieuses de travailler désormais davantage « avec » autrui (plutôt que « sur » autrui). Comment cette injonction à la collaboration est-elle entendue et mise en pratique ? Les différentes sphères concernées (instances administratives, autorités tutélaires, juridictions civiles ou pénales) s'y adaptent-elles avec les mêmes temporalités et les mêmes modalités ? Et par ailleurs, cette évolution ne représente-t-elle pas aussi un instrument de nouvelles contraintes ? Dans quelle mesure par exemple cette capacité sociale à répondre à la participation telle que les différentes instances de la protection la conçoivent, peut-elle être mobilisée dans les décisions prises pour récompenser ceux qui la respectent ou pour sanctionner ceux qui n'y parviennent pas (parents, mineurs) ?

Privilégiant un dialogue fécond entre sociologie et histoire, cet atelier entend tout particulièrement privilégier des communications fondées sur la présentation de matériaux empiriques récoltés sur la base de méthodologies qualitatives diverses (entretiens, analyse documentaire, analyse de dossiers, observations ethnographiques).

Veillez soumettre vos propositions à Arnaud Frauenfelder, Arnaud.Frauenfelder@hesge.ch

Délai de soumission : 29 janvier 2021

Longueur des résumés : max. ~500 mots

Family, Work and Social policies: A gender lens on social (in)justice

Sandra V. Constantin, University of Oxford; Carola Togni, HES-SO, Haute école de travail social et de la santé de Lausanne (HETSL)

The ability to produce gender equality represents an important basis of the legitimacy of any social policies meant to reach social justice. The gendered division of labor within families and at work does not only produce economic injustice but also social injustice (Fraser & Ferrarese, 2011). On the one hand, the existing division between paid productive work and free reproductive and domestic work creates economic injustice, since well-paid activities are mostly male-dominated whereas domestic work and lower-paid service activities are mostly women-dominated. On the other hand, it also creates social injustice since women-dominated activities (professional and non-professional) are less socially valued. Therefore, Nancy Fraser assumes that transformative social policies should intertwine two goals - redistribution and recognition - since women's economic disadvantage restricts their opportunities to make their voices heard, hindering equal participation in the making of culture, in the public sphere and in daily life. In times of uncertainties, such as during the Covid-19 pandemic, it is of paramount importance to question, from a gender and an intersectional perspective, the definition of social justice which is at the heart of social policies implemented by Welfare States. Social divisions and social differences do not operate separately to produce a circle of economic and social subordination, they are intertwined.

This panel proposes to question social (in)justice through the lens of gender and social policies. We welcome papers that consider theoretical and empirical research to explore the relationship between social policies and gender equality outcomes from any of the following or other perspectives: Located between the market and the family how do social policies address gender injustice in family and work arrangements? How are gendered orders transformed by social policies? Do they only address economic injustice through an equal repartition of resources among men and women? Do they also allow for an equal social recognition among men and women? To what extent do social policies, implemented during the Covid-19 pandemic, have produced more gender (in)justice?

Please submit your proposal to Sandra V. Constantin sandra.constantin@spi.ox.ac.uk

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Spannungsfelder und Ungewissheiten im Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutz. Aktuelle empirische Studien zum System des Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutzes in der Schweiz

Gaëlle Aeby Universität Genf; Martina Koch und Lukas Neuhaus (FHNW); Marion
Pomey und (ZHAW); Cornelia Rüegger (FHNW)

Dem Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutz sind verschiedene «Ambivalenzen» (Kelle/Dahme 2020) inhärent, beispielsweise das Spannungsfeld zwischen (fremdbestimmtem) Schutz und Selbstbestimmung (Becker-Lenz et al. 2019) bzw. zwischen Freiheit und Betreuung (Häfeli 2011), zwischen Partizipation und behördlicher Verfahrenslogik (Schoch et al. 2020), zwischen einer Logik der Vereinbarung und einer Logik der Anordnung (Koch et al. 2019) oder spezifisch im Kinderschutz zwischen Kindeswohl und Kindeswille (Oelkers/Schroedter 2008) oder einer Eltern- und einer Kinderzentrierung (Pomey 2017). Dies führt zu Ungewissheiten und zu Unsicherheiten nicht nur bei den betroffenen Personen und Familien, sondern auch bei den Fachkräften, die im Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutz tätig sind. Wie werden solche Spannungsfelder in der Praxis ausbalanciert und ausgehandelt?

Hinzu kommt, dass sowohl der Kindes- als auch der Erwachsenenschutz durch eine Vielzahl unbestimmter Rechtsbegriffe geprägt ist, beispielsweise durch Begrifflichkeiten wie Gefährdung, Kindeswohl, Schwächezustand, Schutzbedürftigkeit, Urteilsfähigkeit. Aus rechtssoziologischer Sicht bedürfen diese unbestimmten Rechtsbegriffe erst einer Überführung in die Rechtswirklichkeit, was Auslegung, Anwendung und Aushandlung beinhaltet. Auch in dieser Hinsicht ist der Alltag der Fachkräfte von Unsicherheiten und Ungewissheiten sowie einem erheblichen Ermessensspielraum geprägt. Des Weiteren zeigt sich, dass dies für die betroffenen Personen problematische Implikationen haben kann: Oft ist für sie nicht ganz nachvollziehbar, inwiefern die Fachkräfte bei ihnen eine Gefährdungssituation oder einen Schwächezustand konstatieren. Insofern sind die ungewissen Rechtsbegriffe auch umkämpfte Wirklichkeiten; es zeigen sich Kämpfe um Deutungen beispielsweise hinsichtlich dessen, was unter Verletzlichkeiten verstanden wird und was eine 'gute Kindheit' oder ein 'gutes Leben' mit einem (potentiellen) Schwächezustand ausmacht. Zu fragen sein wird daher, welche Deutungen sich wann durchsetzen und inwiefern auch die betroffenen Personen zu Deutungshoheit gelangen können.

In diesem Workshop möchten wir aus soziologischer Perspektive anhand aktueller empirischer Studien den Ungewissheiten nachgehen, die sich durch Spannungsfelder und unbestimmte Rechtsbegriffe im Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutz zeigen. Die Anzahl empirischer Studien zu den Auswirkungen der Gesetzesreform des Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutzrechtes 2013 sowie zur Arbeit der damals neu geschaffenen Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutzbehörden (KESB) und weiterer organisationaler Akteure in diesem Feld sind überschaubar. Wir möchten im Workshop Studien dazu versammeln, um folgende Fragen zu diskutieren:

- Welche Spannungsfelder sind dem Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutz inhärent und wie gehen die beteiligten Akteur*innen damit um?
- Inwiefern ergeben sich daraus Ungewissheiten und wie gehen die betroffenen Akteur*innen mit solchen Ungewissheiten um?
- Welche Gemeinsamkeiten und welche Unterschiede sind zwischen dem Kindes- und dem Erwachsenenschutz auszumachen?
- Und welche Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede zeigen sich zwischen verschiedenen Kantonen bzw. Sprachregionen der Schweiz?

Literatur

Becker-Lenz, R.; Käch, O.; Müller-Hermann, S. & L. Neuhaus (2019): Selbstbestimmung, Schutz, Wohl. Zielorientierungen im Erwachsenenschutz. Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Soziale Arbeit, No 24, pp. 58-71.

