

The context of crisis, as evoked in recent years, at the heart of social work, requires the ability to elucidate a certain number of phenomena. In view of the complexity inherent in this movement, and the tensions that this arouses among the protagonists, research can constitute an angle to be examined. In this possible look, from a research in social work, several postures determine the conceptual gesture chosen. For my part, from a singular, hybrid place, I chose to analyze first the effects observed among social work professionals, making it possible to shed light on the sufferings, in the daily activity. These first works, as part of a master's degree in philosophy and ergology, allow us to take a look at participation, within social and medico-social interventions. Our research mobilized a diagnosis of the concept of participation documented by the social sciences (missed meeting, Bacqué, 2015, constantly reinvented, Bresson, 2014, Participation embodies a form of expected emancipation but also tenses professionals as it is complex (Marcel Jaeger 2009) ; similarly, various evaluation reports (high social work committee, anti-poverty observatory, support associations for individuals). Thus, it is around an exploratory work, that I confronted the conceptual contributions, with the elements of analyzes emanating from the protagonists themselves (professionals and accompanied people). This shared diagnosis has supported the hypothesis of a process of participation taking a long time to emerge, and of an injunction in the couple to “involve” “make autonomous”, a source of tension and contradiction within work organizations. Thus a first research, built by a dialogue of approaches, ergological approach, philosophical procedure, a work of genealogical inspiration and the social engineering approach, made it possible to deconstruct the mechanisms at work within social work, for better understand the inclusion of the concept of participation. We perceived phenomena of injunctions, at the heart of the devices, as falling under paradoxes, plunging the protagonists into tensions and contradictions that we advance as a growing malaise in this sector of activity. Similarly, given the necessary commitment of professionals, in complex encounters, with the public in situations of vulnerability, it is an entire system that seems to us to be at risk of danger. Indeed, can there be a problematic and growing impact of public action to think about social work and the concepts that characterize it, in autonomous policies that govern professional practices? Public action offers standards of action to professionals to deal with the complexity of work situations, in these conditions, is not the professional in this context, dispossessed of an endogenous deliberation, at the origin of his training, of his system of complex values, built to respond to the singularities of the human being? Is this climate not harmful in the long term, and thus linked to the context of the crisis? Finally, the results of this exploratory research were confronted with examples of cooperation between actors, allowing us to identify ways of emancipating from these contradictory norms. Indeed, within collectives observed and created by the protagonists themselves, it seems that the margins of interaction between individuals generate “well-understood” participation (Zask, 2011). Spaces for dialogues of knowledge, professional and experiential, allowing to renew practices in a debate of standards. This is why I wanted to continue this exploration, through doctoral research, to develop an approach, thought out with the protagonists and the philosophy. Before exposing possible spaces for new inspiring practices, it is important to offer a reading of the context as a preamble. Indeed, let us remember that to deal with this "renewed impediment" to the participation of supported people, public intentions propose normative frameworks, where people in vulnerable situations are encouraged to participate in their life project, through tools regulated and assessed by the state. A new governance of social and medico-social action, instituted since January 2002, and intended to be paradigmatic, recognizes and affirms the right to autonomy. The ability to determine oneself, to govern oneself, was protected by law. It is a legislative series, initiated two decades ago, in the health

and social sector, where participatory democracy has been strongly imbued with the principle of personal autonomy. This set of analysis bundles allows us to announce that participation in social support questions the autonomy of the people supported. But, how to think about autonomy and participation, at the heart of organizations, outside normative frameworks, by suspending injunctions, by developing a collective thought, focused on ethics? In France, since 2019, the High Authority for Health has been responsible for developing a common reference system, making it possible to assess the quality of support, and this, driven in particular by universal values, in favor of participation and the autonomy of the accompanied public. As we know, the participation of people in the decision-making processes that concern them is also a strong political movement, for several decades, of activism, of struggles carried out by the people concerned themselves. But participation is not self-evident, because, for free and effective participation to manifest itself in every interstice of support, the paths to achieve it are sometimes very complex and a source of conflicting values. The participatory approach questions the autonomy of people, and more particularly the autonomy of their decisions, what we call moral autonomy or autonomy of will in philosophy. "The autonomy of the will is this property that the will has of being its own law" (Kant, 1785), autonomy in Kant, is first of all a property of our mind, of what 'it appeals to our reason, but also to our will. All human beings are autonomous in the sense that they can become themselves through their individual reason and which acquires something universal, the source of their actions and their choices. This is the Kantian paradigm, thinker of modernity, major influence of the doctrine of law, today. Joelle Zask, philosopher, offers a well-understood definition of participation, which seems to me conducive to understanding the foundations of my remarks: "to experience participation, each actor receives the conditions of possibility to take part, contribute and receive a share of his participation. ". I propose to perceive this definition as three levels, which constitute the guarantor of an operational implementation of people's power to act. The principle of autonomy in France, compared to that of participation, covers a major issue, since instituted since the French Revolution, as a norm on which the social contract is based. The autonomy norm, like participation, is driven by public policies, and as announced above, subject to evaluation. These evaluation models, strongly inspired by new public management, thus transferred to social and medico-social work, seem to us to collide with the very definition of Joelle Zask, by generating, what we think, sources of conflicts of values in particular, and probably, ethical dilemmas. This notion of value conflict seems insufficiently thought out in social work, yet it is a source of crisis, of disaffection, which develop and accumulate in this system. What to do with this finding? Especially since the question of values is a driving force for the social worker, even a vector of his commitment to people in vulnerable situations. Labor analysts have documented this extensively for several decades. Value conflicts are a major cause of suffering at work (Girard, 2009), six out of ten working people are exposed to them (DARES, Direction de l'Animation de la Recherche, des Etudes et des Statistiques, 2021). As early as 2011, the ANACT (national agency for the improvement of working conditions) alerted to the process of professional disaffection, which is particularly harmful to health, by pointing out new forms of organization and management. Diane Girard clarifies "the moral distress of the professional", by documenting the conflicts of values at work: "these occur, when in a given situation, a person is torn between various values which recommend contradictory acts". DARES, in 2021, informs that the most frequent exposure results from ethical conflicts, in situations where professionals must do things they disapprove of. In 2022, the new Piveteau report mentions that the very clear call from the public authorities to arouse people's "power to act" is sometimes felt as a paradoxical injunction, due to inconsistencies observed between the stated principles and