Häfeli, C. (2011): Das neue Kindes- und Erwachsenenschutzrecht der Schweiz im Spannungsfeld von Freiheit und Zwang – Selbstbestimmung und Fremdbestimmung. Verschriftlichte und erweiterte Fassung eines Referates bei Caritas Luxemburg vom 8. Februar 2011. ULR: https://www.kokes.ch/assets/pdf/de/dokumentationen/revision/Haefeli_KESR_zwischen_Freiheit_und_Zwang_Referat_Caritas_Luxemburg_8.2.2011.pdf

Kelle H. & S. Dahmen (eds) (2020): Ambivalenzen des Kinderschutzes. Empirische und theoretische Perspektiven. Kindheiten. Weinheim: Beltz Juventa.

Koch, M., Piñeiro, E., & N. Pasche (2019): "Wir sind ein Dienst, keine Behörde." Multiple institutionelle Logiken in einem Schweizer Jugendamt - ein ethnografisches Fallbeispiel aus der street-level bureaucracy. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 20(2), pp. 1-30.

Oelkers, N. & M. Schrödter (2008): Kindeswohl und Kindeswille. Zum Wohlergehen von Kindern aus der Perspektive des Capability Approach. In Otto, Hans-Uwe & Holger Ziegler (eds) Capabilities – Handlungsbefähigung und Verwirklichungschancen in der Erziehungswissenschaft. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp 143-161.

Pomey, M. (2017): Vulnerabilität und Fremdunterbringung. Eine Studie zur Entscheidungspraxis bei Kindeswohlgefährdung. Weinheim: Beltz Juventa.

Schoch, A.; Aeby, G.; Müller, B.; Cottier, M.; Seglias, L.; Biesel, K.; Sauthier, G. & S. Schnurr (2020): Participation of Children and Parents in the Swiss Child Protection System in the Past and Present: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. Social Sciences, vol. 9(8), pp. 1-19.

Bitte senden Sie Ihren Vorschlag an Aline Schoch, aline.schoch@fhnw.ch, Gaëlle Aeby, gaelle.aeby@unige.ch, Martina Koch martina.koch@fhnw.ch, Lukas Neuhaus lukas.neuhaus@fhnw.ch), Marion Pomey, pome@zhaw.ch, Cornelia Rüeegger, cornelia.rueegger@fhnw.ch

Einsendeschluss: 29. Januar 2021

Länge der Abstracts: maximal ~ 500 Wörter

Other research networks: Sociology of consumption
Sustainability and social justice

Katia Vladimirova, Johanna Huber and Marlyne Sahakian
Institute of Sociological Research, University of Geneva

The normative notion of ‘sustainability’ has social justice implications at its core. Environmental sustainability is often treated as a distributional issue, regarding how to better allocate the access to natural resources and how to assign responsibility for environmental impacts, and touches upon questions of procedural justice. Such perspectives shed light on who is involved in decisions regarding sustainability practices, processes and policies as well as who is excluded or included, and in what way. The questions of ‘by whom’ and ‘for whom’ sustainability applies also relate to how ‘sustainability’ is often considered to be an anthropogenic topics; more attention is needed on how humans and nonhumans are equally important actors in socio-ecological systems. Further, some of the solutions proposed for ‘sustainable’ change tend to involve the white upper-middle-class, and may lead to forms of elite environmentalism that render invisible or less significant the lower impact lifestyles of the world’s under-privileged groups. Furthermore, movements proposing sustainable solutions may be blind to racial and economic barriers faced by certain groups to participate in these solutions (Alkon and Agyeman 2011). Thus, sustainability as a concept must also extend beyond its environmental dimension, to recognize the ways in which societal contexts support the reproduction of societal-and-nature relations. This relates to the normative goal of sustainable wellbeing (Gough 2017), or how sustainability must include a consideration for theories of human wellbeing, and the wellbeing of nonhumans.

This paper session welcomes contributions on how sustainability relates to social justice, across systems of provision, and in relation to labor issues, moral markets, and consumption practices. More specifically, we are interested in debates around questions of inequalities and social justice, in relation to sustainability, but also examples of what (collective) sustainability initiatives are emerging, their transformative possibilities, and the role of critical theories in uncovering further opportunities for socially just and environmentally sustainable change.

We welcome contributions from all those who are interested in exploring this topics. The following colleagues from the University of Geneva have expressed interest in presenting:

- Irène Courtin, “Antispecism, sustainability and social justice”, UNIGE
- Johanna Huber, “Alternative food production and sustainability”, UNIGE
- Orlane Moynat, “Understanding the sufficiency and wellbeing nexus through a study of degrowth practices”, UNIGE
- Auxane Pidoux, “Urban gardens and sustainable wellbeing in Geneva”, UNIGE
- Katia Vladimirova, “Sustainable fashion for all? An analysis of sustainable fashion initiatives in Geneva” UNIGE

Please submit your proposal to Ekaterina Vladimirova, ekaterina.vladimirova@unige.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Anchoring International Organizations in the Study of Organizational Sociology

Leah R. Kimber, University of Geneva; Fanny Badache, University of Lausanne

This paper session aims to bring together scholars who adopt a sociological perspective to the study of international organizations (IOs). IOs have historically been studied by jurists and later by political scientists through the prism of theories in international relations (IR). In the past two decades, growing scholarship in IR has shifted the focus to analyzing IOs as actors in IR in their own right. To this end, scholars have not only developed new methodologies, traditionally used by anthropologists and organizational sociologists, but have also embraced sociology as a discipline and more precisely the field of organizational sociology. In this way, IOs have been studied as bureaucracies, as organizations within which various actors compete, which comply and produce norms and values. Nowadays, organizational sociology provides a fascinating basis to study IOs not only from within, but also with respect to their environment in a dynamic perspective.

For this session, we encourage submissions which delve into issues pertaining to IOs whether it be directly (e.g. by using a specific IO as a case study), or indirectly (e.g. by tackling NGOs with ties to IOs), from an organizational perspective. The objective is to give an opportunity – for scholars anchored in the discipline of sociology or for those whose framework speaks to organizational theories – to find a conducive environment to further pursue an upcoming field which holds the promise for deep insight into the world of multilateralism. Ultimately, the aim is to build constructive and lasting bridges between disciplines and perspective and to identify peers with whom to continue developing innovative theoretical contributions to answer salient issues in times where IOs and multilateralism are under threat for their lack of legitimacy for instance.

Please submit your proposal to Leah R. Kimber, leah.kimber@unige.ch and Fanny Badache, fanny.badache@unil.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Other research networks: Sociology of sport

Social Justice and Inequities in Sport and Physical Activity in Times of Uncertainty

Siegfried Nagel, University of Bern; Institute of Sport Science; Monica Aceti, University of Basel Institute of clinical research; Markus Lamprecht, ETHZ

Regular sport as a meaningful leisure-time activity can play an important role in health promotion, social integration and education for modern societies. Sport sociology has long been concerned with social inequality and the opportunities for and accessibility to sport and physical activity. Although campaigns such as “sports for all” and the increasing interest in health sport have broadened participation rates for certain population groups, e.g. women and the elderly, there are still inequities when it comes to participation in regular sport activities. Some social groups are underrepresented, particularly within club sport, including people with low education and income, people with disabilities or migration background (for current figures see Lamprecht, Bürgi & Stamm, 2020). The current health pandemic and economic uncertainties may impact on the wider access and practice of sport and physical activity. To understand and analyse this impact and the broader concerns of social justice in sport and physical activity, we encourage the submission of papers on the following issues and topics:

- Theoretical concepts and critical reflections on inequities in sport as well as approaches to reduce and hinder such phenomena (e.g. diversity management);
- Empirical studies that examine participation and/or successful social integration in sport, in particular within organised sport (e.g. clubs, fitness centres), and those that have specific focus on certain target groups (e.g. women, people with low income / migration background / handicap), or consider relevant social, organisational and structural factors;
- Longitudinal as well as lifelong development of participation in sport and physical activity;
- Case studies that analyse and evaluate programs and initiatives to promote the equal participation of certain target groups (see above) in sport and physical activity;
- Analyses of the effects of the health crisis on sport and its adaptation in associations, schools, firms, etc.;
- Case studies on adherence to sport or physical activity in semi-confinement situations: activity rate, barriers and resources to practice, adaptation to online sports, fitness or well-being offers, etc.;
- Prospective reflections on the sustainability of sports organization and the emergence of new physical and sport practices or lifestyle (home office and “healthy-sporty” smart jobs) to better cope with the COVID context.

Please submit your proposal to Siegfried Nagel, siegfried.nagel@ipsw.unibe.ch and/or Monica Aceti, monica.aceti@unifr.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

La « bonne vie » des chercheurs.euses en sciences humaines et sociales

Ophélie Bidet, Université de Neuchâtel ; Thomas Jammet, Université de Neuchâtel

Dans le monde de la recherche académique, la crise sanitaire due à la pandémie de Covid-19 bouleverse nombre d'objets d'études des sciences sociales, et offre de nouvelles perspectives de recherche et d'analyse. Cependant, au cœur de cette effervescence, un groupe semble encore difficilement trouver grâce aux yeux des sociologues : les chercheurs.euses en sciences humaines et sociales eux.elles-mêmes. En effet, les regards se portent avec intérêt sur le personnel soignant, l'Etat, les entreprises et les indépendant.e.s, les catégories de population vulnérables (SDF, migrant.e.s, personnes vivant sous le seuil de pauvreté, victimes de violence domestique...), les groupes associatifs actifs pendant la crise... mais qu'en-est-il des chercheurs.euses ? Collecteurs de données, productrices de savoir, les sociologues sont pourtant elles et eux aussi affecté.e.s par ces temps d'incertitudes et de bouleversements.

L'objectif de cette session est de partir de questions concrètes pour arriver à une réflexion plus globale sur ce qu'est – ou devrait être – la « bonne vie » d'un.e sociologue, quel que soit son statut (doctorant.e, post-doc, professeur.e, etc.).

Ces questions concrètes qui ont émergé lors de la pandémie ont pu toucher différents aspects de la vie de chercheur.euse : comment bien conduire des entretiens sans pouvoir rencontrer les interlocuteur.trice.s face à face ? Comment composer avec la fermeture soudaine de certains terrains ? Comment adapter, réinventer son protocole de recherche, et avec quelle légitimité dans le cas des jeunes chercheur.se.s ? Le confinement et les plans de protection au sein des institutions (par exemple le télétravail) ont quant à eux soulevé la question des conditions de travail et de l'encadrement institutionnel des jeunes sociologues soudain isolé.e.s. Comment continuer à travailler sans accès à un bureau, avec parfois des enfants au domicile, en étant coupé.e – plus ou moins durablement – de ses pairs et collègues ? Quelles ressources ont pu être trouvées auprès des institutions universitaires ?

Ces questionnements ont mis en lumière des inégalités et des incertitudes transcendant une pandémie qui a pu les amplifier ou parfois les minimiser : inégalités de genre et de statut, pression à publier, défi de l'équilibre vie privée/ vie professionnelle, précarité au niveau des contrats et des salaires... Cette session vise donc *in fine* à élargir l'application de cette notion de « temps d'incertitude » (thème de ce congrès) à d'autres temps que celui de la pandémie dans la vie d'un.e sociologue : dans quelle mesure être sociologue aujourd'hui implique de vivre des temps d'incertitude ? Si l'incertitude liée à la connaissance scientifique sous-tend et nourrit l'ordinaire des recherches, à quel point l'incertitude liée à la carrière et à l'environnement professionnel des sociologues influence-t-elle, de façon souvent cachée, ces mêmes recherches et les dynamiques de production de savoirs ?

La session se déroulera principalement en français mais les propositions de présentation en anglais sont les bienvenues. Les propositions doivent contenir le titre de la présentation, le nom de l'intervenant.e ou des intervenant.e.s et leur.s contact.s.

Veillez soumettre vos propositions à Ophélie Bidet, ophelie.bidet@unine.ch et Thomas Jammet, thomas.jammet@unine.ch

Délai de soumission : 29 janvier 2021

Longueur des résumés : max. ~500 mots

Discovering Precarity, Reinventing Justice? Covid-19 in the Realm of Work

Eva Nadai, University of Applied Sciences Northwestern Switzerland; Peter Streckeisen, University of Basel

Early into the lockdown, Switzerland was shocked by disturbing pictures of long queues of people waiting for food aid because they had lost their jobs and did not know how to make ends meet. Another group that drew attention were the self-employed and the owners of micro- and small enterprises who suffered from the economic effects of the pandemic but had no recourse to unemployment benefits. In public discourse, wide-spread precarity was suddenly discovered. Social workers and sociologists were less surprised. After all, poverty, precarious employment, or the non-take up of welfare benefits had long been around. This paper session aims to explore the intertwining of the pandemic and precarity, discussing issues of justice relating to work and employment. The session addresses the following main questions:

- I. Precarity: Heightened economic uncertainty will probably persist for a long time. This raises the following questions. First, which social groups are affected in which way by the labour market crisis: does it exacerbate the situation of those already suffering precarity before or will unemployment, precarity and poverty spread to new social groups? Second, employers may react to heightened uncertainty with further flexibilization strategies: can we observe more precarious employment conditions *within* remaining jobs and if so, in which forms and in which jobs?
- II. Activation: The magnitude of the Covid-19 pandemic and its economic effects questions the ideological foundation of labour market and social policy, namely the belief in individual responsibility. One might ask whether activation policies, dominating the field in all OECD countries for years now, will be transformed or even overcome as a result of the pandemic. In the midst of the crisis for instance, new support measures were introduced quickly and existing benefits were extended, whereas surveillance and sanctions were eased to some extent. In what ways, has the pandemic changed our understanding of unemployment and the policy responses to it? Does it have a long term impact on practices of welfare administrations and programs for the unemployed?
- III. Recognition: The pandemic also led to a debate on justice in the realm of work, namely on social recognition for work “of systemic importance”. It was argued that (gendered) professions like nursing deserved better working conditions and pay. These claims were obviously inspired by the feminist theorization of invisible and undervalued care work. The debate did not, however, extend to working class low-skilled jobs like cleaners, supermarket cashiers, delivery service couriers and the like who also kept the system running. Does the pandemic affect the moral economy of work more generally, shifting boundaries between esteemed and disregarded work? Does it affect differences in pay and social rights? Who are the winners, and who are the losers?

Abstracts submissions

We welcome theoretical and empirical contributions to these main questions. Abstracts should be submitted in English. Papers can be presented in French, German or English.