certain administrative operations. Finally, if we complete this analysis of the sources of paradoxes, one of the axes of the definition of social work, seems to constitute another source of tension, clearly established: "promoting autonomy AND protection" (Article L116-1, social action and family code). It appears that this definition of social action strongly mobilizes the professional, in the daily life and the reality of the support. Indeed, combining autonomy and protection is a central concern, which requires a singular elaboration. Social workers may be required, to combine these tensions, to summon different postures and positions to take positions; to do this, they rely on a register of values, which depending on the outcome chosen, may generate emotional discomfort, itself a source of conflict. As we have seen, conflict is a source of suffering, it is a test. But in this test, the tensions are the subject of a treatment, the outcome of which is to be able to evacuate them, and to resolve the conflicts, by decisions, sometimes arbitrary. We propose, to maintain the tensions and the crises, not to evacuate them, in order to think them and to work out them, individually and collectively... by the ethical reflection and by the participation of the people accompanied. We have found that to deal with the complexities of the reality of the activity, professionals rely on piloting, in the place of morality. It seems necessary, however, to clarify that morality can be discussed, at the place of ethics. Ethics, here, is understood as a reasoned reflection on values, in a questioning of our habits and our ways of being with others (Socratic approach and the emergence of ethical thought in philosophy) These phenomena, deserve to be observed and diagnosed, and it is necessary to be inventive. (Currently, field of study, Unapei Alpes Provence, since March 2022, ethical workshops, with 200 professionals and workshops with people with intellectual disabilities) Current experiments, demonstrate emancipatory paths, through the culture of ethical questioning. The philosophical tradition, since antiquity, documents the moral questions and judgments that humans make. Ethical reflection promotes the development of the professional posture, in favor of participation. These workshops allow a dialogue between morality and ethics, "we will easily agree that it is very important to know if we are not fooled by morality" (Levinas, 1961), which seems to constitute, a revision practices, embodied by the actors themselves, in a maieutics of elaboration of thought. The philosophy of Levinas, offers contributions, on which we can rely, towards an inspiring understanding of what can also be understood by ethics "a questioning of my spontaneity by others, (Ethique et Infini, EL.) The fruitful contributions of phenomenology, a current of philosophical thought, of which Levinas is a part, allow us to question the mechanisms of thought, which, as we currently observe, are very often devitalized. So is a culture of philosophical questioning possible? Can it cover breathing spaces, making it possible to develop a professional thought, by involving people in it? Phenomenology assumes that "everything that is offered to us originally in its corporeal reality must simply be received for what it gives itself" (Husserl,) Welcoming "phenomena as they give themselves" (Heidegger, 1985) it is to welcome what manifests, as it manifests, outside the highways of thought. Isn't this a transformative entry, an opportunity to revise representations, doctrines, to be with the other, by his presence, far from the obvious. Husserl, discusses the pre-reflective, "in the lower layers, where one can find the presuppositions". This process proposed by the phenomenologist approach constitutes, here, in the context of the intervention, a climate favorable to a reflection on the professional posture, and what we think, a reflection on the other, in a movement of otherness. "To meet a man is to be kept awake by an enigma" (Levinas, 1949). An enigma that inhabits and strikes the professional, in his humanity, Levinas' ethics develops on a critical reflection of oneself, (of the Same) by the presence of the other (Other) "the other alters me but does not not swallow me up". It is in this sense that the participation of others, the person he accompanies, develops a presence, allowing