Please submit your proposal to Eva Nadai, eva.nadai@fhnw.ch and Peter Streckeisen, p.streckeisen@unibas.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Engaging pluralist perspectives in civic interventions: neopragmatism and social research

Rainer Diaz-Bone, University of Lucerne ; Kenneth Horvath University of Lucerne;
Simon Schroer, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (HU) ; Guy Schwegler, University of
Lucerne

More and more sociological theorizing and methodological strategies set out to highlight pluralities in the social world. Recent pragmatist and neopragmatist approaches have played a key role for deciphering such pluralities and outlining their relevance for understanding social orders and the dynamics of their transformation (e.g. situational analysis, relational sociology, actor-network theory, economics and sociology of convention; see Barthe et al. 2013; Corcuff 2011; Nachi 2006). Compared with older and more traditional research paradigms (e.g. positivism, neofunctionalism, rational-choice approach), these contemporary sociological perspectives on the question of plurality refrain from any definite judgment regarding what counts as good, right, or fair. In this sense, one could be led to believe that the practice of “critique” is left to social actors alone. Any attempt of social researchers to intervene in a given social context would therefore become harder both to articulate and to legitimize.

At the same time, we recognize an increasing request for scientific knowledge by civic actors and agencies in the face of unfolding societal crises and against the background of a growing awareness of social inequalities and institutional deficiencies (accelerated in times the COVID19 pandemic). Already in classical pragmatism, social research was regarded as a resource to be applied and tested for its capacity to improve societal institutions. Neopragmatist sociology continues the pragmatist position to link science to a common good and focuses the tensions of different ways of engagement and critique (see the book series “Raisons pratiques” at EHESS, Paris and “Soziologie der Konventionen” at Springer VS.). In contrast to classical pragmatism, however, neopragmatist sociology is aware of the close interrelation of science and society articulated in the concept of “performativity” of the sciences (Michel Callon): the social sciences perform society. Therefore, social research cannot be restricted to an analytical standpoint only, but is itself entangled in the plurality of empirical normativities, being, among others, coined by epistemic values which correspond to different views of “the social.”

We would like to present research approaches and methodologies that explore and display perspectives and possibilities for interventions and social experimentations in light of their embeddedness in pluralities. Applying the neopragmatist approach, the contributions will discuss ways of designing social research for situations which are structured by a plurality of everyday rationalities to decide on matters of “truth” and “justice” (i.e. orders of justification). In situations like these, scientific actors (knowingly or not) ally with civic agencies to mobilize, apply, test, and adopt knowledge, which enables informed civic intervention.

References :

Barthe, Yannick, Damien de Blic, Jean-Philippe Heurtin, Éric Lagneau, Cyril Lemieux, Dominique Linhardt, Cédric Moreau de Bellaing, Catherine Rémy & Danny Trom (2013): Sociologie pragmatique: mode d'emploi. Politix. Revue des sciences sociales du politique 26 (103), pp. 175-204.
Corcuff, Philippe. 2011. Les nouvelles sociologies. Entre le collectif et l'individuel. 3rd ed. Paris: Armand Colin.
Nachi, Mohamed. 2006. Introduction à la sociologie pragmatique. Paris: Armand Colin

Please submit your proposal to Rainer Diaz-Bone rainer.diazbone@unilu.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Social inequalities and orders of justification in the health care system

Rainer Diaz-Bone, University of Lucerne; Cappel Valeska, University of Lucerne

Health care has become one of the most important economic and political spheres, in which issues of governance and social justice are core. Seen from the neopragmatist institutionalism of economics of conventions (in short EC), one can identify a plurality of institutional logics, which are the foundation how to evaluate health and justice. Therefore, economics of convention opposes a simple view of only one efficient way or only one possible just way how to organize health care. Instead EC studies the tensions and critiques, which rise out of the pluralist constellations of institutional logics. These institutional logics are also the foundations for knowledge production about health and its evaluation and interpretation. Digitalization and neoliberalism are changing health care massively. The upcoming danger is an erosion of the solidarity principle and a concentration of power/knowledge at private companies. Civil societies and parliaments tend to lose their influence in the deliberation about health care principles and lose access to digital data bases about human behavior and health practices.

The contemporary COVID19 pandemic has demonstrated the unequal distribution of risks. Social inequalities intensified, because disadvantaged occupational status groups and underprivileged class fractions suffer greater risk of infection. These are the groups, which are targeted by neoliberalist politics of transforming statist structures into market structures. Traditional collective structures (as industrial labor relations) and precarious new collectives (as creative class fractions, self-entrepreneurs) are being dissolved and the COVID19 pandemic contributes to the fragilization of their collective structures. Although the COVID19 pandemic has shown the importance of statist regulation and foresight, statist regulation is criticized because of the restrictions of individual freedom and public life.

The planned workshop will gather presentations, which study the institutional transformations of the health care systems in times of digitalization and the COVID19 pandemic. Seen from EC, digitalization and the COVID19 pandemic introduce more asymmetries and inequalities in the health care system and reduce the plurality of health conceptions and health care institutions.

The perspective introduced by economics of convention it to focus the empirical tensions and critiques, which are present in society. The claim is that EC is an empirical approach to the normative quarrels about justice and inequality the health care system is currently facing.

Please submit your proposal to Rainer Diaz-Bone rainer.diazbone@unilu.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Gesellschaftliche Ungerechtigkeiten verstehen: Welchen Beitrag leistet Armutsforschung?

Franz Erhard, University of Siegen; Stefan Kutzner, University of Siegen

Das vorgeschlagene Panel möchte aktuell drängende Fragen zu gesellschaftlicher Ungerechtigkeit aus der Sicht der Armutsforschung diskutieren. Im Kern der Diskussion soll Armut als eine der greifbarsten Formen gesellschaftlicher Ungerechtigkeit thematisiert werden. Obwohl Armut eine naheliegende Größe zur Beschreibung gesellschaftlicher Ungleichheit darstellt, geraten (extremer) ökonomischer Mangel und die lebensweltlichen Folgen, die daraus für die Betroffenen erwachsen, als Ausdruck und Treiber von Ungerechtigkeit regelmäßig aus dem Blick. Darüber hinaus soll allerdings auch diskutiert werden, wie sich weitere Themen, in denen Fragen gesellschaftlicher Gerechtigkeit relevant werden, mit der Diskussion von Armut verknüpfen lassen.

So lässt sich mit Bezug auf die aktuellen Diskurse um die Covid-19-Pandemie bspw. sagen, dass sich die Probleme einer eingeschränkten Reisefreiheit oder einer drohenden Quarantäne auf einem Kreuzfahrtschiff für Personen am ‚unteren Rand‘ der Gesellschaft nicht stellen. Stattdessen sind ganz basal wirtschaftliche Absicherung und Formen sozialer Einbindung bedroht. Welche politischen Maßnahmen sozial gerecht sind, muss vor diesem Hintergrund neu bewertet werden. Noch deutlicher wird dieser Zusammenhang mit Blick auf die Klimakrise. Vulnerable und ökonomisch benachteiligte Gruppen sind – zumal im globalen Maßstab – von ihr meist zuerst und am härtesten betroffen. Fragen der Klimagerechtigkeit sollten deshalb argumentativ nicht allein an Treibhausgasemissionen festgemacht werden, sondern sich auch daran orientieren, wer am meisten leistet, d.h. ökonomisch verkräften kann.

Über diese besonders prägnanten Themenbereiche hinaus müssen aber auch bspw. Fragen der Geschlechtergerechtigkeit, der Gesundheit oder der Beteiligung an politischen Prozessen im Kontext von Armut diskutiert werden. Mit dem Einbezug dieser und anderer Themen und Bereiche in die Armutsforschung wird unsere Gesellschaft und die Gerechtigkeitsherausforderungen, mit denen sie konfrontiert ist, mit einem Blick ‚von unten‘ beleuchtet.

Vorgesehen sind fünf Vorträge (20 + 5 Minuten) und eine abschließende gemeinsame Diskussion (25 Minuten). Der Vorträge werden über einen Call for Papers eingeworben. Gewünscht sind Erkenntnisse und Theoretisierungen, die aus empirischen Arbeiten hervorgegangen sind und auch empirisch im Vortrag gedeckt werden können. Dabei sollen nach Möglichkeit paradigmengreifend (qualitative und quantitative Zugänge) Wissenschaftler:innen gewonnen werden, sowie paritätisch Frauen und Männer zum Zug kommen. Die Moderation der Veranstaltung übernehmen die Antragsteller.

Bitte senden Sie Ihren Vorschlag an Franz Erhard, franz.erhard@uni-siegen.de

Einsendeschluss: 29. Januar 2021

Länge der Abstracts: maximal ~ 500 Wörter

Privation de liberté en temps de pandémie et justice sociale

Daniel Fink, Université de Lausanne et Université de Lucerne

La pandémie COVID-19 qui s'est répandue dès le début de 2020 a probablement soulevé des questions de justice sociale dans les établissements de privation de liberté comme dans aucune autre institution. Il ne s'agissait plus seulement de la mise en œuvre dans ces institutions d'une offre de santé qualitativement égale à celle en société, selon l'application du principe d'équivalence, mais de l'adaptation des mesures de prévention en une période de pandémie virulente. Ces dernières, définies dès mars 2020 pour la population générale, devaient être adaptées dans des espaces restreints et des conditions de vie strictes, à l'aide de moyens sanitaires limités, mais d'une communication institutionnelle intensifiée. Un réaménagement des espaces communs et une réorganisation des cellules ont dû être organisés à la hâte dans beaucoup de lieux de détention, afin de garantir un suivi adéquat de santé, de l'organisation d'espace de quarantaine pour les détenus arrivants jusqu'au conseil médical pour toute personne avec symptômes, et en cas de maladie plus grave, une hospitalisation adaptée à la situation. En même temps, certaines catégories de détenus considérés comme particulièrement dangereux ont pu être confrontés à davantage de restrictions et à davantage d'obstacles d'exercer dans l'exercice de leurs droits élémentaires. Inversement, il est possible aussi que la prévention du suicide et des automutilations ait poussé les directions des établissements à davantage de surveillance des détenus. Du côté de la justice, la pandémie a conduit à des décisions qui relèvent de la politique pénale, d'un côté, par exemple, à l'extension automatique de la durée initiale des détentions provisoires, de l'autre à l'application des libérations anticipées, au renvoi de l'exécution des peines de substitution ou encore à la fermeture de certains centres d'expulsion. La justice tournant au ralenti, les plaintes, les demandes de libération anticipée et toute autre doléance provenant des détenus ont été traitées avec moins de célérité. Finalement, ce sont les activités liées à la prévention de la torture qui ont été interrompues durant un long moment, dans une période qui demandait probablement plus que jamais un monitoring du traitement des détenus et de leurs conditions de vie.

Ce panel se propose d'aborder la question de la justice sociale dans le monde de la privation de liberté en temps de pandémie à l'aide de diverses approches et à partir de divers questionnements. Il s'agira autant de soumettre au débat les premiers résultats des travaux en cours depuis juin 2020 que de discuter le travail théoriques préparatif des diverses équipes qui se lancent sur le COVID-19 en privation de liberté.

Intervenant.e.s :

- Gaëtan Cliquennois (CNRS, Université de Nantes) et Annie Kensey (CESDIP): L'exercice des droits à la santé des détenus durant la pandémie COVID-19
- Stefano Caneppele, Christine Burkhardt (Université de Lausanne) : Justice et prison en temps de pandémie (titre de travail)
- Melanie Wegel, Sabera Wardak et Darleen Meyer (all ZHAW): The crises management of the pandemic COVID-19 in coercive contexts.
- Daniel Fink (Universités de Lausanne et Lucerne): Les organismes de prévention de la torture comme agents de justice sociale

Veillez soumettre vos propositions à Daniel Fink, daniel.fink@unil.ch

Délai de soumission : 29 janvier 2021

Longueur des résumés : max. ~500 mots

Bénévolat en temps de crise : (re)configurations des engagements

Maëlle Meigniez, Dominique Malatesta et Carola Togni

Haute école de travail social et de la santé de Lausanne (HETSL)

La crise sanitaire actuelle a été la scène d'apparition de nombreux appels à l'entraide et à la solidarité, pour faire face au creusement des inégalités, à la précarisation des conditions de vie des plus vulnérables ou encore à l'isolement des personnes âgées confinées. Distributions alimentaires, réseaux d'entraide de voisinage, groupes d'échange virtuels, visites à domicile, etc. ; autant d'actions collectives et d'initiatives citoyennes qui ont pris en charge une certaine organisation de l'aide. Dans ce contexte incertain, l'engagement bénévole revient en effet sur le devant de la scène pour se présenter comme un vecteur essentiel de solidarité et de lien social.

A partir de ce constat, nous souhaitons dans cette session interroger les configurations et reconfigurations des engagements bénévoles lors des moments de crise, comme celui que nous vivons actuellement avec la pandémie de Covid19. Intégrant également une dimension socio-historique, il s'agira de mettre en perspective la place actuelle que peut prendre le bénévolat, en regard d'autres périodes historiques marquées par l'incertitude et les transformations des relations sociales.

Le bénévolat de *care*, qui fonde ses engagements sur l'attention portée à autrui, prend plus que jamais une signification sociale qu'il s'agit de questionner sous l'angle des enjeux qu'il met en lumière – autant du côté des populations aidées que des bénévoles. L'éthique du *care* (Laugier 2009) permet en effet de comprendre le sens et la part bénévole du *prendre soin*, tout particulièrement dans les moments de crise à large échelle qui creusent les inégalités et renforcent les situations de précarité et de dépendance. L'engagement bénévole de *care* pose ainsi la question de la *justice sociale*, à la fois en termes de *reconnaissance* et de *redistribution* (Fraser 2004). La *reconnaissance* des personnes – principalement des femmes – qui œuvrent pour ce *prendre soin* de manière non-rémunérée, mais également la reconnaissance du caractère indispensable des tâches accomplies ainsi que de la *redistribution* de ce travail au sein de la société (notamment entre les sexes, entre les classes sociales, entre les personnes rémunérées ou non, entre professionnel-les et profanes, etc.). Se pose ainsi la question de la recomposition des formes et de l'organisation de l'aide dans des espaces professionnels ou non, institutionnalisés ou non¹.

A la croisée d'une analyse de l'engagement et d'une perspective de *care*, cette session vise à mettre en discussion des contributions permettant de comprendre : comment les moments de crise transforment les engagements bénévoles ? A quelles conditions et dans quelle mesure le bénévolat peut se présenter comme un espace d'exercice de la citoyenneté favorisant des formes de reconnaissance et de redistribution ?

Références:

Fraser, N. (2004). Justice sociale, redistribution et reconnaissance. Revue du MAUSS, 1 (23), 152-164.
Laugier, S. (2009). L'éthique comme politique de l'ordinaire. Multitudes, 37/38, 80-88.