the professional not to reduce the person, not to crush him, while remaining unique, and, singular, in his professional identity, too. “The encounter is not one possibility among others, it is what constitutes me, it is my birth, my full birth, the one that plunged me into the reality of human beings. Meeting others is the primary source of my individuation” (Pillant, 2021) This reflection can prove to be very complex, in a perilous context, in a climate of performance and standardization, even of crisis. As described above, thought can be prevented or even anesthetized. This is, moreover, one of the points that our research protocol with professionals has been able to shed light on. Nevertheless, by making this observation, emanating from our hypotheses, we observe that, when professionals have the possibility of a suspended meeting time, conducive to questioning, they speak of "awakening, elaboration, emancipation and even strategic and collective foresight" (excerpt from verbatim research protocol conducted at Unapei Alpes Provence). The ethics workshops, as deployed in three territories, establishment, service and home support, produce a form of knowledge, making it possible to reconcile the constraints of the crisis and the spaces conducive to revisited practices. It should be noted that these workshops were the subject of an in-depth study and a conceptual “popularization” effort, which revealed a unique methodology. This takes place through an entry into ethics by deciphering knowledge of values, through the register of emotions, “knowledge of values depends on our emotions, the latter being conceived as perceptions of values” (Tappolet, 2000). The professionals present at the heart of the workshops are invited to evoke difficult events, which they can re-stage, and for which, the other members present, recognize themselves. The meeting around the emotions felt, takes place in a first stage, in one between oneself, “with people who recognize themselves from the same group” (inspired by the workshops of the crossing of knowledge developed by ATD Fourth World). The exploration protocol, dictated by the doctoral research, is linked to the dialogue of knowledge, an approach, resulting from the work of Yves Schwartz, making it possible to produce "unpublished knowledge". This knowledge emerges, in a dialogical process, from the protagonists in situation, who can combine with established knowledge, but also with philosophical contributions, inspired by phenomenology. This dialogue is inspired by ergological approaches, the dynamic device with three poles, it inspires, here, the posture of research, making it possible to rely on a clear postulate, that the knowledge invested, allied to the knowledge instituted, allow the emergence of a knowledge, which was not known in advance. The current results confirm certain hypotheses, allowing us to elucidate that professionals, outside the normative framework, are able to elaborate, by a singular accompaniment, but also, by a methodology which seems to us linked to the experiences of professionals. The fact of rehabilitating emotions, as a support for questioning values, allows professionals a relevant identification, echoing practices. Professionals discover their representations, revisit their relationship with others, and the possible projections on the accompanied person. These mechanisms for the elucidation of conflicts provide avenues for reviewing the axes of people's power to act, and call on an ethical sensitivity, often embodied, but not argued. In addition, the methodology proposes to discover one's register of values, and then to confront it with the accompanied person. It shows that the professional rarely seems in the same register as the public he accompanies. The stakes are not identical, the aspirations and the decisions, and thus the register of values is not the same. These findings need to be explored further, because if the values invoked in the decisions are not the same, which of the protagonists will this impact? What conflicts? What dilemma? What is not the case for professionals, who in the majority of cases collectively share the same values, are more emotional cursors, who are not in the same place.

After having described the context of the crisis, and the impacts of the modes of organization, of the standardized type, we have proposed avenues for reflection, to think about some of the tensions currently going through the social and medico-social sector in France.. We testify to a thesis, currently being explored, in order to develop hypotheses, between ethics and participation, and their interdependent relationship, in a dialectic. Thus, we have, in a synthetic way, described a singular methodology, inspired by an ethics applied to social work. These aspects currently seem to have a positive impact, even if our sample does not seek absolute completeness, but a benchmark, allowing us to visualize a trend.

The philosophy of ethics of Levinas allows us to think, through ethical reflection, a concern for others, BY the other. By mobilizing concepts such as otherness, heteronomy and exteriority, we can, it seems to us, combine contradictions, revisit practices and standards of action, by awakening the mobilization of thought. The ethical workshops seem to us to constitute spaces for the emancipation of the protagonists, a lever for new knowledge, constituting embodied standards. However, we would like to discuss these hypotheses, these research paths. The AIFRIS congress is an opportunity to contradict each other, and to explore the points of view of other countries, other views, postures, which are particularly favorable. Likewise, these questions deserve other debates, which we believe are essential to raise. Can we discuss the morality of society, of professionals, of public policies? Don't we often discuss the morality of people with disabilities? What place to give to their conception of the world, their values, their moral judgments are they not denied? Because we know what is "good" for them, "right", suitable, for the purpose of protecting them? Is it not possible to combine these questions? All situations of deficiencies, even "profound" would probably deserve that we revisit our approaches, our postures. A look, a feeling, a movement, must invite us to invade ourselves, and less to be diagnosed, assign to an alteration that does not allow us to decide. The professional, placed in a situation of heteronomy by the person he accompanies, can he thus welcome the possibility of a posture of accompaniment, allowing him to pose a decision-making process, through otherness, to the place of ethics?