Veillez soumettre vos propositions à Maëlle Meigniez, maelle.meigniez@hetsl.ch

Délai de soumission : 29 janvier 2021

Longueur des résumés : max. ~500 mots

¹ La recherche que nous menons actuellement à la Haute école de travail social et de la santé Lausanne (HETSL) et financée par la Société Suisse d'Utilité Publique (SSUP) a notamment mis en lumière comment la pandémie et le semi-confinement du printemps dernier en Suisse a modifié en profondeur les lieux de l'animation socioculturelle à Lausanne et leurs activités, tout en reposant largement sur un travail bénévole féminin.

Childhood: politics and moral economies in times of global crises

Daniel Stoecklin, Quentin Fayet, André Sarli

University of Geneva, Center for Children's Rights Studies

Global crises are events that tend to overtake the attention of political, economical, moral, philosophical discourses in spite of apparently less important matters.

The question is how actors react to such crises by reinforcing existing discourses, disrupting them in favor of alternative narratives or even creating new ones. A particularly visible discourse is the humanitarian one (Fassin, 2011) which focuses on the mobilisation of compassion to “help” or “save” those who need it. Children are often at the very center of these concerns and their lives can be strongly influenced by these discourses and how they are being shaped by various actors.

The onset of “more pressing needs” - a social construct and one of the elements of transaction of the moral economy, a shift on the discourses and focus can easily divert programs and funding from a specific issue such as children in street situations to a “newer” regional or global worry, such as the child soldier. Thus leaving some of the target programs and their beneficiary, if not adapted, to face difficulties. This transformation has been explored in the literature (e.g. Poretta et al's “The rise and fall of icons of ‘stolen childhood’ since the adoption of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child”, 2014 and Burman's “Innocents abroad: Western fantasies of childhood and the iconography of emergencies”, 1996)

With this paper session, we would like to delve into this topics and look at how moral economies (Fassin, 2011) and the politics of childhood are being (re)shaped in the face of global crises as the current coronavirus pandemic.

We aim on receiving paper from different perspectives, including inter and transdisciplinary approaches and to find synergies across fields.

Please submit your proposal to Daniel Stoecklin daniel.stoecklin@unige.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Conducting qualitative research in times of uncertainties: Methodological and ethical considerations

Tomás Liva and Ophélie Bidet

University of Neuchâtel, Institute of Sociology

The health pandemic that erupted in 2020 has had a major impact on our research and particularly on the methods at our disposal for the collection of qualitative data. Qualitative research has been strongly affected from limited access to participants, restricted mobility and the uncertainty regarding the duration of the health crisis and the respective constraints. These circumstances provoked researchers to develop original strategies in order to advance ones' own research under the new conditions. Online interviews – whether conducted synchronously through VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) technologies such as Skype, Zoom, FaceTime and WhatsApp or asynchronously through e.g. online chats – have played a major role by providing an alternative ways to gain access to participants.

Although the set of literature on online interviews is increasing (Deakin and Wakefield, 2014; Janghorban, Roudsari and Taghipour, 2014; Salmons, 2015; Mirick and Wladkowski, 2019), only little is known about the impact of the virtual mode on the role of the researcher, on the participants, on the interview methods, on the type of data produced and its quality. In this panel, we aim to raise such questions and to discuss the methodological and ethical considerations made in this time of uncertainty that has accompanied us in 2020. We welcome papers that may include, but not limited to, the following topics:

- What are the advantages and disadvantages of using online interviews for qualitative data collection?
- How to evaluate the quality of data collected through online interviews?
- How to adapt interview guides and techniques when conducting online interviews?
- Has online interviewing changed the relationship between participant(s) and the researcher? How to critically question such changes?
- How to assess the impact of online interviews on the participants? How can researchers address these possible implications on the participant?
- How to guarantee participants' confidentiality and privacy when conducting online interviews?

References

- DEAKIN, H. and WAKEFIELD, K. (2014). "Skype Interviewing : reflections of two PhD researchers", *Qualitative Research*, 14(5), pp.603-616.
- JANGHORBAN, R., ROUDSARI, R. L. and TAGHIPOUR, A. (2014). "Skype interviewing: The new generation of online synchronous interview in qualitative research", *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, 9(1), p.24152.
- MIRICK, R. and WLADKOWSKI, S. (2019). "Skype in Qualitative Interviews: Participant and Researcher Perspectives", *The Qualitative Report*, 24(12), pp.3061-3072.
- SALMONS, J. (2015). *Qualitative online interviews: strategies, design and skills*, 2nd ed., London & California: SAGE Publications Inc.

Please submit your proposal to Tomás Livia livia.tomas@unine.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

En français : Penser le travail et les vieillesse : au croisement des sociologies

Laura Guérin, Université de Lille ; Valérie Hugentobler, Haute école de travail social et de la santé de Lausanne (HETSL) ; Cornelia Hummel Université de Genève ; Iris Loffeier, Haute Ecole de Santé du Canton de Vaud (HESAV), David Pichonnaz, HES-SO Valais-Wallis, Institut Travail Social ; Isabelle Zinn, Universität Konstanz et HETSL.

L'espérance de vie à la naissance a fortement augmenté au cours du 20^{ème} siècle, ce qui fait de la vieillesse un des grands défis de l'Etat-providence contemporain. L'ajout de plusieurs décennies d'espérance de vie, les modifications des structures de solidarité en direction des plus âgé-es mais également la diversification des manières de vieillir ont conduit à la mise en place de réponses collectives parmi lesquelles la professionnalisation de la prise en charge des personnes âgées occupe une place prépondérante. Porter un regard sociologique sur ces activités professionnelles et sur celles et ceux qui les exécutent nous semble dès lors important. C'est pourquoi cet atelier propose de poser spécifiquement sa focale sur le travail, les groupes professionnels et les bénévoles actifs et actives auprès des personnes âgées.

L'atelier vise l'ensemble des professionnel·les de la vieillesse, qu'il s'agisse ou non de personnel soignant. Il s'agira d'explorer comment les professionnel·les appartenant à divers corps de métiers prennent en charge la vieillesse, en portant une attention particulière aux cultures professionnelles, aux tensions, aux frontières de métiers, mais également aux interactions et collaborations entre métiers « soignants » et « non-soignants », entre approches médico-soignantes et approches « alternatives ». Cet atelier a ainsi pour but de réunir des chercheur·es s'intéressant à ces professionnel·les et bénévoles, et à leurs pratiques, et s'attachera plus largement à étudier les enjeux sociaux du vieillissement et comment celui-ci impacte les métiers qui gravitent autour.

Les propositions de communication peuvent porter sur une grande variété de terrains, du moment que ceux-ci impliquent des professionnel·les ou bénévoles fournissant un service ou un accompagnement aux personnes âgées.

Proposer une communication :

Un résumé, précisant la thématique, les choix méthodologiques ainsi que les sites d'enquêtes. Les propositions peuvent être rédigées dans l'une des trois langues du congrès (allemand, anglais, français).

Merci de préciser : (1) dans quelle(s) langue(s) vous êtes prêt·e à présenter la communication ; (2) quelle(s) langues vous comprenez (vous pourriez dès lors faire votre présentation dans un atelier où des présentations seront faites dans les langues indiquées comme comprises).

Veillez soumettre vos propositions à Isabelle Zinn zinn.isabelle@gmail.com

Délai de soumission : 29 janvier 2021

Longueur des résumés : max. ~500 mots

In English: Working with old age: at the crossroads of sociological theories

Laura Guérin, Université de Lille ; Valérie Hugentobler, Haute école de travail social et de la santé de Lausanne (HETSL), Cornelia Hummel Université de Genève ; Iris Loffeier, Haute Ecole de Santé du Canton de Vaud (HESAV), David Pichonnaz, HES-SO Valais-Wallis, Institut Travail Social ; Isabelle Zinn, Universität Konstanz et HETSL.

Life expectancy at birth has sharply increased during the 20th century, making old age one of the great challenges of contemporary welfare states. The addition of several decades of life expectancy, modifications in solidarity structures for the elderly, but also the diversification of ways of aging have led to the implementation of collective responses, among which the professionalization of elder care occupies a predominant place. It is therefore crucial to investigate occupational activities and those who carry them out. This is why this panel will specifically focus on work, occupations, and voluntary workers involved in elder care, whether or not they are part of the medical personnel. It will explore how workers from various professions deal with old age, with a particular attention to professional cultures and identities, tensions, professional boundaries and territories, but also to the interactions and collaborations among different professional groups, and between those involved in the social model of care and medical professions.

This workshop aims at bringing together sociologists from different fields interested in these professionals and voluntary workers, and their practices, and will focus more broadly on the social challenges of aging and their impact on professional groups. Contributions can cover a variety of fields, as long as they involve professionals or volunteers providing a service or support to the elderly.

Submit an abstract:

A summary specifies the topics, the methodological approach as well as the fieldsites. Proposals can be written in one of the three languages of the congress (German, English, French). Please specify (1) in which language(s) you are ready to present the communication; (2) which language(s) you do understand (you could then make your presentation in a workshop where presentations will be made in the languages indicated as understood).

Please submit your proposal to Isabelle Zinn zinn.isabelle@gmail.com

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Other topics
Waste and modern societies

**Nadine Arnold, Universität Luzern; Schürkmann Christiane, Johannes Gutenberg
Universität Mainz**

In the light of fundamental socio-ecological transformations waste does not simply refer to leftovers, but rather to an urgent issue that calls for attention and action: Ecosystems, particularly oceans and seas are full of micro-plastic, rising CO₂ emissions produce greenhouse effects and global warming, nuclear waste challenges societies to find solutions for disposal of these toxic materials. In this context, modern societies more and more realize that “there is no away” (Morton 2013) for materials, substances and things that have become (ir-)relevant as waste. Waste thus emerges as a phenomenon of material resistance and activity that requires treatment, governance, and ethical frameworks. Therefore, debates on sustainability emphasize the implementation of a ‘Green New Deal’ or alternatively strategies of ‘degrowth’ and waste emerges as a contingent phenomenon, involving processes of interpretation and meaning making.

Although people necessarily produce waste (George 2014), we know that consumer cultures producing trash are a modern phenomenon (Strasser 1999). This means human consumption drives the production and accumulation of wasted goods (Packard 1960), but we must also consider that humans and their lives themselves can become wasted as outcasts (Bauman 2004). The notion of human waste demonstrates the tremendous metaphoric power of waste (Farzin 2017), although referring to Mary Douglas’ (1966: 36) structuralist perspective, waste is often discussed “as a matter out of place”. However, waste appears to be an issue created by ‘the moderns’ (Latour 1993, Descola 2013) and in view of the changing state of the nature and its relationship with people, waste is turning into a globalized ‘stress test’. Considering this societal relevance of waste, we encourage empirical and theoretical contributions from different sub-disciplines that will respond to the following:

- What is waste in modern times and who defines what has to be treated as waste and in which way? In other words, how are things, materials and artefacts classified as ‘waste’?
- Which situated ‘waste practices’ embedded in routines and everyday life are developed by the ‘moderns’? And what are the characterizing structures of waste management and governance and what are their societal effects on waste and society?
- Which conflicts and controversies emerge in the production, distribution and prevention of waste? How does waste challenge producers, consumers, and disposers and therefore societies at large? And what interventions are chosen to meet these challenges?
- Which theoretical perspectives are useful to study the materiality of waste as well as the construction of its meaning? And which methods are well-equipped to examine waste empirically?

Confirmed participants who will make a presentation:

- Stefan Laser (Ruhr-Universität Bochum)
- Christiane Schürkmann (Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz)
- Mallory Xinyu Zhan (Université de Genève)
- Kathrin Eitel (Goethe-Universität Frankfurt)
- Nadine Arnold (Universität Luzern)
- Christopher Dorn (Fernuniversität Hagen)

Please submit your proposal to Nadine Arnold, nadine.arnold@unilu.ch

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

Other topics

Les chemins numériques d'accès aux droits et prestations sociales à l'aune de la justice sociale.

Jean-François Bickel, HES-SO – Haute école de travail social Fribourg

A l'instar de nombreux espaces de la vie professionnelle, citoyenne et quotidienne et d'une multitude d'actes y compris les plus ordinaires, l'accès aux droits et prestations sociales est aujourd'hui médié par les outils numériques, qui deviennent de plus en plus incontournables et omniprésents, telle une évidence qui n'est pas ou plus discutée. C'est précisément à une mise en discussion de cet impératif normatif de digitalisation de l'accès aux droits et aux prestations sociales, et plus largement de la relation à l'État et aux services d'intérêts généraux (publics, privés ou associatifs), que cette session entend contribuer, une discussion menée à l'aune de la justice sociale. Ainsi, les communications attendues s'inscriront dans l'une ou l'autre des deux perspectives suivantes :

- Soit, en adoptant un point de vue de justice procédurale, elles s'attacheront à scruter en quoi et comment la digitalisation constitue un obstacle ou un levier pour l'accès aux droits et prestations, favorise ou fait reculer le non-recours ; ou encore à mettre en évidence dans quelle mesure et de quelle manière tel ou tel public concerné ou les professionnel-le-s qui les accompagnent s'approprient ces nouveaux chemins d'accès et avec quelles conséquences.
- Soit, en adoptant un point de vue de justice distributive, elles s'appliqueront à examiner comment la digitalisation de l'accès aux droits et prestations contribue à renforcer, à reproduire ou à atténuer les inégalités sociales déjà présentes et / ou en constitue une nouvelle composante spécifique, par exemple en prenant appui sur ce que M. Ragnedda conceptualise comme « capital digital » et ses interactions avec les autres formes de capitaux (économique, social, culturel...). Les formes d'inégalités concernées pourront concerner aussi bien l'accès au numérique que les compétences à utiliser et expériences d'usage, ou encore les bénéfices sociaux résultant de l'usage (souvent thématiques respectivement comme *first, second and third digital divides* dans la littérature).

La session privilégiera les communications dont les théorisations s'appuient sur une base empirique, tout en étant ouverte à la pluralité des méthodes et des perspectives théoriques. Des communications prenant pour objet les outils numériques eux-mêmes et leurs effets propres structurant (cf. par ex. le concept de script développé par M. Akrich) sont bienvenues.

Le(s) nom(s) et appartenance(s) du, de la ou des auteur-e-s ainsi que l'adresse de contact sont à inclure dans le message.

Veillez soumettre vos propositions à Jean-François Bickel, jean-francois.bickel@hefr.ch

Délai de soumission : 29 janvier 2021

Longueur des résumés : max. ~500 mots

Building platforms: management, organization and (in)justice

Loïc Riom and Luca Perring

Mines ParisTech

In recent years, platforms have emerged as an issue of concern and controversies in both academic and public spheres. As a form of market, the platform model is now ubiquitous, ranging from social media to ride-hailing. By providing an interface between multiple parties, they promote interactions through the design of their matching and pricing mechanisms. For their proponents, platforms are generally viewed as a way of improving the organization of information, thus solving a wide range of social problems. On the contrary, their critics argue that they create injustices, undue market power, and labor rights infringement. With the recent lockdowns, people had to turn away from the brick-and-mortar economy towards e-commerce. The reliance on online platforms has never been heavier. It has made the downsides of this model more visible, and more controversies have arisen.

Numerous works have focused on the impact of platforms on employment and consumption. The effects of platforms has been already extensively examined for their effects on markets (Srnicek, 2017; van Doorn & Velthuis, 2019), labor (Casilli, 2019), or their technical infrastructure (Van Dijck, 2013; Bucher, 2017). However, few studies have questioned platform from the point of view of the people that build them: entrepreneurs, developers, and managers. This panel aims to fill this gap. Rather than considering platforms as stable entities, they will be approached as an emerging challenge for entrepreneurs: What does it mean to organize a business as a platform? What does this model make entrepreneurs do? What kind of problems does it raise? What kind of agencement does it create? How can we characterize platform entrepreneurship? By bringing together different case studies from various sectors (music, food delivery, dating apps, food activism), this panel will aim to better understand how platform management shapes organizations and interactions. Particular attention will be paid to the way in which the platform as a metaphor (Gillespie, 2010) is used by actors to account for their activity and their business. In doing so, we will address how platform creators respond to social concerns - especially social (in)justices – and incorporated them into sociotechnological devices we use on a daily basis.

Expected speakers: Tanja Schneider (UniSG), Laetitia Della Bianca (UNIL), Jessica Pidoux (EPFL), Thomas Jammet (UNINE)

Please submit your proposal to Loïc Riom, loicriom@gmail.com

Deadline for submissions: January 29, 2021

Abstracts length: maximum ~500 words

CO-VIES20 – Vivre (dé)confiné-e-s, penser en commun

Proposé par les membres de l'équipe éditoriale du blog <https://covies20.com>

En réduisant drastiquement les possibilités de réunion publique en coprésence, les diverses

mesures prises pour endiguer la pandémie de la covid-19 fragilisent les différents espaces-temps communs (salles de cours, séminaires de recherche, comités éditoriaux, etc.) qui, d'ordinaire, nous permettent de réfléchir à ce que « faire société » veut dire. Or, dans le contexte de la crise sanitaire, la notion même de société a perdu de son évidence. Se délier, s'isoler et se protéger des autres s'imposent comme des lignes de conduite à suivre, et les individus et la société qu'ils composent sont appréhendés d'abord comme les membres potentiellement menaçants d'une population dont les comportements doivent être régulés. Dans un tel contexte, il est nécessaire de se pencher sur la façon dont le coronavirus SARS-CoV-2, alors qu'il bouleverse nos manières d'interagir et de ressentir, est susceptible de défaire ce par quoi nous tenons ensemble, de creuser les inégalités et d'amplifier les injustices, mais aussi de transformer le cours habituel de nos relations (dans la famille, au travail, dans la rue, etc.) en un domaine appauvri, dans lequel la « vie nue » semble supplanter « la vie bonne » et où règnent des passions tristes, la peur et la colère en particulier.

Réunissant un ensemble d'enseignant-e-s chercheur-e-s gravitant autour de l'Université de

Lausanne, de la Haute école de travail social de Genève et de la Haute école de travail social et de la santé de Lausanne, le blog CO-VIES20 s'est constitué en avril 2020 pendant le confinement destiné à freiner ladite « 1e vague ». CO-VIES20 vise à réfléchir à la période inédite et pleine d'incertitudes que nous traversons à l'aide des prises réflexives et des agrafes conceptuelles que les sciences sociales ont développées pour faire sens du monde social. Ouvert aux sociologues (anthropologues, etc.) aguerris-e-s comme aux étudiant-e-s, ce blog sert aussi, en pluralisant les voix et les points de vue, à suivre au plus près notre expérience individuelle et collective afin de documenter la mémoire de la pandémie et de mieux comprendre ce qui nous arrive, que ce soit en relatant une expérience, en décrivant une situation, en partageant des images ou en proposant un éclairage.

Cette double visée de documentation et de compréhension contribue à faire du blog CO-VIES20 un espace de recherche participative à distance qu'il nous semble utile et salutaire de présenter et de mettre en discussion. Faire vivre ce type d'espace nous semble en effet plus que jamais essentiel à l'heure où les outils numériques pénètrent en force la recherche et l'enseignement académiques et où il est devenu difficile de penser en commun.

Détails sur panel :

Les membres de l'équipe éditoriale du blog CO-VIES20 sont à la fois les organisateurs du panel et les orateurs.trices qui prendront la parole durant le panel. Le programme de ces prises de parole sera précisé en temps voulu.

Membres de l'équipe éditoriale du blog CO-VIES20 au 28.11.2020 :

- Sélim Ben Amor (assistant diplômé et doctorant, Institut des Sciences sociales, Université de Lausanne) : selim.benamor@unil.ch
- Daniela Cerqui Ducret (Maître d'enseignement et de recherche, Institut des Sciences sociales, Université de Lausanne) : daniela.cerquiducet@unil.ch
- Célia De Pietro (assistante diplômée et doctorante, Institut des Sciences sociales, Université de Lausanne) : celia.depietro@unil.ch
- Mariano Fernandez (Professeur, Université Nationale de La Plata, Buenos Aires) : marianonestor.fernandez@unil.ch
- Laurence Kaufmann (Professeur ordinaire, Institut des Sciences sociales, Université de Lausanne) : Laurence.Kaufmann@unil.ch
- Marine Kneubühler (Chercheuse FNS junior, Institut des Sciences sociales, Université de Lausanne) : marine.kneubuhler@unil.ch

- Fabienne Malbois (Chercheuse FNS senior, Institut des Sciences sociales, Université de Lausanne ; collaboratrice scientifique, Haute école de travail social et de la santé Lausanne) : fabienne.malbois@hetsl.ch
- Maëlle Meigniez (collaboratrice scientifique, Haute école de travail social et de la santé Lausanne ; chargée de cours, Institut des Sciences sociales, Université de Lausanne) : maelle.meigniez@hetsl.ch
- Olivier Moeschler (chef du domaine Culture, OFS ; chercheur associé, Institut des Sciences sociales, Université de Lausanne) : Olivier.Moeschler@unil.ch
- Pierre-Nicolas Oberhauser (assistant diplômé et doctorant, Institut des Sciences sociales, Université de Lausanne) : Pierre-Nicolas.Oberhauser@unil.ch
- Nicole Peccoud (assistante HES, Haute école de travail social de Genève, et doctorante, Université de Genève) : nicole.peccoud@hesge.ch
- Justine Scheidegger (doctorante FNS, Institut des Sciences sociales, Université de Lausanne) : justine.scheidegger@unil.ch

Détail des intérêts, des titres et des fonctions et des intérêts de chacun-e :

<https://covies20.com/a-propos/>

Veillez soumettre vos propositions à Fabienne Malbois : fabienne.malbois@unil.ch ou fmalbois@gmail.com

Délai de soumission : 29 janvier 2021

Longueur des résumés : max. ~500 mots

The congress is supported by :



h e t s

Haute école de travail social
Genève



**Société
Académique**



de
Genève

Schweizerische Akademie der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften
Académie suisse des sciences humaines et sociales
Accademia svizzera di scienze morali e sociali
Academia svizra da ciencias morales e socialas
Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences

